

School District of Osceola County, FL

Canoe Creek K 8



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Canoe Creek K 8

3600 CANOE CREEK RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: David Noyes

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2020-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Canoe Creek K 8

3600 CANOE CREEK RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34772

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	81%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Canoe Creek K-8 will engage students with a rigorous and innovative Environmental STEM education while providing the instructional building blocks to develop 21st century global citizens. Through hands-on investigation and problem solving, students will become critical thinkers who are empowered to build sustainable and informed communities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Canoe Creek K-8 is a student-centered organization delivering excellence in education. We are committed to cultivating tomorrow's innovators where academics, well-being, and experiences combine to prepare students for success today and in the future.

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
Noyes, David	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.
Miller, Amy	Assistant 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.
Petrangeli, Kodie	Instructional Coach	Focus on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high fidelity implementation of Florida Standards in literacy through research-based strategies.
Woollet, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Focus on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high fidelity implementation of Florida Standards in math and science through research-based strategies.
Reid, Nicole	Dean	Focus on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementation of the Florida Standards in all content areas through research-based literacy strategies in addition to providing support for struggling readers by using, scientifically based reading strategies and programs on the secondary level.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 2/1/2020, David Noyes

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2020-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	74	75	83	88	91	71	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	3	4	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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

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

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	2	6	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Number of students enrolled														
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	59%	56%	61%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	57%	59%	70%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	55%	54%	64%	54%	51%
Math Achievement	54%	52%	62%	52%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	55%	59%	63%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	49%	52%	52%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	49%	56%	51%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	75%	78%	69%	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	55%	51%	4%	58%	-3%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	60%	48%	12%	56%	4%
	2018	70%	50%	20%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019	53%	48%	5%	54%	-1%
	2018	46%	46%	0%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
07	2019	50%	47%	3%	52%	-2%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	55%	49%	6%	56%	-1%
	2018	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	54%	5%	62%	-3%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	53%	-11%	64%	-22%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	62%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2019	53%	48%	5%	60%	-7%
	2018	74%	52%	22%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	49%	45%	4%	55%	-6%
	2018	32%	43%	-11%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
07	2019	57%	30%	27%	54%	3%
	2018	48%	29%	19%	54%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
08	2019	11%	47%	-36%	46%	-35%
	2018	32%	43%	-11%	45%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	45%	10%	53%	2%
	2018	67%	49%	18%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	46%	42%	4%	48%	-2%
	2018	44%	42%	2%	50%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
2018	57%	70%	-13%	71%	-14%
Compare		7%			

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	86%	49%	37%	61%	25%
2018	92%	52%	40%	62%	30%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	14	61	56	7	35	31	18				
ELL	44	64	56	45	46	44	40				
BLK	59	59		59	48		33				
HSP	55	64	57	51	49	37	53	58	86		
WHT	68	61	57	58	52	33	63	71			
FRL	56	63	59	56	49	34	47	61	83		
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	26	33	20	22	63	58					
ELL	33	47	46	43	59	58	32	33			
BLK	55	75		55	58						
HSP	48	49	42	54	59	53	52	55			
WHT	61	50	18	60	67		76	53			
FRL	46	44	35	52	58	38	56	38			
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	39	43		32	63						
ELL	39	67	65	36	65	58	36				
BLK	54	66	64	57	72		54				
HSP	53	72	65	46	63	55	43	68	64		
WHT	62	66	58	57	59	50	62	70			

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
FRL	48	62	59	46	58	47	49	63			

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	52
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	56
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	58
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.

89% of our ESE students did not make proficiency in grades 3-6 on their ELA FSA Assessment.
84% of our ESE students did not make proficiency in grades 3-6 on their Math FSA Assessment.

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

No prior year data. This is a new school.

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.

No prior year data. This is a new school.

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

No prior year data. This is a new school.

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

No prior year data. This is a new school.

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

1. Lowest Quartile ESE in Mathematics
2. Lowest Quartile ESE in ELA
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Math Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The state average for ELA proficiency is 55%. The district average is 47%, The goal is to meet or exceed the district and state averages while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome for 2020-2021 is to have an ELA proficiency of 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.
2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.
3. Training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered.
4. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.
5. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.
6. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
7. Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and, scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

Person Responsible Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The state average for Math proficiency is 62%. The district average is 52%, The goal is to meet or exceed the district and state averages while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to have an Math proficiency of 62%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.
2. Staff will assist students monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.
3. Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non-proficient in mathematics.
4. Staff will develop outcomes re presenting high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of learning.
5. Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques, supported by quality feedback and the ability to self-assess progress related, to the learning outcome.
6. Teachers will utilize formative assessments to monitor student learning and provide feedback.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2018-2019 science achievement for the state was 56% and for the district was 49%. In 2020-2021 science achievement will be 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning PLC.
2. Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards.
3. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.
4. Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.
5. ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses.
6. Teachers will provide individual student data chats.
7. The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises.
8. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level standards data, student tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared.

A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed a 38% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2020-2021 this question will be increased 10%.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.
8. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plan will be developed.
9. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop inventions as required.

**Person
Responsible**

Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams.

Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities.

It was found through the in sight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.

Measurable Outcome:

Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2020-2021
Opportunities to pursue leadership roles at 15% .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increase teacher leadership roles within the school. Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students and what they themselves need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school-improving student learning outcome. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from one another, and become experts in specific area. This team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down-and towards conducting experiments (such as small, 30-day projects), using pattern recognition, and execution by the whole.

2. The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period is intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project is not working.
3. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day toward goals.
4. Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrators. Both are equally valuable and necessary, especially with leadership teams.

Person Responsible Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As we are a new school sub group data will be an important part of the school and student achievement especially as the Federal ESSA data will reflect how the school is doing in this area.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	The school will have no subgroups below 41%.
----------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)
---	--

Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum:
---	---

	Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process - how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning
--	---

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
2. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies, ELLEVATION training, and ESE support strategies.
5. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1, 2, & 3.

Person Responsible Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

#7. Other specifically relating to School-wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A college-going culture builds the expectation of post-secondary education for all students- not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.

Measurable Outcome:

In 2019-2020 the the grade distribution at the end of the year was as follows:
A-10%, B-25%, C- 30%, D 20, F-15%
In 2020-2021 there will be an increase in grades A, B, and c by 5% each grade.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation with effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing post-secondary work which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone. (Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequence activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a post-secondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and meta-cognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills.
5. Administration and the Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.

Person Responsible

Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@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.

The school engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: •Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data • Student work is displayed throughout school • All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school is in the process of establishing an infrastructure to support family engagement, and a decision-making SAC council. The school will reach out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, the

school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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					\$3,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
		140-Substitute Teachers	0916 - Canoe Creek K 8	General Fund		\$3,100.00	
			Notes: Substitute Teachers will be used for ELA grade level planning days with the instructional coaches.				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$3,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
		140-Substitute Teachers	0916 - Canoe Creek K 8	General Fund		\$3,100.00	
			Notes: Substitute teachers will be used for grade level planning days with the instructional coaches.				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science					\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
		140-Substitute Teachers	0916 - Canoe Creek K 8	General Fund		\$300.00	
			Notes: Substitute teachers will be used for a 5th grade planning day with the instructional coaches.				
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning					\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team					\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups					\$2,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
		100-Salaries	0916 - Canoe Creek K 8	General Fund		\$2,400.00	
			Notes: Teachers will be paid for before/after school tutoring.				
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School-wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students					\$0.00
Total:						\$8,900.00	