

School District of Osceola County, FL

Boggy Creek Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	29

Boggy Creek Elementary School

810 FLORIDA PKWY, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Yara Tavarez De La Fuentes

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Boggy Creek Elementary School

810 FLORIDA PKWY, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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.

Boggy Creek Elementary will create a culture that builds relationships and promotes college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Boggy Creek Elementary will build a solid academic and social/emotional foundation for every child to achieve their highest potential in a global society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tavarez-De La Fuentes, Yara	Principal	To be responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To be responsible for all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To develop positive school/community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public.
Broming, Jeri	School Counselor	Will lead social emotional learning for students to ensure holistic development.
Campos, Keisy	Instructional Coach	Will work with students and teachers to utilize ELlevation and ELL strategies to meet the needs of our students and help with achieving learning gains.
Sicardo, Adelene	Instructional Coach	Emphasis on student achievement, and to ensure research-based implementation of math and science instruction. Coach, mentor and facilitator of research based feedback to strengthen instruction. Support instructional staff by collaboratively planning, co-teaching, modeling strategies, providing professional development and analyzing data to address student needs..
Terry, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards student success. To take ownership of the school's stocktake meetings and ensure all stakeholders know: who, what, when, why, and how they are meeting the needs of their specified areas. If areas are not making gains or being accountable, an edit of the stocktake plan for that area will need to be adjusted and monitored closely for positive results.
Brown, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Will monitor the MTSS process ensure students who are not achieving success in Tier 1 will have the supports necessary to succeed. Identify students who are not progressing and create a plan with the MTSS team to put in place for the student to be successful.
Villanueva Bonilla, Mayra	Instructional Coach	Will work with all staff to ensure a literature rich culture for all students. The coach will co-teach, model, and give feedback to all instructional personnel meeting the needs of the students teaching to the depth of knowledge of the standards.
LaCount, Anicia	Other	Will work with students and teachers to utilize ESE strategies to meet the needs of students and help with achieving learning gains.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Yara Tavarez De La Fuentes

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

14

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

34

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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 .	

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	93	102	104	112	105	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	622
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	15	8	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	1	0	6	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	103	104	109	108	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	103	104	109	108	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	56%	53%	57%	56%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	51%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	55%	63%	54%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	59%	62%	59%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	51%	50%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	49%	53%	46%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	49%	48%	1%	56%	-7%
	2018	58%	50%	8%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	53%	5%	64%	-6%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
05	2019	46%	48%	-2%	60%	-14%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	45%	-6%	53%	-14%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	32	48	56	44	74	69					
ELL	50	63	69	58	62	53	34				
BLK	53	42		67	63		29				
HSP	55	63	70	58	64	60	43				
WHT	59	59		70	73		53				
FRL	55	59	63	56	61	51	38				
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	46	68		38	40	25	45				
ELL	35	56	54	42	48	40	48				
BLK	61	61		46	54		45				
HSP	48	61	50	49	52	37	53				
WHT	68	54		60	54		71				
FRL	47	59	49	46	53	38	54				

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	25	33		15	40						
ELL	41	45	65	50	56	59	35				
BLK	59	52		40	42		13				
HSP	55	57	58	55	60	55	44				
WHT	62	63		65	67		92				
FRL	55	56	61	52	56	49	41				

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	58
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	63
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Science Achievement- 42%

-Lack of Consistent science instruction

-Lack of foundational science concepts and content knowledge

Subgroup Data: Black Science Achievement - 29%

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

Science Achievement - Declined by 13%

-Missed opportunities to use science content during reading instructional times

Subgroup Data: White Science Achievement - Declined by 18%

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Science Achievement below by 11%.

-Lack of Rigor in science instruction

-Students not able to access the reading complexity

-Low level questions

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

Math Lowest 25th percentile - Improved by 18%

-Consistent monitoring of formative data

-Strategic planned instruction and interventions

Subgroup Data: SWD Math Learning Gains and SWD Math Learning Gains L25% - Both improved by 34%

