School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Amy Flowers   Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2018-19 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Osceola 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.

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.

Table of Contents

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Education which inspires all to their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At St. Cloud Elementary we focus on the child and expect success to promote lifelong learners. We lead with vision because education must be a shared responsibility between the home, students, school and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dierickx, Megan	Principal	To administer the programs, facility and personnel of SCES and develop positive school-community relations with parents, students, community members, business partners, and other educational agencies.
Gray, Kelly	School Counselor	Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principles of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies.
Thai, Savannah	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with the team to plan and deliver professional feedback for new and returning staff members aligned to high priority initiatives and outcomes in the area of mathematics and science. Support the development of high quality/effective math and science instruction; observe and coach developing math and science teachers to improve instructional planning, teaching practice, and the use of data, assessment, and instructional technology. Work with various teams (administrators, teachers) to facilitate analysis of data provided by diagnostics, common assessments, and formative assessments. Help teacher teams develop both school wide and classroom intervention plans.
Larson, Suzi	Instructional Coach	This position focuses on Student Achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementations of research-based reading program(s) and scientifically-based reading strategies/practices implemented in the school.
Flowers, Amy	Assistant Principal	Responding to disciplinary issues. Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed.
Savillo, Sandra	Instructional Coach	Provides direct intervention services to targeted students in reading and or math. Support individuals and collaborative teams in their effort to make data and research based instructional decisions to increase student learning.
Bradley Eyerly, Katherine	School Counselor	Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principles of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies.

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	145	146	150	157	149	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	12	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	21	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	6	4	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
72

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 10/10/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	8	15	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	1	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	8	15	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	1	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	63%	53%	57%	67%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	63%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	51%	53%	49%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	55%	63%	69%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	59%	62%	53%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	51%	36%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	49%	53%	68%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	145 (0)	146 (0)	150 (0)	157 (0)	149 (0)	180 (0)	927 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (13)	10 (8)	12 (15)	9 (12)	12 (15)	9 (15)	70 (78)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (6)
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)	1 (28)	21 (34)	35 (37)	57 (99)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%	
	2018	70%	51%	19%	57%	13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%	
	2018	65%	48%	17%	56%	9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		-10%					
05	2019	61%	48%	13%	56%	5%	
	2018	62%	50%	12%	55%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	74%	54%	20%	62%	12%	
	2018	73%	51%	22%	62%	11%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	68%	53%	15%	64%	4%	
	2018	68%	53%	15%	62%	6%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		-5%					
05	2019	65%	48%	17%	60%	5%	
	2018	65%	52%	13%	61%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	64%	45%	19%	53%	11%	
	2018	72%	49%	23%	55%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		-8%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

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	42	62	47	56	64	38	45				

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
ELL	48	50	43	59	62	41	63				
BLK	56	58		63	47						
HSP	57	50	34	64	56	32	55				
MUL	61	77		78	85						
WHT	69	62	60	79	63	42	78				
FRL	52	57	46	59	56	35	56				

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	45	47	29	45	43	31	47				
ELL	40	53	67	63	50	38	33				
ASN	73			91							
BLK	75	61		82	72		82				
HSP	57	52	47	64	45	48	61				
MUL	67			75							
WHT	77	60	50	76	61	43	81				
FRL	60	54	50	62	51	41	65				

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	22	31	26	29	38	28	6				
ELL	47	49	50	64	53	40	50				
ASN	81	54		75	50						
BLK	65	67		70	78						
HSP	55	61	53	64	55	36	57				
WHT	76	64	36	73	48	26	75				
FRL	59	58	49	62	49	33	59				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Lowest Quartile students showed the lowest performance. Lowest quartile students are showing growth in day to day learning and school-wide progress however this is not evident in FSA data. There is a disconnect between the learning observed and application to standardized measures.

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

Math learning gains for students in the lowest quartile dropped 7 points (35 from 48). An overall school-wide decline in literacy proficiency is directly impacting math achievement. Need to strengthen math literacy in all grades.

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.

ELA and Mathematics lowest quartile students are furthest from the state average.

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

Math learning gains for all students increased 4 percentage points (56 to 60). The use of mathematical mindsets and intensive, targeted intervention contributed to the gain.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Early Warning Systems indicate that our individual cases are very isolated. The potential problem based on current and previous EWS is the correlation between attendance and Level 1 and 2 students. This data needs to be monitored regularly.

