

School District of Osceola County, FL

Celebration School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Celebration School

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Gary Weeden

Start Date for this Principal: 1/17/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (76%) 2014-15: A (85%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Celebration School

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

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)
Combination School KG-8	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

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.

Celebration K-8 School will educate each student to his/her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebration K-8 School will be a nationally recognized, top performing school in the state. (#1)

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
Manion, Kimberly	Principal	Instructional Coaches- Work with teachers to assist in implementation of the standards utilizing researched based instructional strategies and monitor school- wide data collection and interpretation Assistant Principals- Work with appropriate grade levels to ensure that teachers have the necessary tools to be successful in the standard- based, student-driven classroom, monitor and empower PLCs, prepare and lead Stocktakes, engage in school management and district responsibilities. Dean- Maintain school-wide procedures and policies, and led the efforts for our Positive Support System Guidance Counselors- Teach career-based lessons, provide mental health support for students, engage students in school-wide culture of well-being and success
Kanner, Denise	Instructional Coach	
Jones, Deborah	Assistant Principal	
Schad, Rhonda	Instructional Coach	Job duties include instructional support for grades K-8, conducting the coaching cycle with teachers, provide instructional resources for tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 interventions, monitoring school literacy data, literacy liason between school and community, providing literacy PD for grades K-8, iReady Coordinator, and PLC lead for ELA.
Connolly, Elisa	Assistant Principal	
Rivera, Francisco	Assistant Principal	

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	111	152	147	151	161	188	194	175	215	0	0	0	0	1494
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	2	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	9	2	4	0	0	0	0	35

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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		3	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

120

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/17/2019

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	17	10	9	10	15	10	17	19	22	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	2	4	8	5	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	20	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	8	7	10	12	5	0	0	0	0	56

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	2	1	7	2	1	6	8	4	0	0	0	31

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	17	10	9	10	15	10	17	19	22	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	2	4	8	5	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	20	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	8	7	10	12	5	0	0	0	0	56

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	2	1	7	2	1	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	31

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	80%	56%	61%	81%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	57%	59%	73%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	55%	54%	62%	54%	51%
Math Achievement	86%	52%	62%	86%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	82%	55%	59%	77%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	49%	52%	68%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	82%	49%	56%	85%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	75%	78%	95%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	111 (0)	152 (0)	147 (0)	151 (0)	161 (0)	188 (0)	194 (0)	175 (0)	215 (0)	1494 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (17)	1 (10)	0 (9)	0 (10)	0 (15)	0 (10)	0 (17)	1 (19)	1 (22)	3 (129)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (5)	0 (2)	1 (4)	3 (8)	2 (5)	3 (8)	9 (34)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (20)	2 (4)	5 (0)	1 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	1 (1)	10 (27)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (14)	7 (8)	13 (7)	9 (10)	2 (12)	4 (5)	35 (56)

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	77%	51%	26%	58%	19%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	51%	20%	58%	13%
	2018	72%	48%	24%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	80%	48%	32%	56%	24%
	2018	76%	50%	26%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	76%	48%	28%	54%	22%
	2018	77%	46%	31%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	82%	47%	35%	52%	30%
	2018	73%	46%	27%	51%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	76%	49%	27%	56%	20%
	2018	82%	52%	30%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	54%	22%	62%	14%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	53%	23%	64%	12%
	2018	78%	53%	25%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	78%	48%	30%	60%	18%
	2018	77%	52%	25%	61%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	91%	45%	46%	55%	36%
	2018	84%	43%	41%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
07	2019	70%	30%	40%	54%	16%
	2018	43%	29%	14%	54%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
08	2019	92%	47%	45%	46%	46%
	2018	81%	43%	38%	45%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	45%	33%	53%	25%
	2018	75%	49%	26%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	75%	42%	33%	48%	27%
	2018	77%	42%	35%	50%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	62%	38%	67%	33%
2018	100%	68%	32%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	73%	21%	71%	23%
2018	95%	70%	25%	71%	24%
Compare		-1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	49%	51%	61%	39%
2018	99%	52%	47%	62%	37%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	44%	56%	57%	43%
2018	100%	39%	61%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	33	37	34	46	62	66	35	53			
ELL	67	69	59	82	81	79	64	78	100		
ASN	87	78		98	86		90	92	100		
BLK	48	58	50	58	65	65	50				
HSP	75	71	58	84	80	77	79	90	100		
MUL	84	70		87	86						
WHT	84	72	65	88	83	76	84	97	97		
FRL	74	69	59	77	79	73	67	83	100		
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	33	48	45	42	54	53	58	47			
ELL	60	71	64	64	70	56	62	100	80		
ASN	87	72		91	86		79				
BLK	61	61		52	52		60				
HSP	74	71	69	75	70	63	73	94	86		
MUL	78	65	60	82	70		87				
WHT	82	69	53	84	74	69	88	94	91		
FRL	68	67	51	70	68	63	72	93	85		

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	30	36	29	35	43	42	36				
ELL	64	69	64	78	81	67	79				
ASN	86	83		91	90		94				
BLK	65	52	50	65	57						
HSP	78	73	68	82	76	67	78	100	90		
MUL	74	71	55	81	79	73	65				
WHT	83	74	60	88	77	70	89	93	93		
FRL	70	69	62	73	70	57	73	94	90		

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	80
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	801
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	75
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	79
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	82
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 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	82
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	75
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.

