School District of Indian River County

Oslo Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oslo Middle School

480 20TH AVE SW, Vero Beach, FL 32962

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Craig Kinsley

Start Date for this Principal: 6/14/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2020-21: (46%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kinsley, Craig	Principal	
Cummings, Anitra	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	
Szpaichler, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	
Reese, Marsha	Other	Interventionist
Roux, Joanna	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/14/2022, Craig Kinsley

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
37

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
60

Total number of students enrolled at the school
863

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	270	303	292	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	86	89	0	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	18	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	63	34	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	48	69	0	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	62	86	0	0	0	0	215
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	50	92	91	0	0	0	0	233

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	0	0	0	0	17

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 10/21/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	303	286	297	0	0	0	0	886
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	77	72	0	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	16	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	30	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	27	19	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	70	76	0	0	0	0	196
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	89	83	0	0	0	0	242
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	70	76	0	0	0	0	196

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	75	68	0	0	0	0	187

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	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	48%	50%	46%			44%	54%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	45%	48%	47%			54%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	34%	38%	37%			43%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	41%	51%	54%	40%			48%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	53%	58%	37%			52%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	57%	55%	32%			49%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	50%	49%	42%			45%	53%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	55%	67%	71%	65%			62%	72%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2022					
	2019	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	52%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	54%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	61%	69%	-8%	71%	-10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	79%	58%	21%	61%	18%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	53%	42%	57%	38%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	22	21	14	43	52	18	27			
ELL	34	43	36	36	45	48	30	43	67		
ASN	60			50							
BLK	33	42	31	29	55	68	27	48	57		
HSP	46	45	35	42	48	48	39	55	73		
MUL	34	41	19	39	55	75	35	59	77		
WHT	51	45	28	48	48	56	50	56	71		
FRL	38	43	33	36	50	60	35	45	67		
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	35	29	21	32	28	15	33			
ELL	35	44	36	26	31	32	24	47			
BLK	35	37	35	28	31	32	25	55	63		
HSP	45	46	33	37	32	39	39	61	73		
MUL	42	41	25	39	39	17	61	69	62		
WHT	53	53	43	49	42	31	51	75	69		
FRL	41	44	35	35	33	29	37	59	67		
2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	55
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	50
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	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	50
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on FSA data, SWD student achievement for ELA, MATH, CIVICS, and SCI were 15%, 16%, 19%, and 27% in the 21-22 school year.
The above subgroup will need additional action steps written in the academic section of the SIP.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2022 progress monitoring for ELA was 31% Achievement and Math was 9% Achievement on the BOY. Math would be the greatest need for improvement but ELA also needs to improve. Specifically our SWD subgroup performed with 76% scoring a level 1 in ELA and 865 scoring a level 1 in Math

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

One contributing factor would be the implementation of the BEST standards in Math and on the BOY it was assessing standards that students had not been taught. We should see improvement on the MOY because standards based instruction with BEST has been occurring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the BOY we showed improvement in the strand informational reading informational text

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

For the last several years there has been an increase in utilizing informational texts throughout all subject areas. Our critical thinking classes had been focusing on informational science and social studies texts.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue to use our critical thinking classes to focus on science and social studies with an ELA focus. In addition our foundational math classes will help support those students who are struggling in math to help accelerate the learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Each week during collaborative planning we are asking teachers to bring work samples and data to identify misconceptions in student learning. We are using those data points to plan professional development based on needs. For example we are providing PD on monitoring, engagement and formative assessments.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We have a teacher assistant who supports students in our reading and critical thinking and 2 full time ESOL support teachers. Our ESE support facilitators are planning with teachers during collaboration to ensure that the needs of all students are met.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Students and Staff	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	During the 2021-2022 school year, 1038 Non-Transportation ODR's were processed in the 21-22 school year. In addition the ODR count Sixth Grade: 418 ODR's, Seventh Grade: 439 ODR's, Eighth Grade: 451 ODR's and the Black vs White Risk Ratio for ODE 1.74
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Create and foster a positive learning environment for both students and staff. Student climate survey scores will increase 25% to reflect a sense of belonging at Oslo Middle School. Staff climate survey scores will increase 50% to reflect a sense of better behavior and orderly school at Oslo Middle School
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Climate surveys will be given to staff and students Title 1 Parent Survey
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Craig Kinsley (craig.kinsley@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Utilizing the PBIS tiered system approach to rewards student positive behavior and staff who utilize the program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The center for PBIS contains numerous publications to support utilizing positive behavior interventions and supports

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Assistant Principals meet with grade-level teams pre-week to facilitate an open forum to discuss staff reflections of the 21-22 school year.

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

Grade-level teams will meet monthly to discuss EWI grade-level data and create monthly initiatives to counteract negative data trends.

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

Create PBIS school teams to implement PBIS initiatives and incentive system.

Person Responsible	Kenneth Brown (kenneth.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Create MTSS Tier 2Team that routinely meets to discuss, monitor, and implement Tier 2 Behavior Interventions.

