
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	30
Budget to Support Goals	32

Deerwood Elementary School

3701 MARIGOLD AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Millie Torres

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

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: C (47%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	32

Deerwood Elementary School

3701 MARIGOLD AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34758

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	91%

School Grades History

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

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.

The Deerwood Family is committed to working collaboratively to meet the needs of each individual child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a collaborative community that cultivates and empowers future leaders to meet the needs of ALL students.

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
Confesor, Audie	Principal	Manage the operations of the school Ensure high quality, standards based instruction is taking place in classrooms Use data to make student centered decisions Hire and maintain staff Communicate School Improvement Goals with Community Manage and maintain school budget
Freeman, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ELA Curriculum and Instructional Support · Structured and Individual Professional Development Sessions · Strengthen Tier 1 Instruction for guided and close reading · Coaching Cycles · Model Lessons · Grade 3 PLC · Osceola Writes · FLKRS · 3rd grade Portfolio
Centeno, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Bullying designee Aggressive/violent discipline referrals Parent discipline issues Event request forms Threat Assessment team member Evaluations School City
Rodriguez, Noricely	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •MTSS Coordinator •myPGS •PLC Facilitator •Attendance •SAC •LSI/Classroom walkthroughs and feedback
Morales, Michelli	Instructional Coach	Learning Resource Specialist Behavior Interventionist AVID Site Coordinator Model Lessons (AVID Lessons and WICOR Strategies) Testing Coordinator 21st Century Site Coordinator
Wachter, Shawna	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Curriculum and Instructional Support Structured and Individual Professional Development Sessions Strengthen Tier 1 Instruction in Mathematical Problem Solving, Tangible Connections, Additional Resources, and Hands On Science Support relating to Standards Coaching Cycles Grade 5 PLC

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Isaac, Michelle	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Individual and Group Counseling •Classroom Guidance Lessons •Gifted referrals and initial screenings •Support MTSS interventions for behavior •Mental Health referrals and related services •Families-In-Transition liaison •Section 504 Designee •Child Abuse/DCF report support •Threat Assessment Team member

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Millie Torres

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.*

2

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Elementary School PK-5</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p>2019-20 Title I School</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students</p>

	Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%)
	2017-18: D (35%)
	2016-17: C (46%)
	2015-16: C (51%)
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	68	73	79	84	83	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	20	17	39	17	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	71	78	90	97	91	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	19	8	21	17	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	1	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	2	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	71	78	90	97	91	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	19	8	21	17	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	1	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	2	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	46%	53%	57%	48%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	50%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	51%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	55%	63%	41%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	59%	62%	49%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	45%	51%	38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	49%	53%	52%	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	36%	51%	-15%	58%	-22%
	2018	30%	51%	-21%	57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	48%	-10%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	44%	48%	-4%	56%	-12%
	2018	32%	50%	-18%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
	2018	21%	51%	-30%	62%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	53%	-18%	64%	-29%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	44%	48%	-4%	60%	-16%
	2018	33%	52%	-19%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	45%	-11%	53%	-19%
	2018	24%	49%	-25%	55%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	29	46	56	29	36	17	27				
ELL	39	53	63	40	44	28	39				
BLK	39	63	64	55	54		27				
HSP	44	59	60	44	46	24	35				
WHT	61	69		59	58						
FRL	41	60	60	46	50	29	31				

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	23	31	20	20	27	23					
ELL	21	38	37	27	35	20	8				
BLK	33	38		32	44	30					
HSP	35	42	32	33	42	29	27				
WHT	46	29		46	45		45				
FRL	33	41	31	33	46	27	27				
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	17	50		4	36						
ELL	27	45	50	25	48	39	36				
BLK	57	51	36	52	51	27	60				
HSP	44	54	52	37	52	46	50				
WHT	56	36		41	29						
FRL	45	48	43	38	48	32	51				

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	47
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	50
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	44
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	62
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	46
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.