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

-Attendance

-Course failure in ELA and Math

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

1. Science Achievement - 42% and Subgroup Data: Black Science Achievement - 29%

2. Math Lowest 25th - 53% and Subgroup Data: SWD ELA Achievement - 32%

3. ELA Achievement - 56% and Subgroup Data: ELL Science Achievement - 34%

4. ELA Gains and Math Achievement - 60% and Subgroup Data: FRL Science Achievement 38%

5. ELA Lowest 25th and Math Gains - 65% and Subgroup Data: Black ELA Learning Gains 42%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Increase delivery focus and monitoring of ELA instruction will ensure high levels of learning for all the students in literacy.
High frequency instructional modeling, co teaching and planning between coaches and teachers will propel content knowledge and improve the delivery of instruction. Direct focus in differentiate standards-based instruction for all students in literacy with a direct focus in close reading and guided reading (differentiate small group instruction) incorporating AVID, Academic Teams and Read, Write, Talk and Solve need to be placed in order to increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency will increase by 5 points for the coming year for a total score of 65% or greater.
ELA learning gains will increase by 5 points for a total score of 65% or greater.
ELA bottom quartile gains will increase by 9 points for a total score of 65% or greater.
ELA proficiency for ESE students will increase by 10 points.
ELA proficiency for ELL students will increase by 15 points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mayra Villanueva Bonilla (mayra.villanuevabonilla@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

NWEA diagnostics, quarterly NSGRA reading records and biweekly benchmark tests will help clarify what students will need further support to attain proficiency on each ELA standard. Effectively implement of Guided Reading and appropriate ESE and ELL scaffolds/supports as a Balanced Literacy approach to literacy instruction.
Using evidence-based practices help students improve on their outcomes. Some of these powerful tools for improving the student outcomes are; systematically design instruction toward a specific goal and adapt curriculum tasks and materials for those specific learning goals. Provide scaffolding, use explicit instruction, vocabulary instruction, flexible grouping and the use of strategies to promote active student engagement. Also, provide intensive instruction and supplemental instruction to small groups or individually, when need it. Additionally, provide positive and constructive feedback to guide students' learning and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

With a 33.9% of ELL and a 17% ESE population and growing, specific bi-literacy and literacy best practices strategies will need to become part of everyday instruction in ELA classes. Cognates, frequency of methodical vocabulary practice and guided reading forms and integral part of the balanced literacy approach. Anderson, R. C., Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In Guthrie, J. T. (Ed.), Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews (pp. 77–117). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
Through the strategic use of these elements during the literacy block teachers can utilize information obtained from reading records and benchmark assessments to identify individual student reading deficiencies and address those needs in small group setting. Running records are used for assessing reading progress and have proven to be reliable when utilized with a minimum of three passages (Fawson, et al, 2006).

Action Steps to Implement**Professional Development**

1. Professional Development will be conducted to build teacher capacity and ensure highly effective ELA core, small group instruction, and Guided Reading instruction. All delivered PD will be monitored through weekly classroom walk through. Data will be collected and shared at leadership meetings.
2. Utilize ELA, ELL and ESE Task Force to monitor progress of all students, including the subgroups, on

ELA and provide professional development to ensure the implementation of best reading strategies and practices during ELA lessons.

Person Responsible Mayra Villanueva Bonilla (mayra.villanuevabonilla@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching

1. Provide coaching support to increase rigor in whole group, small group instruction, guided reading and follow up by monitoring implementation for face to face students and digital students.
2. Provide coaching to increase instructional rigor through the authentic use of learning goals and scales.
3. Engage teachers in coaching cycles and provide feedback on lessons to ensure standards are taught and assessed to the depth of the standard, to provide and optimal learning environment for face to face students and digital students.
4. Ensure ESE support facilitation through push in services will occur for ELA.(VE Support Facilitation Teachers).

Person Responsible Mayra Villanueva Bonilla (mayra.villanuevabonilla@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborative Planning

1. The ELA coach will meet bi-weekly with teachers to: plan for each standard/target, will model and update any changes to delivery models based on student data-talks and student samples, and participate directly in co-teaching in each of the ELA classrooms as need it. ELA coach will provide a monthly progress report at Stocktake.
2. Collaborate with ESOL Compliance Specialist on the use of ELlevation strategies. During grade level planning sessions throughout the school year, the ESOL Compliance Specialist will join me to provide pinpoint strategies that will be embedded into classroom plans.

Person Responsible Mayra Villanueva Bonilla (mayra.villanuevabonilla@osceolaschools.net)

Data Analysis and Reflection

1. PLCs will meet every week during early release and will also meet on two individual planning days during the month for the purpose of standards-based planning, developing common assessments, analyzing student work and adapting instruction to meet individual student learning needs. Leadership team members will participate in grade level PLCs to offer support on process and planning.
2. Collaborate with MTSS Coach on all student needs to ensure tier are prescriptive. All interventions delivered to students will be research-based and monitored for student growth. The data collected will then be addressed at our monthly MTSS meetings and at Stocktake.
3. Continue to utilize the ELL & ESE Task Force to monitor ELL and ESE progress, data, grades, and interventions.
4. ELA Coach, MTSS Coach and Resource Compliance Specialist and ESS will meet monthly to review progress and monitor ELL and ESE students.

