

School District of Indian River County

# Oslo Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>23</b> |

# Oslo Middle School

480 20TH AVE SW, Vero Beach, FL 32962

[www.indianriverschools.org](http://www.indianriverschools.org)

## Demographics

**Principal: Craig Kinsley**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 58%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)<br>2016-17: D (39%)<br>2015-16: C (43%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Provide a high-performing learning environment that fosters academic excellence, personal integrity, community action and encourages our students to become informed, engaged, and ethical global citizens.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

To provide personalized, data-driven learning opportunities that create independent thinkers.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name              | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Robinson, Eddie   | Principal           | <p>Primary responsibility is to provide the leadership and vision necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff, parents, and community.</p> <p>The principal is also responsible for providing instructional leadership and supervision for student achievement and managing and administering the development, implementation and assessment of the instructional program at the assigned school.</p> <p>The department head teachers are responsible for leading their team in collaborative efforts in subject area focus to improve our school-wide academic goals.</p> |
| Reese, Marsha     | Instructional Coach | <p>To assist schools to provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their academic potential.</p>  |
| Roux, Joanna      | Instructional Coach | <p>To provide COACHING support for teachers which helps students move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation.</p>   |
| Kinsley, Craig    | Assistant Principal |   |
| Schwager, Heide   | Teacher, K-12       | <p>To provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation.</p>  |
| Byrd, Brandi      | Instructional Coach | <p>To assist schools to provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their academic potential.</p>  |
| Cairl, Cole       | Teacher, K-12       | <p>To provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation.</p>  |
| Cuddeback, Robert | Teacher, K-12       | <p>To provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation.</p>  |

| Name              | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Pennell, Shawna   | Teacher, K-12       | To provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation. |
| Smith, Lyn        | Teacher, K-12       | To provide an educational experience in which students move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation. |
| Spivey, Rhonda    | Other               | To provide training and support with school-wide PBiS, Restorative Justice Practices, positive climate and culture building, and behavior intervention support.                       |
| Shells, Christine | Assistant Principal |   |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Craig Kinsley

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

21

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

59

**Demographic Data**

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                | Active                 |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | K-12 General Education |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>                           | Yes                    |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 58%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)<br>2016-17: D (39%)<br>2015-16: C (43%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Number of students enrolled               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 297 | 323 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 905 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 20  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 87  |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10  | 18  | 20  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 48  |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 26  | 80  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 121 |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16  | 33  | 71  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 120 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50  | 55  | 67  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 172 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45  | 3   | 100 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 148 |