The component showing the lowest performance was the ELA proficiency for our students identified as ESE. Several factors contributed to this including student access to the depth of grade level standards and teacher use of appropriate resources tied to the standards. Teachers may be providing multiple scaffolds that potentially inhibit students' independently reaching the full intent of the standards.

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

Civics EOC showed a 2 percentage point drop in achievement from the prior year. We attribute this to several factors including teachers new to teaching the content as well as the lack of more timely formative assessments to help shape and drive instruction.

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.

Math achievement was 28% points over the state average. The math teachers focused on standards-based instruction with remediation daily for struggling students during PRIDE period. Struggling math students were targeted for additional work utilizing SAI funding in the fall.

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

Math Proficiency improved by 11 percentage points from 75% to 86%. Targeted intervention periods with strategically placed teachers were the major contributing factor to this achievement along with timely supports focused on individual needs of students. The school's master schedule, allocating dedicated intervention periods every day, provided the time for necessary support.

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

A potential area of concern is the number of students scoring level 1 in grades 3-8 is 35. Another area of concern is the number of students missing 20% of school with either excused or unexcused absences.

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

1. ELA ESE achievement is a priority because it is the lowest performing area and it decreased from 32% to 31% of student.
2. ELA ELL is the second lowest performing area at 35% proficient and it also decreased 1 percentage point.
3. Math achievement is a priority since we have 3 new teachers in middle school and more students in Algebra that did not have exposure to Pre-Algebra standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all in Literacy
Rationale	In order to improve Literacy for all students we will pay particular attention to our subgroups. For ELL students we will dedicated intervention time to building their skills to close foundation gaps. We will host a literacy lab for several weeks to offer additional support in building and developing language acquisition.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase our achievement level for ELL on the FSA ELA from 35% to 40%. In addition, we have dedicated time for ESE students to work in small groups to reinforce Tier 1 instruction and provide Tier 2 intervention. We plan to raise achievement by ESE students on the ELA FSA from 31% to 40%. Lastly we aim to raise overall achievement in literacy from 80% to 85%, and our lowest 25% from 60% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rhonda Schad (rhonda.schad@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Begin using the DIBELs and NSGRA system to gather baseline data to drive instruction. Provide targeted Tier 2 interventions during small group instruction and Tier 3 interventions during iii and middle school intervention period. Incorporate the use of Achieve 3000 to raise lexile levels and build close reading skills. Teachers will utilize students centered instruction with a focus on standards-based instruction.</p> <p>School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.</p> <p>Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their halfway point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By using the evidence based strategies teachers should be able to close the gaps in learning and move students forward toward proficiency. Using the aforementioned systems, teachers will be able to monitor students progress toward achieving at higher levels. Small group instruction focusing on the standards and targeting specific student needs will provide the opportunity to build upon foundational skills.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use common formative assessments within the PLC to assess and measure students progress toward mastery of the standards. 2. Teachers will review and understand the district curriculum plans and implement with fidelity. 3. Incorporate small group instruction based on diagnostic data using a rotational method to meet individual student needs. 4. Continue to have the Literacy Coach oversee the use of Achieve 3000, DIBELs, NSGRA and provide teachers with the appropriate data to drive instruction. 5. Continue and broaden the use of Core Connections in grades K-8 to build and reinforce writing across the curriculum. Evidence of implementation should be apparent during walk-throughs and observations. 6. Create an after school literacy lab that focuses on building English skills and proficiency with ELL students. Parents will be informed of the lab and data collected will be shared with the leadership team.

7. Teachers received additional summer planning time to review scales, to introduce curriculum unit plans, and to align tasks to targets.

Person Responsible Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

#2

Title Ensure high levels of learning for all in Math

Rationale While our math scores increased in all areas reported, we plan to increase the number of students proficient to 90%. We are striving to have all students have learning gains in mathematics.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve We plans to increase learning gain from 82% to 87% and the lowest quartile achievement to grow from 75% to 80%. Our ESE students need to grow from 41% to 46% proficient, and ELL student achievement should grow from 62% to 67%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Utilize standard based instruction in all grade levels to move all students towards growth and proficiency in math. Teachers will work in PLCs to analyze data to drive instruction. Teachers will be trained and incorporate Kagan structure to engage students in reading writing talking and solving as associated with math.
School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their halfway point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Kagan structures will increase student engagement in mathematical practice. Collaboration among teachers to drive instruction will provide students with opportunities to close foundational gaps.

Action Step

Description

1. Provide additional support for students through an Intensive math course built into master schedule. Students will work on Tier 2/3 instructions to re mediate gaps in math instruction.
2. Strategically incorporate flex scheduling into math PRIDE periods to meet the ongoing needs of students based on real-time data.
3. Strategically incorporate the district provided math formative assessments and utilize the data in PLCs and Stock takes to drive instruction and remediation.
4. Have coach teach model lesson to provide teachers with exemplar classroom practices.

