School District of Osceola County, FL

Flora Ridge Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Flora Ridge Elementary School

2900 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Dustin Sassic

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Flora Ridge Elementary School

2900 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

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 KG-5	Yes	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

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.

Inspiring all students to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create an environment of high expectations where all learners achieve their full potential.

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
Merritt, Tracey	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To assist the principal in all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To serve as a liaison between and among the principal to create positive school-community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public.
Dwyer, William	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.
Archambeau, Gidget	Instructional Coach	This position focuses on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementations of research-based reading programs and scientifically-based reading strategies/practices at all elementary levels.
Rogers, Neroli	Teacher, K-12	Teach efficiently and faithfully, using books and material required, following the prescribed courses of study, and employing approved methods of instruction.
Wolferd, Joanne	Instructional Coach	Assist principal with all ESOL program and ELL student matters, provide teacher support and inservice on ESOL strategies and Best Practices. Perform all program compliance duties and implement procedures, at the school , as required byy the Florida Consent Decree, State Board Rues and District Policy.
Morales, Rosani	School Counselor	To assist in the needs of the student in growth and development- social, academic, physical, emotional and behavioral, serves as a consultant to the student, teacher and parents, and provides leadership and organization to all guidance activities within the school.
Chaverez, Carmen	Teacher, K-12	Teach efficiently and faithfully, using books and material required, following the prescribed courses of study, and employing approved methods of instruction.
McCain, Lakisha	Teacher, ESE	To coordinate educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. To serve as LEA representative at eligibility, re-evaluation and Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings at assigned schools. This position will assist schools with the implementation of IDEA Federal and State regulations for students with disabilities. Additionally, it will provide support to schools in the areas of curriculum and instruction,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		behavior supports, service delivery models and staff development to address the needs of students with disabilities.
Barbour, Emily	Instructional Coach	This position focuses on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementations of research-based reading programs and scientifically-based reading strategies/practices at all elementary levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/8/2020, Dustin Sassic

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.*

6

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Multiracial Students* White Students

	Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	118	115	144	169	155	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	854
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	14	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	2	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Wednesday 7/8/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	24	24	28	31	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	79	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172

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	1	0	0	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	24	24	28	31	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	79	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172

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	1	0	0	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	42%	53%	57%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	53%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	51%	53%	55%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	55%	63%	57%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	59%	62%	57%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	51%	45%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	49%	53%	55%	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	38%	51%	-13%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	51%	-16%	58%	-23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	36%	48%	-12%	56%	-20%
	2018	35%	50%	-15%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	54%	-14%	62%	-22%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	53%	-14%	64%	-25%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	36%	48%	-12%	60%	-24%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	28%	45%	-17%	53%	-25%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	45	36	23	48	38	15				
ELL	35	56	52	41	55	48	28				
ASN	52	71		59	76		40				
BLK	30	38		22	23						
HSP	39	54	51	43	52	44	29				
WHT	65	59		60	51		58				

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
FRL	38	52	47	41	49	36	30				

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	22	35	27	25	26	23	20				
ELL	30	37	34	35	36	27	12				
ASN	39	44		57	44						
BLK	37			25							
HSP	38	40	34	43	41	38	37				
WHT	55	44		60	50	45	67				
FRL	31	38	35	36	34	27	41				

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	10	41	44	23	36	36					
ELL	32	50	59	47	60	56	30				
ASN	65			71							
BLK	48	38		62	44						
HSP	42	53	56	54	57	48	54				
WHT	63	50		63	64						
FRL	40	47	52	52	51	41	58				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36

Students With Disabilities	
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	48
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	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	64
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	45
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.

Our 2019 FSA Science Achievement was at 33% proficiency. This is down from 36% the previous school year, a decline of 3%. This data Science Achievement score shows a gap of 16% below the district average and 20% points below the state average. When analyzing the Science data, the lowest performing area was Nature of Science. In the current science curriculum Nature of Science is embedded with other science topics and is often not a focus as a Science learning target. This data shows a need to increase the intentional focus of teaching Nature of Science.

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

Science Achievement was the single area the school declined in from the previous year. Several factors contributed to this decline. The district adopted a new Science curriculum and teachers had little training to use the materials. Nature of Science was the weakest performing area by students on the assessment. Nature of Science is embedded into other content areas and often skipped or not called out or highlighted during instruction. Grades K-4 do not focus on the urgency of teaching Science standards and often let math or reading standards take precedence over Science, therefore students are not prepared by having a deep understanding of "fair game" science standards taught previous to 5th grade.

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.

Science Achievement showed the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our school Science achievement data in 2019 indicated 33% achievement compared to the state at 53%, a gap of 20%. As indicated in the Analysis in part b (above), new curriculum, little professional development and a lack of a sense of urgency for teaching Science in grades K-4 contributed to the difference in scores form the state average.