**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 35 | 103 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 9/12/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 | 314 | 313 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 918   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 12  | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 3   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 75 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 130   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 304 | 330 | 332 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 966   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 43  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 17  | 40  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 76    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 148 | 65  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 269   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54  | 70  | 93  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 217   |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 75 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 130   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 44%    | 54%      | 54%   | 37%    | 51%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 54%    | 55%      | 54%   | 39%    | 50%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 43%    | 42%      | 47%   | 34%    | 37%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 48%    | 60%      | 58%   | 39%    | 54%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 52%    | 59%      | 57%   | 44%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49%    | 50%      | 51%   | 44%    | 44%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 45%    | 53%      | 51%   | 38%    | 50%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 62%    | 72%      | 72%   | 52%    | 71%      | 70%   |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey |                                   |     |     |       |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator                                     | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     | Total |
|   | 6                                 | 7   | 8   |       |
|   | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 46%    | 52%      | -6%                        | 54%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 36%    | 48%      | -12%                       | 52%   | -16%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 38%    | 51%      | -13%                       | 52%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 33%    | 44%      | -11%                       | 51%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 45%    | 53%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -11%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 50%    | 55%      | -5%                        | 58%   | -8%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 39%    | 53%      | -14%                       | 55%   | -16%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 35%    | 51%      | -16%                       | 52%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 42%    | 53%      | -11%                       | 54%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 52%      | -10%                       | 54%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 46%    | 47%      | -1%                        | 46%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 51%    | 51%      | 0%                         | 45%   | 6%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 43%    | 49%      | -6%                        | 48%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 53%      | -12%                       | 50%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>CIVICS EOC</b>   |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 61%           | 69%             | -8%                          | 71%          | -10%                      |
| 2018                | 47%           | 65%             | -18%                         | 71%          | -24%                      |
| Compare             |               | 14%             |                              |              |                           |
| <b>HISTORY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 79%           | 58%             | 21%                          | 61%          | 18%                       |
| 2018                | 92%           | 61%             | 31%                          | 62%          | 30%                       |
| Compare             |               | -13%            |                              |              |                           |
| <b>GEOMETRY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 95%           | 53%             | 42%                          | 57%          | 38%                       |
| 2018                | 0%            | 50%             | -50%                         | 56%          | -56%                      |
| Compare             |               | 95%             |                              |              |                           |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 14              | 42            | 41                 | 16               | 45             | 51                  | 15              | 24             |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 29              | 49            | 42                 | 27               | 46             | 56                  | 25              | 53             |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 29              | 47            | 39                 | 27               | 44             | 42                  | 24              | 53             | 63               |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 49              | 58            | 37                 | 50               | 56             | 53                  | 47              | 67             | 70               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 43              | 51            | 36                 | 49               | 41             | 30                  | 31              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 49              | 56            | 51                 | 57               | 55             | 55                  | 57              | 64             | 58               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 39              | 53            | 43                 | 43               | 50             | 48                  | 43              | 57             | 58               |                          |                                |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 16       | 32     | 30          | 19        | 45      | 40           | 19       | 19      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 22       | 46     | 43          | 24        | 51      | 61           |          | 23      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 60       | 80     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 46     | 43          | 35        | 48      | 46           | 24       | 37      | 47        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 51     | 51          | 46        | 60      | 51           | 32       | 51      | 70        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 41       | 49     |             | 58        | 71      |              | 30       | 50      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 46       | 51     | 38          | 52        | 58      | 49           | 54       | 51      | 66        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 48     | 44          | 41        | 54      | 50           | 34       | 45      | 58        |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 8        | 33     | 30          | 10        | 36      | 37           | 8        | 24      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 6        | 27     | 32          | 13        | 41      | 33           |          | 27      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 50       | 73     |             | 100       | 64      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 29     | 25          | 20        | 35      | 39           | 16       | 47      | 17        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       | 34     | 32          | 41        | 44      | 46           | 38       | 33      | 35        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 26       | 43     | 55          | 39        | 46      |              | 17       | 64      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 46     | 37          | 45        | 48      | 51           | 47       | 61      | 26        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 30       | 35     | 31          | 33        | 41      | 44           | 33       | 42      | 19        |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 50   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 40   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 499  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 31   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 41  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 41  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 52  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 40  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 56  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile. This percentage is 1% higher than the district, but also 1% lower than previous year. Overall learning gains increased from previous year and matched the state average. The trend is that we are seeing a steady increase overall in ELA-which is our focus area.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

MATH learning gains dropped by 5%. This is due to an increase in student placement in Algebra. Inconsistency in instructional staff in 6th grade also contributed to decline. Overall math achievement increased. We will be sure to address the needs of all math students for increased learning gains.

#### Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The biggest gaps are across three different components. ELA and Math achievement overall has a gap of 10%. We are increasing our ELA and MATH achievement each year and hope to decrease this gap with specialized instruction. The third gap was in Civics. We actually increased our Civics scores by 14%, so we hope to see a closing of this gap this year due to some instructional changes made for this year.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The area of biggest gains was CIVICS. We took a different instructional approach to teaching the concepts and we provided students opportunities to attend boot camps to dive deeper into specific topics.

#### Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance is a potential area of concern. We are aiming for an overall attendance rate of 95% or higher. We will be implemented some PBIS motivators. Another area of concern is the number of level 1 students in reading and math. We have added intensive math sections to our master schedule and streamlined instruction in our intensive reading classes.

#### Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Math achievement and learning gains
2. ELA achievement and learning gains
3. ESE student achievement and learning gains
4. Attendance
5. Acceleration across all subgroups

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** A focus on academic achievement for ALL students is required by ALL staff. Standards-based instruction aligned to grade level rigor will lead to achievement gains.