The component that showed the lowest performance is Math Lowest 25% Gains (24%). The primary contributing factor to this data component is not identifying the lowest 25% in math and tracking those students success. An additional factor is new staff members not being aware of how to interpret data and use it to guide instruction. Other contributing factors include low expectations from the year(s) prior and not having an intervention component that focused on Tier 2 mathematics.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline (down 3%, 27% to 24%) from the prior year is Math Lowest 25% Gains. The primary contributing factor to this data component is not identifying the lowest 25% in math and tracking those students success. An additional factor is new staff members not being aware of how to interpret data and use it to guide instruction. Other contributing factors include low expectations from the year(s) prior and not having an intervention component that focused on Tier 2 mathematics.

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 4th grade math achievement (DWES 40%, State 64%). The primary factor that contributed to this gap is the group of students coming in at 20% proficient based on the 3rd grade 2017-2018 FSA data. Another primary factor that contributed is the core instruction not being taught to the appropriate depth of the standard. In December the leadership team changed when the current Math and Science Coach left. Other contributing factors include low expectations from the year(s) prior and not having an intervention component that focused on Tier 2 mathematics.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is ELA Lowest 25% Gains (61%). The strongest new action that our school took in this area is strengthening Tier 1 core instruction through hiring experienced teachers with a growth mindset that put PD into practice. This area was improved through consistent monitoring of classroom instruction with instant actionable feedback and coaching. An additional action our school took was investing in writing professional development and making writing a primary focus in ELA with a plan for all of the components. The ELA MTSS process was completely redesigned with the appropriate focuses and curriculum. Finally, the strengthening of PLC allowed for a collaborative structure that focused on data.

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

Upon reflection of the EWS data, we have a concern in regards to our current 4th Grade students. When they were in 3rd Grade, 18% of the students had attendance below 90%. 38% of our current 4th Grade students scored at a Level 1 on a statewide assessment. It is imperative that we improve the student attendance in order to help show growth for our students that scored at Level 1 on the 2018-2019 statewide assessments.

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

1. Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy.
2. Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.
3. Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students.
4. Ensure a school-wide post secondary culture for all students.
5. Strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met (with the PLC Action Plan embedded within the action steps and monitoring).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The data shows that in the 2018-2019 school year, ELA Achievement was at 46%. This data point is 7% below the District average and 11% below the State average.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA Achievement will increase by 6%.
 ELA Learning Gains will increase by 3%.
 ELA Lowest 25% Gains will increase by 4%.
 ELA SWD will increase by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Freeman (jessica.freeman@osceolaschools.net)

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)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Higher level learning closes the achievement gap quicker. If students are constantly exposed to below grade level expectations, the gap will continue to widen as they lose exposure to grade level standards and expectations. According to "Taking Action: Handbook for RTI at Work" ... "to learn at high levels, students must have access to grade-level curriculum each year." (Buffum, Mattos, Malone, 2018)
 School wide literacy is essential to and directly correlates to student achievement. A strong foundation in reading will help students achieve across subject areas. The ability to read, write, think, and solve critically using complex texts prepares students to be successful in their educational career and to become productive citizens within a 21st Century society.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher teams will meet each month for a total of six times a month for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative Team.
2. Teachers will track using the LSI Tracker, on the spot formative assessments, common formative assessments, and summative assessments to track the progression of standards mastery.
3. Students will be provided Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.
4. Students will provided Tier 3 instruction based on gaps in literacy foundations: phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency.
- 5.. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of highly effective ELA instruction. Tier 1 Core Instruction will be strengthened by the provision of ongoing professional development provided by the District for all grades K-5.

Person Responsible

Jessica Freeman (jessica.freeman@osceolaschools.net)

6. The Literacy Coach will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, LSI PLC Planning Days, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Learning Cycle Visits.

7. All students will be monitored using the DIBELS Universal Screener at the beginning of the year, Osceola Writes three times a year, Next Steps to Guided Reading Assessment three times a year, and district formative assessments quarterly.