Person Responsible Mayra Villanueva Bonilla (mayra.villanuevabonilla@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The data shows that our students are making learning gains. An analysis of fifth grade scores shows these students are 14% below state average. Comparison data shows improvement for all subgroups, however, the achievement levels of SWDs is at 44%, and ELLs, HIS and FRL students are below 60%. Improved planning practices with a focus on differentiation and fluid tiered instruction and interventions will result in improved student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

The intended outcome is to increase proficiency from 60% to 65%, or higher, and learning gains from 65% to 70%, or higher. Within our lowest quartile, the intended outcome will increase by 10 points for a total score of 63 points, or higher. We intend to increase our math proficiency of students with special needs by 10 points for a total of 45%, or higher. Math proficiency for ELL students will increase by 13 points for a total of 45%, or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teaching for conceptual understanding, developing students' procedural fluency, and promoting strategic competence through meaningful problem-solving tasks, are components for effective instruction. There is strong evidence to suggest that math inequalities and overall performance is directly correlated to students' lack of conceptual understanding, which in turn affects procedural fluency. Students with strong conceptual understanding can easily make connections to previous learned skills and apply those as they engage in complex tasks. Students deepen their conceptual understanding by working in student teams to support and challenge their strategic thinking. Students who struggle to grasp conceptual math ideas also benefit from either one-on-one (with an effect size of +0.19), or small group instruction (effect size of +.30), as opposed to whole group instruction. Effective small group instruction is best implemented when teachers are provided with intensive content PD and/or coaching opportunities to analyze and understanding standards, for planning purposes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will plan, and implement face to face and digital lessons that build conceptual understanding, and that also takes into account potential student errors in thinking. Teachers will be able to make meaningful improvements with their procedural fluency. Adams, D.M., McLaren, B.M., Durkin, K., Mayer, R.E., Rittle-Johnson, B., Isotani, S., van Velsen, M.: Using erroneous examples to improve mathematics learning with a web-based tutoring system.

Teachers will effectively plan rigorous standard based mathematical tasks, which allows students to productively challenge themselves. Appropriate and strategic scaffolding will be embedded in small group instruction to increase student achievement and make learning gains of 1.5 years.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics 1989

Classroom teachers will organize instruction that is facilitative and collaborative. Teachers will incorporate the use of student teams to ensure students achieve social, emotional and cognitive competencies to be successful in math.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development

1. Provide professional development and/or coaching opportunities to support teachers' understanding of math standards, math content and math strategies.
2. Provide professional development in support of the adopted mathematics resources, and the District's initiative to ensure students have multiple opportunities to Read, Write, Talk and Solve.
3. Provide professional development and/or coaching opportunities to support teachers with classroom management, student led academic teaming, and cognition as it applies to cooperative learning, AVID implementation, and students' metacognitive capacities.
4. Provide professional development and/or coaching opportunities to maximize the use of online tools for digital learning.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching

1. Provide coaching support for teachers that need additional guidance with the implementation of standards-based instruction. Engage in coaching cycles with all instructional staff throughout the school year to address student needs and development of strategies and pedagogy.
2. Engage all teachers in Coaching Cycles and work collaboratively in and outside of the classroom to determine, implement, and reflect upon a learner-centered goal.
3. Model strategies to create an optimal learning environment in the classroom and online, for students who are learning digitally.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborative Planning

1. Establish weekly planning days for each grade level to plan instruction, analyze student learning, and to learn high yield strategies for the implementation of interventions, small group instruction, and differentiation in the face to face classroom and in the digital classroom.
2. Support teachers with analyzing student learning, and student data. Work closely with teachers to identify students who are performing below the grade level standards to create learning goals, re-teach lessons and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Data Analysis and Reflection