Person Responsible	Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

Create and implement Teacher and Student of the Month

Person Responsible   Anitra Cummings (anitra.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

80% of staff using PBIS Rewards to recognize student behavior

Person Responsible   Kenneth Brown (kenneth.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Create school events and Rewards Based on positive behavior, attendance, grades

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELA ACH, LG, and BQLH fell 2%, 3%, and 7% between the 20-21 and 21-22 school year. Science ACH fell 1% from the 20-21to the 21-22 school year Civics ACH fell 10% between the 20-21 and the 21-22 school year Black student achievement for ELA,MATH, and SCI were 33%, 29%, and 27% in the 21-22 school year SWD student achievement for ELA,MATH, CIVICS, and SCI were 15%,16%, 19%, and 27% in the 21-22 school year. ELA LG and BQLG for SWD were24% and 22% in the 21-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Implement productive structures for academic role-alike collaborative planning in which teachers deepen their capacity to use consistent monitoring strategies to instruction which are evident in 75% of classrooms walkthroughs.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Admin and Coaches attendance and support during collaborative planning will monitor based on lesson creation and monitoring lesson form.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Craig Kinsley (craig.kinsley@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collaborative planning to utilize formative assessments and data
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	John Hattie's research on collective teacher efficacy yields an effect size of 1.57. Teachers will be working together to plan, identify misconceptions and analyze data to inform which students need reteaching.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Coaches, teachers, and administration attend weekly collaborative planning

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

Weekly sweeps to monitorthe goal and collect data for leadership team.

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

ESSA - Weekly sweeps to monitor the deliberate practices of teachers and support facilitators to enhance understanding of content by SWD

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

Through Collaborative Planning have conversations to discuss how teachers are monitoring and what tools are needed to be successful

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

Provide PD on Monitoring

Person Responsible   Anitra Cummings (anitra.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Within CP, teachers are discussing and choosing the problems for the upcoming week to input in their lesson plans. Within CP, ensure that questioning and monitoring strategies
are explicitly planned/implemented

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

ESSA -Bi-Weekly sweeps to monitor the deliberate practices of teachers and support facilitators to enhance understanding of content by SWD – Adding Data chats to Specifically target the needs of our SWD

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Family and Community Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Lack of Parent involvement in the 21-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 2022-2023 school year OMS and PTSA will work together to improve parental involvement at school educational and extra-curricular events by 50%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Sign in Sheets, Advertisements on Social Media, Attendance at Events, Monthly PTSA meetings with administration
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Craig Kinsley (craig.kinsley@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Parent Involvement events created
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research supports that when parents are involved in their child's education that the students will have higher grades, test scores, decreased behavior, attend school regularly and have been social skills

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Schedule and Facilitate First PTSA Joint fundraiser of the 22-23 school year.

Person Responsible	Anitra Cummings (anitra.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Schedule and Facilitate PTSA sponsored events to improve membership and also bring together the stakeholders

Person Responsible	Anitra Cummings (anitra.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Continue to foster relationships with community partners/stakeholders

Person Responsible	Kenneth Brown (kenneth.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Plan collaborative events with community/ business partners/stakeholders

Person Responsible	Kenneth Brown (kenneth.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Schedule and execute a dessert and refreshment night with the principal.

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

Implement parent and family engagement events such as Honor Roll, Attendance, Citizenship Awards. Title 1 Nights

Person Responsible	Anitra Cummings (anitra.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Data Findings:
- Student 21-22 Climate Survey results identified students rating a 2/5 for 'There is a sense of belonging at my school'
- SWD student achievement for ELA, MATH, CIVICS, and SCI were 15%, 16%, 19%, and 27% in the 21-22 school year.
- Staff 21-22 Climate Survey results identified staff rating a 2.4 for 'Students behave well in the hallways and lunchroom'. "Rated 2.5 Students behave well in class."

Rationale for Selection of Data:
- Student's sense of belonging has an impact on Climate and Culture
- SWD's feeling of success and growth has an impact on Climate and Culture
- Staff sense of structures, systems and orderly environment has an impact on Climate and Culture

High Yield Strategy: Environment

Goal: Create and foster a positive learning environment for both students and staff. Student climate survey scores will increase 25% to reflect a sense of belonging at Oslo Middle School. Staff climate survey scores will increase 50% to reflect a sense of better behavior and orderly school at Oslo Middle School.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

(6th, 7th, and 8th grade level chairs)
- Grade-level teams will meet monthly to discuss EWI grade-level data and create monthly initiatives to counteract negative data trends

(Assistant Principal and PBIS Coach)
- Create PBIS school teams to implement PBIS initiatives and incentive system.

(Assistant Principals)
- Create MTSS Tier 2Team that routinely meets to discuss, monitor, and implement Tier 2 Behavior Interventions.
- Teacher and Student of the Month
- 80% of staff using PBIS Rewards to recognize student behavior
- Honor Roll, Attendance, Citizenship Awards

(School Leadership Team)
- School events and Rewards Based on positive behavior, attendance, grades