**Measurable Outcome:** Consistent Collaborative planning will include common daily standard, target, essential question, Higher Order Thinking Questions, and daily Formative assessments. This outcome will be measured through consistent classroom observations by administration and instructional coaches to find at least 75% of classrooms show evidence of these elements in place. Continued improvement in collaborative planning will impact rigorous instruction leading to achievement gains on assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Rigorous Standards-based instruction in every classroom with high expectations, regardless of achievement deficits.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When students are presented with standards-based, grade-level rigorous texts and tasks, regardless of deficits, research indicates this leads to increased student achievement and the closing of achievement gaps and opportunity gaps.

“Students spend most of their time in school without access to four key resources: grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers who hold high expectations...Greater access to the four resources can and does improve student achievement—particularly for students who start the school year behind” (TNTP, 2017).

<https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/>

**Action Steps to Implement**

ELA & Reading Collaborative Planning will include increased focus on common HOT Qs and CFUs aligned to rigor of standard

**Person Responsible** Joanna Roux (joanna.roux@indianriverschools.org)

Math Collaborative Planning will include increased focus on common HOT Qs and CFUs aligned to rigor of standard

**Person Responsible** Brandi Byrd (brandi.williams@indianriverschools.org)

Professional Development around bell-to-bell instruction in block scheduling, standards-based instruction, questioning aligned to appropriate rigor, and engagement strategies (embedded in collaborative planning) followed by classroom implementation

**Person Responsible** Joanna Roux (joanna.roux@indianriverschools.org)

Monitoring standards-based instruction aligned to grade level rigor with consistent and constructive feedback.

**Person Responsible** Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through a strong culture and positive climate at OMS, students will feel confident to achieve and become kind, independent thinkers. Positive Behavior support will shift common focus from applying consequences for negative behavior to preventative supports for students and reinforcements of positive behaviors as well as strengthened social-emotional skills.

**Measurable Outcome:** Believing in Blue along with increased schoolwide PBIS plan, will decrease referrals, in-school and out-of-school suspensions. By addressing social-emotional learning, building relationships, and promoting positive behaviors, suspensions and referrals will decrease by 5% or more. Other data to be measured includes frequency of respite pass use and student documentation for PBiS targeted students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rhonda Spivey (rhonda.spivey@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Following the guidelines for PBiS, students will build intrinsic motivation to make responsible and positive decisions and focus on learning.  
SEL skills are necessary to build confidence and independent thinkers. By building these SEL skills, students will have a more positive outlook on academics and goal-setting which in turn will decrease the incidents of office-managed behaviors.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** PBiS is a tiered systems approach to "establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success" (Horner, Lewis & Sugai, 2020).  
Numerous Studies supporting the success of PBiS can be found here: [https://assets-global.website-files.com/5d3725188825e071f1670246/5f57daacfa5a0946c4ad8e88\\_Evidence%20Base%20PBIS%20043020.pdf](https://assets-global.website-files.com/5d3725188825e071f1670246/5f57daacfa5a0946c4ad8e88_Evidence%20Base%20PBIS%20043020.pdf)

**Action Steps to Implement**

Staff training and Implementation of new SDIRC code of conduct

**Person Responsible** Craig Kinsley (craig.kinsley@indianriverschools.org)

PLC focused on faculty book study of Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond. Book study includes teacher ownership of content through presentations to peers on a rotating bi-weekly basis. Practical application of CRT strategies to be guided and supported by Multicultural Coordinator. Specific CRT strategies to be selected for focus based on student and/or teacher needs in order to help reach Culture & Climate goals at Oslo.

**Person Responsible** Marsha Reese (marsha.reese@indianriverschools.org)

Professional Development on the implementation of Restorative Justice Practices (supported by Lavonne Walker). Practical application of RJ to be guided and supported by Success Coach according to student and teacher needs as they arise. Continued follow with students engaged in RJ practices will take place by the success coach and PBiS team.