1. Provide a monthly progress report at Stocktake, that highlights classroom trends of instructional strategies, student engagement, assessment results, and next steps for student achievement.
2. Meet with all teachers to analyze data, and set learning goals during Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students.
Description and Rationale:	Students have made minimal gains in Science, and decreased their proficiency level from 55% to 42% proficiency. Content understanding and a lack of consistent and authentic hands on science inquiry has limited students' conceptual understanding of complex science concepts.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase the proficiency of a5th grade students on the Science FCAT by 18 percentage points. Our students will achieve 60 percent proficiency as measured by the 2020-2021 Science FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The 5E's, instructional model is an effective way to engage students, and build strong foundation of scientific knowledge through active participation. The District's CUPS incorporates this model, along with effective strategies for all students to engage, explore, explain, elaborate and evaluate new knowledge. This model supports explicit discussion and a variety of opportunities to support and develop students' understanding of the nature of science. By incorporating the 5Es Model, and creating multiple opportunities for students to learn science through problem solving and inquiry, students will gain the knowledge to successfully understand science in different contexts, resulting in students achievement. "The 5E Model includes five phases: Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. It provides a carefully planned sequence of instruction that places students at the center of learning. It encourages all students to explore, construct understanding of scientific concepts, and relate those understandings to phenomena or engineering problems."</p> <p>–Rodger Bybee</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Teachers will plan rigorous and inquiry based tasks, that incorporates the 5E's Model. Students will be provided multiple opportunities to explore their thinking and knowledge of science, will be motivated to ask questions and explore new concepts, and will develop a multi-perspective understanding while problem solving with their peers.</p> <p>Teachers will plan science investigations that are aligned to the depth of knowledge of the standards, and students will deepen their understanding of grade level standards, while applying new knowledge to multiple situations.</p> <p>Teachers will allow students to productively challenge themselves for standards mastery, with scaffolding and cross-curricular connections. Students' understanding of scientific concepts will increase therefore, student achievement and mastery will increase.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development

1. Provide professional development and/or coaching opportunities to support teachers' understanding of science standards and task alignment.
2. Provide professional development in support of the adopted science resources, and the District's initiative to ensure teachers use the 5E Model for instruction and students have multiple opportunities to Read, Write, Talk and Solve within that framework.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborative Planning

1. Each grade level will collaboratively plan with the coach on a weekly basis to ensure effective teaching

strategies are embedded into instruction using the 5Es Model.

2. Facilitate monthly data chats all teachers to analyze student learning and make instructional decisions.
3. Develop small group instruction, focused on specific reading strategies that can be implemented during science class, Triple I, or during reading, to ensure understanding of informational text, reading strategies and vocabulary

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching

1. Provide coach support for teachers that need additional guidance with the implementation of standards-based instruction, included, but not limited to individualized collaborative planning, co-teaching, modeling, and creating labs together.
2. Model, Co-Teach, and Whisper Coach best practices for face to face teaching and digital teaching.
3. Work with teachers to incorporate technology with instructional practices to enhance engagement, provide immediate feedback and allow students to access technology as a learning tool.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Enrichment

1. Create a culture of science throughout all grade levels: 5E's, House of Science, STEM Lab, Robotics, Project Lead the Way, The Everglades Project and Science Family Nights
2. Implement a face to face and digital science lab to support, and extend learning.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

Data Analysis and Reflection

1. Monitor student progress in all grade levels, using the NWEA, District Formative Assessments, and in-school assessments.
2. Conduct monthly data chats with teachers.
3. Report school wide data during Stocktake meetings to set ongoing academic goals based on student needs.

Person Responsible Adelene Sicardo (adelene.sicardoarmstrong@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will provide a supportive, regulated, and fulfilling environment with conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the highest needs of all students. Safety is paramount. Staff will understand and effectively demonstrate the five CASEL SEL competencies so as to model and transfer the skills to their students. These skills will be introduced during the Mental Health Training for all staff during the planning time preceding classes. These include the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, demonstrate empathy and social awareness. Increase ability to develop decision making skills that lead to positive and safe choices, self-regulation skills and relationship skills. SEL competencies will improve student rigor, self-esteem, and achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	According to data gleaned from the spring, 2020 administration of the Panorama Survey taken by 303 students in grades 3-5, the major area for growth at Boggy Creek was safety. Sixty percent of students expressed concerns regarding emotional regulation, particularly in provoking situations. Sixty percent of students expressed concerns about self-management, particularly the ability to remain calm when agitated.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeri Broming (jeri.broming@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School will utilize findings from Panorama to inform strategies to improve school safety, including fostering respect among students and teaching self-regulation skills so as to improve self-management and emotional regulation. Specific students who scored in the at risk zone in these areas will be provided with more intense intervention. Updated data and strategies on student SEL will be collected through the Panorama program. SEL strategies, goals and activities are embedded in the CUP Lessons for Math and Science. School counselor and social worker will continue to implement Safer, Smarter Kids and Too Good for Drugs programs to all students as Tier 1 strategies to improve decision-making skills, respect, and self-management per district plan. Tier 2 will include small group instruction through Second Step curriculum and strategies provided by Panorama. For Tier 3 students services will include individualized behavior intervention plans developed by MTSS Team, calming strategies and mental health referrals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above strategies will meet the needs of students at all levels of social development. Interventions and programs are data driven and research-based. SEL strategies and activities are imbedded in the CUP lessons for Math and Science. Teachers will incorporate the SEL strategies in their daily lessons. Safer, Smarter Kids is the district chosen program to be used to satisfy the state mandated lessons for human trafficking. The program has been proved to be effective in teaching the safety skills children need to make appropriate decisions and employ self-advocacy. Through a series of lessons which are reinforced each year, students learn the difference between safe and unsafe behaviors and social situation. The other state mandated program is TOO GOOD for Drugs. Ready to Lead: A 2019 Update of Principals' Perspectives on How Social and Emotional Learning Can Prepare Children and Transform Schools. Matthew N. Atwell and John M. Bridgeland