Person Responsible Jessica Freeman (jessica.freeman@osceolaschools.net)

1. Schools PLC teams will meet weekly for assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team.

2. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes

3. School City will be used by each PLC team for assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs. Professional development will be conducted to train staff on the School City platform.

4. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team.

5. A PLC Guiding Coalition will be formed to oversee the process.

6. SWD will receive grade level instruction, scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.

7. SWD will receive intervention based on Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs

Person Responsible Jessica Freeman (jessica.freeman@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Mathematical problem solving is imperative in the emergence of thinking logically and critically, as well as exposure to real world situations. Authentic situations and multiple avenues of solving problems is essential to student achievement.

Due to the inability to take state testing this past school year, the 2018-19 data will be used and is as follows:

Measurable Outcome:

Proficiency 47%
 Learning Gains 49%
 Lowest Quartile Gains 24%
 SWD Achievement 29% Learning Gains 36% BQ Gains 17%

It is intended to improve this data in 2020-2021 to:

Proficiency 54%
 Learning Gains 60%
 Lowest Quartile Gains 60%
 SWD will increase by 5%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Research indicates that utilizing data to guide next steps in instruction positively impacts both the students and teachers. Additionally, it strengthens collaboration within the Professional Learning Community.

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. Attend Professional Development for insight and implementation of new information as it pertains to the BEST standards.
2. Tier 2 Interventions - Once an assessment has been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on error analysis. Students will receive interventions based on those errors in order to clarify misconceptions about specific strategies used.
3. Data Tracking System - Teachers will receive an online data tracker with essential standards. After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teacher will provided interventions as needed and reassess to monitor their learning.
4. Monitor and Support - During PLC's, teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs.
5. Student Self-Tracking/Goal Setting - Students will track their own learning and set attainable goals which will be monitored by the teacher.

Person Responsible

Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

1. Schools PLC teams will meet weekly for assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team.
2. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC

processes

3. School City will be used by each PLC team for assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs. Professional development will be conducted to train staff on the School City platform.
4. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team.
5. A PLC Guiding Coalition will be formed to oversee the process.
6. SWD will receive grade level instruction, scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.
7. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students who are exposed to and literate in science will gain valuable information needed for the 21st century. Implementing science within other content areas shows students real world applications and will better assist in problem solving in both social and academic settings.

Measurable Outcome: As of 2018-19, Science Proficiency was 37%. It is intended to improve this to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that utilizing data to guide next steps in instruction positively impacts both the students and teachers. Additionally, it strengthens collaboration within the Professional Learning Community.

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. Tier 2 Interventions - Once an assessment as been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on deficit content. Students will then receive additional resources and support to sharpen their comprehension.
2. Data Tracking System - Teachers will receive an online data tracker with essential standards. After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning.
3. Monitor and Support - During PLC's, teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs.
4. Student self Tracking / Goal Setting - Students will track their own learning and set attainable goals for themselves, teachers will monitor with subsequent data chats.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