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

The learning gains in ELA showed significant improvement in 2019. Overall, ELA learning gains increased by 15%. In particular, ELA learning gains of ELL students increased by 20%, Asian students by 19%, and students with disabilities by 18%. Furthermore, ELA students in the lowest quartile increased performance by 19% (52%), outperforming the district average by 1% (51%) approaching the state average of 53%. New actions taken by the
school included a restructuring of the MTSS process, remediation and enrichment in ELA offered each day of the week, the introduction of Corrective Reading as a tier 3 intervention and a new position of interventionists to work with low performing students.

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

Our school's area of concern is the core instruction. Proficiency in ELA, math and Science needs to increase to meet the district and state percentages. In 2019 our school's ELA achievement was at 42% (53% district, 57% state), our school's math achievement was at 45% (55% district, 63% state) and our school's science achievement was at 33% (49% district, 53% state) Our school's goal is to strengthen tier 1 instruction by improving collaborative teachers practices through the PLC process.

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

1. Increase Science Achievement
2. Increase Math Achievement
3. Increase ELA Achievement
4. Schoolwide Post-Secondary Culture
5. Attend to staff and student socio-emotional needs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy. According to ELA Achievement data from 2018-19, our school (42%) falls 11 percentage points behind the district (53%) and 15 percentage points behind the state (57%). However, for learning gains in ELA our school (55%) is 1 percentage point behind the district (56%) and 3 percentage points behind the state (58%). For ELA lowest quartile our school (52%) is 1 percentage point above the district (51%) and matches the state (52%) average. Our Next Steps to Guided Reading Assessment (NSGRA) 2019-20 district data indicates in each grade level we fall behind the district average between 1-19 percentage points. Our 2019-20 District ELA formative assessment illustrates a weakness in grades 2-5, falling behind the district average between 5-7 percentage points. A strategic focus needs to be placed on literacy core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to enhance tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Highly trained literacy personnel needs to serve students in the lowest quartile and areas of ESSA to continue to make gains in the ELA area.
Measurable Outcome:	With highly trained personnel and frequently monitored interventions put into place, continued growth and learning gains will be achieved in all areas as indicated by 2019 state assessment data to 2021 state assessment data. We predict ELA Achievement for ESE will growth from 26% to 30%, ELA Achievement for ELL will grow from 35% to 45%, ELA lowest quartile will grow from 52% to 58%, ELA learning gains will grow from 55% to 60% and ELA proficiency from 42% to 53%. In relation to district data, our school will meet district averages on all ELA assessments by the end of the school year. The achievement gap will begin to close as student are engaged in systematic intervention programs and core content instruction is aligned to the rigor of the literacy standard. Student in the bottom quartile will make considerable learning gains with the correct intervention and a skilled teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Powerful classroom instruction on grade level begins with researched based curriculum, effective teaching strategies and an effective collaborative Professional Learning Community. Classroom teachers will use district created Curriculum Unit Plans for tier one instruction. Next Steps to Guided Reading (NSGR) will be used to frequently assess student progress. Foundational Skills will be supported through Words their Way and Phonemic Awareness Supplemental Curriculum. Running records will be conducted and analyzed to inform decision making by PLCs. Intervention opportunities will be offered by highly qualified instructional staff using Corrective Reading, Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) and other research based materials from Curriculum Associates and Houghton Mifflin. All Literacy decision making made by teachers and PLCs will be discussed with the Literacy Coach and Leadership team to ensure constant support for teachers and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing quality classroom reading instruction with researched validated characteristics make a measurable, positive impact on all students. Teachers must be clear about the content and language objectives for the lesson and unit. Learning outcomes should be based on standards with appropriate differentiation to address the needs of all students. Appropriate and varied core and supplemental materials should be available to support different learning styles and needs. Students' reading ability should be screened often and progress should be tracked using a valid measurement tool. Knowledgeable instructional coaches and mentors are available to assist teachers with instructional decision making based on data.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

At the beginning of the school year, an intervention plan was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum will be selected based on the targeted needs of students as evidenced by multiple assessments. This plan will be referenced at each monthly MTSS meeting with grade levels.

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceola.schools.net)

Students will be assessed three times per year to determine instructional reading levels to ensure all students are reading and comprehending at or above grade level. In addition, checklists (Success Criteria), running records (weekly), fluency checks and district formative assessments will be given and analyzed in order to target effective instructional strategies for students

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers, reading interventionist and trained paraprofessionals will provide interventions for Enrichment, Tier 1 Tier 2 and Tier 3. Highly trained literacy interventionists using Corrective Reading and Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) will work with students daily during Triple I that need to show the most growth to close the achievement gap

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

Technology will be intentionally integrated into instructional practices to enhance engagement, provide immediate feedback and allow students to access technology as a learning tool using resources such as School City.