Person Responsible Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

#3	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all in science
Rationale	Celebration K8's science score have been stagnant with 82% proficient.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to improve science achievement to 85%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Teachers will review district formative data in their PLCs and collaborate to create standards-based instruction to target specific student needs. Teachers will emphasize the district initiative on Read, Write, Talk, and Solve while engaging students with hands-on instruction.</p> <p>School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.</p> <p>Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their halfway point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Exposing all students to cognitively complex tasks will lead to higher achievement for all. Incorporating Kagan strategies during classroom instruction, students will be highly engaged in the learning process.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use common formative assessments within the PLC to assess and measure students progress toward mastery of the standards. 2. Teachers will review and understand the district curriculum plans and implement with fidelity. 3. Science Coach will provide 5th grade teachers with their content focus report which outline the most frequently tested standards. 4. As a PLC, teachers will utilize district formative data to identify students in the lowest quartile and provide remediation. 5. Teachers will incorporate strategies when reading scientific texts to build academic vocabulary and reading stamina.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4	
Title	Ensure a school-wide post-secondary culture for all students
Rationale	We intend to prepare all students for wither college or careers after completing high school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	90% of 7th graders will complete interest inventories and align interest with potential career options. 100% of students will participate in college week to raise awareness of post secondary educational options. Guidance will host a high school options night to present 8th graders with programs that they can enroll in as they enter 9th grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Manion (kimberly.manion@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Counselors invite 100 students to participate in Duke Osceola Tips which gives students the opportunity to take the SAT or the ACT and if they qualify they can enroll in summer college programs. Additionally, Counselors instructs students in classes on the My career shines / Kuder program.</p> <p>School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.</p> <p>Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their halfway point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who participate in the above mentioned programs have the opportunity to gain insights on potential careers and the necessary educational path. These programs are all inclusive in focusing on moving students from cradle to college.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with the 6 and 7th grade social studies teachers to present the college program to students. 2. Complete a Holland's code with 6 and 7th grade students to identify strengths and values. 3. 8th graders focus on identifying college options that influence high school options 4. 8th graders create a 4 year high school plan 5. Promote College week to focus on the benefits of post-secondary culture.
Person Responsible	Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

#5	
Title	Strengthen collaborative process to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met
Rationale	Evidence proves that collaboration among teachers leads to positive student achievement and growth. Additionally, analyzing student data to drive instruction has a positive impact on student performance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All PLCs will function at a stage 5 or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Collaboration through common planning focusing on data interpretation will improve student achievement.</p> <p>School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.</p> <p>Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their halfway point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Hattie, effective Professional Learning Communities have an effect size of .93 on student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build a master schedule that allows for common planning 2. PLCs work together to create common formative and summative assessments 3. Utilize Onenote to share data and resources 4. Create PLC groups within SchoolCity to allow teachers the ability to share and analyze data to drive instruction. 5. Allow PLCs to reflect on their progress and what stage they have reached in the seven stages of the PLC process tri-annually. 6. 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. 7. 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.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Manion (kimberly.manion@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).

New teacher development-Create monthly meeting to support new teachers, allow teachers to observe other highly qualified instructors, utilize instructional coaches to provide ongoing support.

Safety- Monthly meetings to address threat assessments, professional development regarding active shooter drills, mental health awareness, adding safety features to tighten building security, enhanced teachers, staff and admin presence at arrival, dismissal and passing periods.

Community relationship- strong school-wide communication with parents and stakeholders in an effort to create transparency and build positive relationships

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 Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, 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.

The school district has added 13 district social worker positions and 2 psychologist positions to support the socio-emotional needs of students. Second Step intervention kits were distributed to all elementary and K-8 schools for support social-emotional learning environments.

Our district has a one-step referral system for mental health concerns. Through Title IV funding, students are screened by Panorama to determine needs for socio-emotional needs. Middle School Counselors receive training in Suicide Awareness. High School presentations are done to recognize signs of chronic absence and mental illness. A full time social worker is assigned to each high school.

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

To support the transition of elementary to middle, middle school counselors are scheduled prior to the end of the school year to visit the elementary feeder schools. During the visit, the guidance counselor(s) share information about course offerings, school clubs/organizations, and expectations for the students as they transition from elementary to middle school.

To support the transition of middle to high school, each comprehensive high school has a College/ Career Specialist paid through a grant with Valencia College to support students in their pursuit of opportunities post-high school. Naviance software is used at the high schools to give students the opportunity to explore career options and interests.

A DJJ Commitment Specialist is employed to support students entering/leaving the juvenile justice

program and a transition plan is created to help any students leaving DJJ and returning to their home-zoned school.

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.

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.

Supplemental district guidance counselors, paid through Title IV funds, to support elementary implementation of Project Lead the Way, and course acceleration and college and career achievement at the secondary levels. Naviance software is used at the high schools to give students the opportunity to explore career options and interests. Campus tours of Valencia College and Osceola Technical College

(oTech) are offered for students in seventh and eleventh grades to learn about career options and potential areas of study.