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

1. ELA achievement
2. ELA learning gains
3. Math learning gains
4. SWD learning gains
5. ELL learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy.
Rationale	School-wide data for ELA achievement decreased 5 percentage points. The decline in literacy over time will directly impact achievement rates in math and science. School wide data for ELA gains, lowest quartile growth, SWD subgroup achievement continue to indicate a decline in student learning.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA learning gains are expected to increase from 57% to 60% ELA Learning gain for the lowest quartile will increase from 46% to 49%. ELA ELL Achievement will increase from 48% to 51%. SWD will increase learning gains in the area of literacy from 62% to 65% .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzi Larson (larsonsu@osceola.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide professional development opportunities for teachers that focus on reading strategies to increase student learning, monitor differentiation, and analyze common assessment data. Leadership team will monitor through collaborative planning meetings, progress monitoring and classroom observations completed through forms/teams. Embedded Coaching for those teachers working on reading endorsement will also student learning by supporting teacher
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Providing professional development to help teachers incorporate effective high yield reading strategies which will increase student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Continue to implement Balanced Literacy in all K-5 Classrooms. 2. Utilize NSGRA in tandem with Richardson's Guided Reading Framework in K-2 for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans for individual student's needs. Grades 3-5 NSGRA will also be used to individually assess and plan for students in MTSS Tier 2 & 3 3. School City will be used by PLC Teams for the purpose of analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on student progression on essential standards. 4. Intervention team continues to use guided reading with Tier 2 & 3 students daily. 5. Provide STEAM to all grades K-5 this year in order to work strategically with those PLC's during their additional planning time.
Person Responsible	Suzi Larson (larsonsu@osceola.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.
Rationale	We need to increase achievement in our sub-group areas. Schoolwide math achievement is at 72%. SWD math achievement was 56% , ELL achievement is 48%. Our goal is to increase mathematics proficiency of essential standards for SWD and ELL students to reflect achievement scores commensurate with schoolwide achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math learning gains are expected to increase from 60% to 63% Math Learning gains for the lowest quartile will increase from 38% to 41%. Math ELL Achievement will increase from 59% to 62%. SWD will increase learning gains in the area of math from 64% to 67% .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide professional development opportunities for teachers that focus on math strategies to increase student learning, monitor differentiation, and analyze common assessment data. Leadership team will monitor through collaborative planning meetings, progress monitoring and classroom observations completed through forms/teams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Providing professional development to support teachers incorporate effective high yield reading strategies which will increase student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Continue to implement Number Talks and Math Tasks in all K-5 classrooms. 2. School city will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on student progression on essential standards. 3. Ensure VE teachers and ELL support teachers participate in professional development opportunities. 4. Master schedule will reflect common planning for VE teachers and their gen-ed counterparts in order to facilitate PLC, common planning. 5. ELL Task force will be created to monitor and support learning gains for all ELL's.
Person Responsible	Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)

#3	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in Science.
Rationale	Fifth grade data showed a decrease in overall science achievement. Strengthening our science content knowledge across all grade levels will increase our ability to ensure high levels of learning for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	St. Cloud Elementary decreased their overall science achievement from 72% to 66% proficient from 2018 to 2019. This still exceeds the state and district average, but our expectation is to be over 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Providing professional development to help teachers incorporate effective high yield reading strategies which will increase student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Professional development will be provided specifically with Science Speed Bags as a supplement to our core Science Program. This will allow students to illustrate science concepts as indicated in NGSSS. These include FSA science questions, graphic organizers, writing prompts, and vocabulary activities.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify and designate a grade level Science Lead that will meet with the Science Coach to ensure that Nature of Science Standards are being spiraled in to the unit assessments. Science leads will collaborate with the Science Coach to plan for science. 2. Benchmark assessments (3-5) and unit assessments (K-5) will be given to students and data collected through Grade Cam to assess mastery of Science Standards. 3. Fifth graders will participate in Houses of Science, beginning in September and lasting through April. Teams will meet weekly on Wednesdays to complete for mastery of Fair Game and high priority standards. 4. Fourth grade will take a beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of year test on Fair Game standards. They will work with the science coach to monitor the data and report to fifth grade at the end of the year. 5. Fifth graders will participate in Science Imagineers Week in April to re-learn and hone their Science skills that were not mastered through Houses of Science. 6. Utilize the Coaching Cycle to support new Science Teachers, ongoing throughout the school year.
Person Responsible	Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)

#4	
Title	Strengthen collaborative process to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met.
Rationale	The data shows that PLCs are not operating consistently at the highest level on the Seven Stages Rubric and formative assessment data throughout the year. This impacts student achievement as there are inconsistencies within delivering the curriculum in each subject area.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All ELA, Reading, Math, Science, Civics, and US History PLCs will be at Stage 5 on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric by the end of Semester 1 2019-2020 assessed by the Principal using the Seven Stage Rubric and format data. All PLCs will be at stage 5 or above on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric assessed by the Principal by May 2020. ELA, Math, proficiency and gains will increase by 3% in all sub groups. Science proficiency will increase by 3% in all sub groups
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction, then student achievement will increase.