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Safer, Smarter Kids Program for all students. Safer, Smarter Kids is an abuse prevention curriculum designed for elementary aged children. Students will learn about personal safety and develop the skills to remain safe.
2. Implement Too Good for Drugs Program for all students. This research based program is designed mitigate the risk factors and enhance the protective factors related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. It

also enhances social and emotional skills and positive decision making.

3. Utilize Second Step Program in small groups. Students will be selected through teacher referrals, and panorama and MTSS behavior data.

4. Analyze academic outcomes for students who receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral supports.

5. Utilize data and strategies from Panorama program to select students who are at risk and provide small group support..

Person Responsible Jeri Broming (jeri.broming@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Ensure a school-wide environment that promotes college and career readiness and a post secondary culture by integrating AVID strategies in all content areas including social/emotional learning.</p> <p>Based on the data, our overall reading proficiency is 56%, overall math proficiency is 60%, and our overall science proficiency is 42%. In addition, our SEL data shows that 3rd -5th grade students rated our school social awareness at 63%, emotion regulation at 40%, self motivation at 40%, school belonging at 65% and school safety at 37%. By providing rigorous, challenging curriculum in all content areas, high expectations for all, and focusing on academic and SEL skills, we will strive to promote post secondary success and provide opportunities for a foundation of college and career readiness.</p>
Measurable Outcome: Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>We will increase our overall reading and math proficiency to 65% and our overall science proficiency to 60%. In addition, we will increase all of our SEL subcategories to 65%.</p> <p>Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>AVID is a nonprofit that assists schools to shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach to close the opportunity gap and prepare all students for college, careers, and life. Research suggests, introducing students to college and career readiness at an early age, can help students see post-secondary opportunities as a realistic goal. Our school will embed AVID strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration. Organization and Reading) into all content areas and incorporate student teams, with a focus on reading, writing, talking and solving real world problems.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>AVID supports our school and district career readiness efforts and SEL by providing strategies for rigorous teaching and learning that empowers our students with academic and 21st century skills to maximize their post secondary career options.</p> <p>The Magnificent Eight: AVID Best Practices Study. Guthrie, Larry F.; Guthrie, Grace Pung. Center for Research, Evaluation, and Training in Education, Burlingame, CA. 2002</p>

Action Steps to Implement**Planning**

1. An AVID site team will be organized and will guide the work of promoting a college and career readiness culture at the school. The team will meet monthly to discuss the needs of the school, goals, and progress.
2. We will implement AVID in all grade levels with a focus on WICOR and SEL strategies. These strategies will be incorporated in all lesson plans and will include reading, writing, talking, and solving within all content areas.
3. A college and career culture will be displayed and encouraged throughout the school and classrooms.
4. AVID ambassadors will be selected by the AVID site team. Ambassadors will be thoroughly trained and will take pride in leadership roles throughout the school.

Person

Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development

1. Professional development will be offered by the AVID site team to enhance AVID strategies.
2. These strategies will be monitored and strengthened through daily walkthroughs, feedback, modeling, and the analysis of our school wide data.

3. In addition to professional development, the AVID site team will mentor other teachers, provide resources, and organize family AVID events that will promote AVID school-wide.

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)

Data Analysis and Reflection

1. Weekly meetings will be held with PLC teams and individual teachers to ensure the fidelity and implementation of AVID and SEL strategies. These meetings will provide the evidence needed to assess the effectiveness of our AVID plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team.