1. Schools PLC teams will meet weekly for assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team.
2. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes
3. School City will be used by each PLC team for assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs. Professional development will be conducted to train staff on the School City platform.
4. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team.
5. A PLC Guiding Coalition will be formed to oversee the process.
6. SWD will receive grade level instruction, scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.
7. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>DWES is committed to providing rigorous, relevant, differentiated opportunities for all students in an environment that promotes college readiness. We believe we can achieve this by embedding AVID strategies into all content areas with fidelity.</p> <p>Our current ELA data shows that our overall reading proficiency is 46%. Our proficiency of our ELL is 39% and ESE proficiency at 29%. This data shows that we are meeting the needs of some students, however, this does not meet the expectation for ALL of our students to be college and career ready.</p> <p>Our current mathematics data shows that our overall mathematics proficiency is 49% with our ELL's at 40% and ESE students at 29%. This does not meet our expectation for ALL of our students to be college and career ready.</p> <p>Our current science data shows that our overall science proficiency is 37% with our ELL's at 39% and ESE students at 27%. This does not meet our expectation for ALL of our students to be college and career ready.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Students' academic performance will increase in all areas preparing them for college and career readiness.</p> <p>In reading, we intend to increase overall student proficiency in reading to 51%, ELL's to 44%, and our ESE students to 34%.</p> <p>In math, we intend to increase overall student proficiency in mathematics to 54%, ELL to 45%, and our ESE students 34%.</p> <p>In science, we intend to increase overall student proficiency in mathematics to 42%, ELL to 44%, and our ESE students 32%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID's proven learning support structure, known as WICOR , incorporates teaching/ learning methodologies in the critical areas of Writing to Learn, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading to Learn. WICOR provides a learning model that educators can use to guide students in comprehending concepts and articulating ideas at increasingly complex levels (scaffolding) within developmental, general education, and discipline-based curricula. Furthermore, the WICOR model reflects and promotes the expertise and attitudes that will serve students well in their academic lives and careers.
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. AVID as a school-wide framework will support ELA, Mathematics, and Science instruction. We will create an AVID site team with representatives from each grade level, which will meet every 3rd Wednesday at 2:40 pm. During this meeting, the team will plan and develop PD and activities for our school-wide AVID PLC held once a month. These PD's will focus on WICOR strategies to increase rigor. All teachers will incorporate WICOR into lesson planning with focus on impacting student achievement. We will increase the use of WICOR strategies in the classroom with support from our LRS, Mrs. Morales. Teachers will utilize WICOR checklist as provided by the AVID Coordinator, Mrs. Morales to help with their

planning. The AVID PLC will be led by an AVID site team with representatives from across the school. The AVID site team coordinator and academic coaches will be responsible for implementation.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

2. The school will host family involvement nights where teachers model the implementation of AVID in their classrooms with an emphasis on WICOR. Grade levels will take turns showcasing their classrooms at these parent nights. There will be one involvement parent night per semester.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

3. Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of AVID and WICOR strategies in all classrooms. Therefore, ensuring that PD goes to practice.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

4. Newly trained teachers and teachers with no prior training in AVID will receive support from the AVID site team. Mrs. Morales will model WICOR and AVID strategies to newly trained teacher and teacher with no prior training in AVID. In addition, we will participate from district PD's to keep developing new AVID strategies.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

5. These action steps will be reviewed at weekly leadership team meetings as well as during monthly Stocktake meetings. Teachers will turn in lesson plans weekly to their shared folder for review by administration. Our weekly review will include data from walkthroughs, weekly formative assessments, district formatives, end of unit assessments and documentation (agendas, minutes, sign in sheets) and surveys. The MTSS team will meet every Wednesday to review data and adjust response for individual student needs. The principal will update the Assistant Superintendent during their monthly check-ins. The principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents once a quarter on progress the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on 2018-2019 data, 29% of the student with disabilities scored on or above average in ELA and Math and 27% of the students with disabilities scored on or above average in Science.

Measurable Outcome: ELA SWD Achievement will increase by 5%.
 ELA SWD Learning Gains will increase by 3%.
 ELA SWD Lowest 25% Gains will increase by 3%.
 Math SWD Achievement will increase by 5%.
 Math SWD Learning Gains will increase by 3%.
 Science SWD Achievement will increase by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Noricely Rodriguez (noricely.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities will receive standard-based Tier 1 instruction in the classroom with support from the VE teacher. Teachers will analyzes student's formative assessments data during MTSS and PLC to modify whole group instruction and determine student's intensive interventions based on needs.