Action Step	
Description	1. Schools PLC's teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team. 2. Principal and assistant principal (s) will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure they are progressing through the PLC Seven Stages Rubric of an effective PLC. 3.Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes. 4. School City will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs. Professional development will be conducted to train staff on the School City platform. 5. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team. 6. A PLC Guiding Coalition will be formed to oversee the process. 7. District formative assessments will be given every four and a half weeks in all accountability areas. 8. Principals will present within their schoolwide PLC a State of Education on a quarterly period to their staff (August 2019, November 2019, January 2020, and March 2020).
Person Responsible	Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of programs at St. Cloud Elementary. All parents are invited to attend meetings through flyers, social media page, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Children go through many transitions throughout their lives, but one of the most important transitions is the one from a Pre-K program to Kindergarten. Here at St. Cloud Elementary our Pre-k Teachers and Kindergarten Teachers work together to provide a smooth transition.

The transition starts in the fall as the Pre-K Teachers expose their students to the cafeteria expectations for breakfast and lunch. School behaviors are modeled daily in the classroom as well as on the playground and walking in the hallways of "big" school. In the spring of the school year, the Pre-K students attend a Kindergarten classroom for a week in the morning. They get to participate in whole group language activities, learning centers and play on the Kindergarten playground.

Family involvement is very important to ensure that the pre-school student is ready for the transition. Parents and students are invited to attend the school's Kindergarten Round Up, which is held in May. The event gives the parents the opportunity to visit a functional classroom, review the curriculum and listen to a power point presentation on "What to Expect in Kindergarten." We also provide helpful pamphlets for the parents on what the school will expect of them and tips on things they can do at home to prepare their children for school.

Students that are looking ahead to Middle School have the opportunity to attend a family involvement College and Career Night where they are able to meet students that participate in programs and the MS, HS, and College Level. Middle Schools representatives come to SCES to talk about course selections, AVID, after-school programs and sports. Transition information is also shared with families at our monthly SAC Meeting.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Our school uses an 8-Step data-based problem-solving process. Step one is to clearly identify a goal and a means to measure the goal. Step two is to define resources and barriers to achieving goal. Step three is to prioritize the various barriers. Step four is to identify strategies to reduce or eliminate barriers. Next, we develop an action plan to implement. Then, we determine a plan to monitor progress toward goal. Step seven is a review of barriers to ensure they are eliminated. Lastly, we evaluate progress toward achieving goal through the review of data elements. At any time we repeat this process to ensure a fluid and continuous plan toward achieving targeted outcomes.

We are not a Title 1 school. Above our discretionay budget received by the district to run the day-to-day operations of the school, we receive limited funds. All monies received in our school are used according to the guidelines of the provider. School fundraising programs are focused on increasing and improving technology school-wide.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The MTSS Team meets weekly to review school-wide progress data and adjust intervention support.

Title I, Part A
Funds may be used to support extended learning and remediation materials and/or professional development and academic coaches.

Title I, Part D
When Neglected and/or Delinquent children enroll, we will coordinate efforts with the Alternative Programs Department to ensure that all student needs are met.

Title II
Focused professional learning opportunities are offered in: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Instructional Pipeline and Framework Design, Standards Based Instruction, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Title III
The Multicultural Department assists in the identification of at-risk Limited English Proficiency (LEP), immigrant, and Native American students. Research-based, comprehensive educational programs help reduce barriers that result from cultural and linguistic needs.

IDEA provides support for students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP), students identified through the Preschool Education Evaluation Program (PEEP), and students identified through gifted screening of all second grade Title I students.

Title IV
The Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) program is intended to help to:
1. Provide a well-rounded education,
2. Improve safe and healthy school conditions and
3. Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. (ESEA section 4101).

Title IX
To help eliminate education barriers the District Liaison works with the school to help homeless students

to enroll, attend, and succeed in our public schools. For students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act, the Liaison provides health/academic referrals and resource vouchers.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

We are an AVID Showcase school. The AVID Site Team develops goals that align with the district and SIP goals to ensure continuity with focus areas of concern. Ongoing AVID training is provided monthly for all teachers.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy.				$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$2,500.00
			Notes: Support Coach.			
			0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Reading A-Z.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of learning for all students in Science.				$1,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,800.00
			Notes: Science Speedbag resources.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Strengthen collaborative process to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met.				$0.00
					Total:	$4,800.00