**Person Responsible** Rhonda Spivey (rhonda.spivey@indianriverschools.org)

School-Wide implementation of PBiS through all three tiers. Students identified (based on both prior and current year data) in need of Tier 2 or 3 interventions will be provided with support including student incentives, check-in/check-out, SEL circles and instruction, restorative justice practices, relationship building as well as consistent communication with virtual/transitional students.

Tier 1 implementation to be expanded including Friday focus on PBiS expectations in Cafeteria with friendly competition and incentives for student awareness of/compliance with rules/procedures as well as proactive responsibility. Culture and Climate goals are also to be addressed with faculty and staff through continued support and morale boosting give-aways. "Believe in BLUE" embedded across campus in order to be proactive instead of reactive: "Build Relationships, Stay Learning Centered, Understand each student has individual needs, and Excel at preparing every Wildcat for the future through inquiry, technology, rigor, and kindness!"

Continuous data collection and intervention adjustments will occur.

**Person Responsible** Rhonda Spivey (rhonda.spivey@indianriverschools.org)

Classroom Management and student engagement support and guidance for teachers: Multicultural Coordinator will collect observational data on teacher and student needs regarding classroom management and engagement. This data will be used to implement explicitly focused support to classroom teachers with classroom management strategies and/or student engagement strategies to support student success and a positive classroom culture. Continued support and feedback will be offered through a systematic cycle of modeling, teacher implementation, observation, feedback, and adjustments as needed.

**Person Responsible** Marsha Reese (marsha.reese@indianriverschools.org)

Build student leaders through NJHS, Student Council, and Minority Student Council

**Person Responsible** Marsha Reese (marsha.reese@indianriverschools.org)

Positive Culture building and school representation through weekly highlights on social media and staff bulletin of positive school culture in action.

**Person Responsible** Christine Shells (christine.shells@indianriverschools.org)

Consistent awareness of analysis of PBiS data with leadership team (weekly) and all staff (monthly) in order to guide celebrations and/or redirection of efforts in and outside the classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through teacher support in the area of providing appropriate differentiation, students will be strengthen academic skills in processing, comprehension, and application of new knowledge. Specific and targeted instruction for ESE students, African American students, and Multiracial subgroups will lead to an increase in proficiency and gains for our identified ESSA subgroups who are in need of increased support and intervention.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increased differentiation for ALL students will be measured through consistent classroom observations by administration and instructional coaches. At least 75% of teachers will show evidence of differentiation in lesson plans and classroom implementation. Continued improvement in best practices and data-driven differentiation will impact rigorous instruction leading to achievement gains on assessments for Bottom Quartile, ESE, African-American, and multi-racial students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Data-driven differentiation strategies used in all lessons, including small group instruction, modified instructions, visual supports, graphic organizers, intentional activities for processing, and additional support through ESE teachers, Teacher Aides, and ESOL Paraprofessional.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research indicates that the effectiveness of instruction is directly related to both the planning and implementation of appropriate levels of differentiation as well as teacher development and support in this area. Furthermore, differentiation only leads to academic gains if strategies are data-driven and aligned to specific student needs (Bushie, 2015).  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1230703.pdf>

#### Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coaches and/or Administration to include explicitly identified strategies for differentiation according to student data with specific focus for Bottom Quartile, ESE students, African American students, and Multiracial subgroups.

**Person Responsible** Brandi Byrd (brandi.williams@indianriverschools.org)

Professional Development on the analysis of iReady data to support data-driven differentiation for targeted students (supported by Tasha Otto)

**Person Responsible** Christine Shells (christine.shells@indianriverschools.org)

Teacher training on (and classroom implementation of) Gradual Release Instruction

**Person Responsible** Joanna Roux (joanna.roux@indianriverschools.org)

ESE teachers to collaborate with admin, coaches, and teachers around appropriate and consistent support strategies for ESE students, consistent targeted scheduling of time, and data tracking for ESE student progress through iReady, work samples and formative assessments, and observation.