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. Teachers will participate in weekly common PLC meetings to develop standardized lesson plans and common assessments.
2. The RCS will provide support during the PLC meetings.
3. Teachers will utilize data while reviewing or developing individualized learning goals.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that will focus on instructional support for the ESE subgroup.
5. Teachers will provide ESE instructional support to the ESE subgroup during support facilitation in Reading and Math.
6. Student's academic and/or behavior performance will be utilize to determine Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible Noricely Rodriguez (noricely.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students who participate in social emotional learning programs are shown to increase academic achievement and engage in positive peer interactions. Self-awareness, self-management, and social awareness are components of social emotional learning that will be addressed in order to promote student success in academics and interpersonal relationships. These elements of emotional intelligence were identified as needs by reviewing the results of inquiries provided by students during the 2019-20 school year.

Measurable Outcome: As of the 2019-20 school year, 55% of students consider the perspectives of others and empathize with them, 37% of students believed that they were able to regulate their emotions, and 34% were able to manage their emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in different situations.

It is intended to improve this data to:
 Social Awareness-60%
 Emotion Regulation-40%
 Self-Management-37%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Isaac (michelle.isaac@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The implementation of evidence-based strategies are shown to be effective in improving the emotional intelligence of elementary aged children. Three strategies that will be utilized to promote overall improvement in social awareness, emotion regulation, and self-management are diversity talks, mindfulness, and Zones of Regulation.
 Diversity talks are activities that aim to promote active listening, opportunities to engage in culturally relevant conversations, and ensures that each student has a voice. This strategy fosters a safe environment in which students are able to listen to the perspectives of others and learn to empathize with their peers minimizing bullying situations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The concept of mindfulness has been proven to stimulate emotional regulation by optimizing overall mental health. It also has a positive impact on stress and anxiety.
 Zones of Regulation is a framework that utilizes a systematic, cognitive-behavioral approach to teach students to self regulate their emotions and impulses successfully in spite of the demands of their environment. This will enable students to better manage their emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in different situations.

Action Steps to Implement

- Diversity Talks:
1. During Red Ribbon Week School Counselor will conduct diversity talks in classrooms.
 2. Encourage teachers to conduct diversity talks throughout the school year and implement them in their lessons.

- Mindfulness:
1. School Counselor will conduct guidance lessons on how to manage stress and anxiety.
 2. School Counselor will conduct individual counseling sessions based on student need and teacher referral.
 3. School Counselor will conduct small group sessions based on student need and teacher referrals.
 4. School Counselor will make appropriate mental health referrals.

Zones of Regulation:

1. Teachers are trained by school district personnel.
- 2 Teachers implement strategies in the classroom.

Panorama Survey will be administered at the beginning and end of the school year to assess student need and the effectiveness of strategies implemented.

Person Responsible Michelle Isaac (michelle.isaac@osceolaschools.net)

#7. Other specifically relating to Ensure a school wide post secondary culture for all students

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</p>	<p>DWES is committed to providing rigorous, relevant, differentiated opportunities for all students in an environment that promotes college readiness. We believe we can achieve this by embedding AVID strategies into all content areas with fidelity.</p> <p>Our current ELA data shows that our overall reading proficiency is 46%. Our proficiency of our ELL is 39% and ESE proficiency at 29%. This data shows that we are meeting the needs of some students, however, this does not meet the expectation for ALL of our students to be college and career ready.</p> <p>Our current mathematics data shows that our overall mathematics proficiency is 49% with our ELL's at 40% and ESE students at 29%. This does not meet our expectation for ALL of our students to be college and career ready.</p> <p>Our current science data shows that our overall science proficiency is 37% with our ELL's at 39% and ESE students at 27%. This does not meet our expectation for ALL of our students to be college and career ready.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome:</p>	<p>Students' academic performance will increase in all areas preparing them for college and career readiness.</p> <p>In reading, we intend to increase overall student proficiency in reading to 51%, ELL's to 44%, and our ESE students to 34%.</p> <p>In math, we intend to increase overall student proficiency in mathematics to 54%, ELL to 45%, and our ESE students 34%.</p> <p>In science, we intend to increase overall student proficiency in mathematics to 42%, ELL to 44%, and our ESE students 32%.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>AVID's proven learning support structure, known as WICOR , incorporates teaching/ learning methodologies in the critical areas of Writing to Learn, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading to Learn. WICOR provides a learning model that educators can use to guide students in comprehending concepts and articulating ideas at increasingly complex levels (scaffolding) within developmental, general education, and discipline-based curricula. Furthermore, the WICOR model reflects and promotes the expertise and attitudes that will serve students well in their academic lives and careers.</p>
<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>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)</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID as a school-wide framework will support ELA, Mathematics, and Science instruction. We will create an AVID site team with representatives from each grade level, which will meet every 3rd Wednesday at 2:40 pm. During this meeting, the team will plan and develop PD and activities for our school-wide AVID PLC held once a month. These PD's will focus on WICOR strategies to increase rigor. All teachers will incorporate WICOR into lesson planning with focus on impacting student achievement. We will increase the use of WICOR strategies in the classroom with support from our LRS, Mrs. Morales. Teachers will utilize WICOR checklist as provided by the AVID Coordinator, Mrs. Morales to help with their