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

1. Subgroup Data: Black Science Achievement - 29%
2. Subgroup Data: SWD ELA Achievement - 32%
3. Subgroup Data: ELL Science Achievement - 34%
4. Subgroup Data: FRL Science Achievement 38%
5. Subgroup Data: Black ELA Learning Gains 42%

Measurable Outcome:

1. Subgroup Data: Black Science Achievement - 39%
2. Subgroup Data: SWD ELA Achievement - 42%
3. Subgroup Data: ELL Science Achievement - 44%
4. Subgroup Data: FRL Science Achievement 48%
5. Subgroup Data: Black ELA Learning Gains 52%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Terry (elizabeth.terry@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Research shows that supporting all levels and tiers of MTSS will give the support to increase student achievement amongst all grade levels.

1. Monthly MTSS meetings that include grade level teachers, academic coaches, and administration. The MTSS team will discuss the intensive interventions being used as well as student success with the interventions. Research based interventions will be used with students daily.
2. Monthly Stocktake Meetings where the Resource Compliance Specialist, MTSS Coach, and ESOL Education Specialist will report to the principal on the Areas of Focus for their specific ESSA subgroup
3. Teacher trainings on effective strategies to support student learning such as Learning Maps and Teaching strategies with VE teachers (i.e. co-teaching)
4. Intensive interventions with all students. Face to Face and Digital students will receive intensive interventions minimally four times a week in reading and mathematics. Teachers will also provide supports during small group.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The specific evidence based strategies were picked because they will provide the supports to the necessary subgroups whether the students are learning face to face or digital. Teachers will be able to implement strategies through small group and intensive intervention time. Meetings will be held monthly that will hold all members of the MTSS team to high levels of responsibility by establishing meeting norms. Data presented during the meetings will decipher if the interventions are helping the students to make progress/ if interventions need to be changed. Teachers' grouping practices play a critical role in facilitating effective implementation of both reading instruction and inclusion of students with disabilities. Maheady (1997); Reading instruction is the academic area of greatest need for students with LD (Lyon, 1995); Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School (2014) Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Action Steps to Implement

Data will be monitored monthly for all Tier 2 students and biweekly for all Tier 3 students. MTSS coach will use baseline data to track if students are making progress during their intensive interventions.

Person Responsible: Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)

PLC time will be use for data deconstruction at each grade level. Each team will be review the ELL and ESE strategies that are working for their students on each specific standard. Teachers will use their formative data to reteach standards using necessary strategies.

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)

ELlevation strategies- training of those teachers that have not previously been trained on how to use ELlevation. During PLC, teachers will plan for the strategies to be used and then review how the strategies were reflected by using formative data.

Person Responsible Keisy Campos (keisy.camposocasio@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Boggy Creek Elementary strives to involve families and the faculty in a compatible understanding of academic, behavioral, and social expectations. It is communicated to families and faculty that there are high expectations for all students to succeed at our school in all areas.

Parents, families, and faculty is all invited to assist in the planning, review, and improvement of our Title I programs and our Parent and Family Engagement Plan. The school meets with the SAC committee on a monthly basis to receive input from parents and community stakeholders on how the school can support students, and follow up with data and results of school-wide initiatives.

Our school also provides all teachers and staff with trainings on rigorous curriculum as well as social and emotional skills. Teachers meet in weekly PLCs to disaggregate data to determine trends amongst the classes and the grade level as a whole. This information is used to create next steps to ensure success for all students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$67,367.99
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	General Fund		\$67,367.99
<i>Notes: Literacy Coach</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$33,788.32
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,788.32
<i>Notes: Math/Science Coach</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$33,788.32
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,788.32
<i>Notes: Mat/Science Coach</i>						
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$110,435.95
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6120	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	General Fund		\$66,453.00
<i>Notes: Guidance Counselor</i>						
	6150	341039-SUPPLIES - EDUCATIONAL	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,386.69
<i>Notes: Parent Engagement Nights</i>						
	6150	160-Other Support Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$40,596.26
<i>Notes: Parent liaison</i>						
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary				\$69,275.29
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$69,275.29
<i>Notes: Learning Resource Specialist/MTSS Coach</i>						
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$137,977.68
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	General Fund		\$70,043.87
			<i>Notes: ESE Resource Specialist</i>			
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0401 - Boggy Creek Elementary School	General Fund		\$67,933.81
			<i>Notes: ESOL Educational Specialist</i>			
Total:						\$452,633.55