Implementation of learning strategies classes as an elective for our targeted ESE students

**Person Responsible** Craig Kinsley (craig.kinsley@indianriverschools.org)

Administration to monitor instruction and provide feedback with specific focus around differentiating for most needy students

**Person Responsible** Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)

After School Tutoring to be offered both in person and virtually for core classes.

**Person Responsible** Brandi Byrd (brandi.williams@indianriverschools.org)

#### #4. Other specifically relating to Design Thinking

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Using the design thinking process students will work collaboratively and critically to solve problems. Students will engage in inquiry cycles to develop a deeper understanding of the content.

**Measurable Outcome:** Using the design thinking process across content areas, students will increase the depth at which they proceed through the inquiry cycle. Each quarter, we will see an additional two classrooms using the LAUNCH cycle during instruction as we move toward future full-school implementation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Joanna Roux (joanna.roux@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** IDEO/ Launch Framework Cycle  
 Design Thinking Teaching Processes (John Spencer)  
 Harvard's Project Zero- Thinking Routines

Design thinking provides a methodology for creating innovative solutions to a vast array of difficult problems. It is no surprise that many universities are developing innovative research labs to study design thinking. The following are some examples Stanford d.school, Agency By Design (Harvard's Project Zero), Rhode Island School of Design, University of Cincinnati

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Others place the origins of design thinking later, with The Sciences of the Artificial and still others point to Design Thinking, which focused more on urban planning and architecture or with Robert McKim's work in Experiences in Visual Thinking.

Design thinking has been influenced by people like Tom and David Kelley, Tim Brown, John Maeda, Peter Rowe (as well as organizations like Stanford d.school and IDEO).

<http://www.spencerauthor.com/what-is-design-thinking/>

#### Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with professional learning on the Launch Cycle Framework

**Person Responsible** Joanna Roux (joanna.roux@indianriverschools.org)

Provide teachers with professional learning on the visible thinking strategies.

**Person Responsible** Brandi Byrd (brandi.williams@indianriverschools.org)

Instructional Coaches collaborate with teachers to create lesson plans and units (and implement during instruction) designed with the Launch Cycle Framework

**Person Responsible** Joanna Roux (joanna.roux@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and Instructional Coaches provide observations and feedback on design thinking unit plan and implementation

**Person Responsible** Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**A strong TIER 1 Behavior Plan- BELIEVE IN BLUE will be explicitly taught and modeled for ALL students: "Build Relationships, Stay Learning Centered, Understand each student has individual needs, and Excel at preparing every Wildcat for the future through inquiry, technology, rigor, and kindness!"**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Oslo Middle School has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for further information.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Part V: Budget**

| Part V: Budget  |               |   |                           |                 |     |                    |
|---|---------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>                  |                           |                 |     | <b>\$14,000.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus              | Funding Source  | FTE | 2020-21            |
|   |               |   | 0271 - Oslo Middle School | Title, I Part A |     | \$7,000.00         |
| <i>Notes: iReady books and College Board supplies for Springboard</i>                     |               |   |                           |                 |     |                    |
|   |               |   | 0271 - Oslo Middle School |                 |     | \$7,000.00         |
| <i>Notes: Will be paid to teachers and support staff to support after school tutoring</i> |               |   |                           |                 |     |                    |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports</b> |                           |                 |     | <b>\$3,300.00</b>  |
|   | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus              | Funding Source  | FTE | 2020-21            |
|   |               |   | 0271 - Oslo Middle School | Other           |     | \$600.00           |
| <i>Notes: PBIS fundraises to support this program.</i>                                    |               |   |                           |                 |     |                    |

|          |               |  |  |                 |               |                    |
|----------|---------------|--|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|
|          |               |  | 0271 - Oslo Middle School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$2,100.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Schoolwide book study of " Culturally Responsive Teaching"</i> |                 |               |                    |
|          |               |  | 0271 - Oslo Middle School  | Other           |               | \$600.00           |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: PBIS fundraises to support this program.</i>                   |                 |               |                    |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b> |  |                 |               | <b>\$0.00</b>      |
| <b>4</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Design Thinking</b>                  |  |                 |               | <b>\$0.00</b>      |
|          |               |  |  |                 | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$17,300.00</b> |