planning. The AVID PLC will be led by an AVID site team with representatives from across the school. The AVID site team coordinator and academic coaches will be responsible for implementation.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

2. The school will host family involvement nights where teachers model the implementation of AVID in their classrooms with an emphasis on WICOR. Grade levels will take turns showcasing their classrooms at these parent nights. There will be one involvement parent night per semester.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

3. Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of AVID and WICOR strategies in all classrooms. Therefore, ensuring that PD goes to practice.

Person Responsible Audie Confesor (audie.confesor@osceolaschools.net)

4. Newly trained teachers and teachers with no prior training in AVID will receive support from the AVID site team. Mrs. Morales will model WICOR and AVID strategies to newly trained teacher and teacher with no prior training in AVID. In addition, we will participate from district PD's to keep developing new AVID strategies.

Person Responsible Michelli Morales (michelli.moralesreyes@osceolaschools.net)

5. These action steps will be reviewed at weekly leadership team meetings as well as during monthly Stocktake meetings. Teachers will turn in lesson plans weekly to their shared folder for review by administration. Our weekly review will include data from walkthroughs, weekly formative assessments, district formatives, end of unit assessments and documentation (agendas, minutes, sign in sheets) and surveys. The MTSS team will meet every Wednesday to review data and adjust response for individual student needs. The principal will update the Assistant Superintendent during their monthly check-ins. The principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents once a quarter on progress the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Audie Confesor (audie.confesor@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Development Opportunities

Weekly PLCs

Plan for coaches to push and assist during planning

Walk through classrooms and provide immediate feedback

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 engages 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. Our school frequently communicates high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based on disaggregated data.
- Exemplary student work is displayed throughout school.
- All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum through the AVID Program.

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Part of this code of conduct includes a PBIS program to recognize positive behaviors. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data includes the following: discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension, and attendance. This also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. This includes establishing specific, but attainable strategies for reducing disproportionate discipline, with staff, student, and family input. This also includes implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and providing 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 solicits staff feedback on school wide procedures and creates 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 has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC

council. It reaches 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 underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small group conversations with school leaders).

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				\$36,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	160-Other Support Personnel	0831 - Deerwood Elementary School	Title, I Part A	36.0	\$36,000.00
<i>Notes: Paraprofessional to assist with Tier 2 Interventions</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$54,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	160-Other Support Personnel	0831 - Deerwood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$54,000.00
<i>Notes: Math Coach to coach teachers and staff through Tier 1, 2, and 3 Instruction</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$54,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0831 - Deerwood Elementary School	Title, I Part A	54.0	\$54,000.00
<i>Notes: MTSS Interventionist to Design, monitor, and assist with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions</i>						
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Ensure a school wide post secondary culture for all students				\$0.00
					Total:	\$144,000.00