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies and LSI techniques to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

Individual data chats will be conducted with the leadership team three times during the school year to ensure teachers have guidance pertaining to instructional choices made for individual students.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Literacy Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school Literacy plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions. Three teacher mentors, two interventionist and a Literacy Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible	Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

Person Responsible	Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

The School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress to the principal. William Dwyer, principal, will update Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Dr. Jane Respess, During their monthly check ins. William Dwyer, will update the Cheif of staff, Dr. Scott Flowers, once a quarter on progress of the Areas of Focus.

Person Responsible	William Dwyer (william.dwyer@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students. According to Mathematics Achievement data from 2018-19, our school (45%) falls 10 percentage points behind the district (55%) and 18 percentage points behind the state (63%). For learning gains in Math our school (52%) is 7 percentage points behind the district (59%) and 10 percentage points behind the state (62%). For Mathematics lowest quartile our school (44%) is 1 percentage point behind the district (45%) and 7 percentage points behind the state (51%) average. Our 2019-20 District Math formative assessment illustrates a weakness in grades K-5, meeting or falling behind the district average between 4-21 percentage points. A strategic focus needs to be placed on mathematics core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to enhance tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Highly trained mathematics personnel needs to serve students in the lowest quartile and areas of ESSA to continue to make gains in the Mathematics area.
Measurable Outcome:	With highly trained personnel and frequently monitored interventions put into place, continued growth and learning gains will be achieve in all areas. We predict Mathematics Achievement for ESE will growth from 23% to 28%, Mathematics Achievement for ELL will grow from 41% to 50%, Mathematics lowest quartile will grow from 44% to 50%, Mathematics learning gains will grow from 52% to 60% and Mathematics proficiency from 45% to 57%. In relation to district data, our school will meet district averages on all math assessments by the end of the school year. The achievement gap will begin to close as student are engaged in systematic intervention programs and core content instruction is aligned to the rigor of the mathematics standard. Student in the bottom quartile will make considerable learning gains with the correct intervention and a skilled teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Powerful classroom instruction on grade level begins with researched based curriculum, effective teaching strategies and an effective collaborative Professional Learning Community. Classroom teachers will use district created Curriculum Unit Plans for tier one instruction. District and PLC developed formative assessments will be used to frequently assess student progress and uploaded into School City for PLCs to easily access to analyze for grade level intervention decision making. Intervention opportunities will be offered by highly qualified instructional staff using Pearson adopted math curriculum and Curriculum Associates curriculum. All Mathematics decision making made by teachers and PLCs will be discussed with the Math Coach and Leadership team to ensure constant support for teachers and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing quality classroom mathematics instruction with researched validated characteristics make a measurable, positive impact on all students. Teachers must be clear about the content and foundational skills objectives for the lesson and unit. Learning outcomes should be based on standards with appropriate differentiation to address the needs of all students. Appropriate and varied core and supplemental materials should be available to support different learning styles and needs. Students' mathematics ability should be screened often and progress should be tracked using a valid measurement tool. Knowledgeable instructional coaches and mentors are available to assist teachers with instructional decision making based on data.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

At the beginning of the school year, a mathematics intervention plan was developed to include instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier,
directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum choices and instructional decisions will be guided by the school's Math Coach. Teachers will provide interventions for Enrichment, Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 in math. Math tier 2 interventions will occur within the 60 mins of math instruction by grade level math teachers and tier 3 interventions will occur outside the math block using an interventionist or math coach during PE waiver time. Interventions may be designed for the grade level through a Math Bootcamp, with teachers selecting a skill to for reteaching.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

Math formative assessments will be on-going throughout the school year. Students will be assessed through PLC and district created assessments, checklists (Success Criteria), and fluency checks. Assessments will be
analyzed by PLCs and Math Coach to monitor effectiveness of instruction. Coaching support will be offered by the Math Coach. Technology will be intentionally integrated into instructional practices to enhance engagement, provide immediate feedback and allow students to access technology as a learning tool using resources such as School City

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies and LSI techniques to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

Individual data chats will be conducted with the leadership team three times during the school year to ensure teachers have guidance pertaining to instructional choices made for individual students.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Mathematics Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school Mathematics plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions.Three teacher mentors, two interventionist and a Math Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

Person Responsible	Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

The School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress to the principal. William Dwyer, principal, will update Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Dr. Jane Respess, During their monthly check ins. William Dwyer, will update the Cheif of staff, Dr. Scott Flowers, once a quarter on progress of the Areas of Focus.

Person Responsible	William Dwyer (william.dwyer@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high Levels of science achievement for all students Science proficiency scores declined in 2019. Science proficiency fell from 36.2% in 2018 to 33% in 2019. According to Science Achievement data, our school (33%) falls 16 percentage points behind the district (49%) and 20 percentage points behind the state (53%). According to 2020 District Science formative assessment data, our school's grades 3-5 fell below the district average between 6-11 percentage points. A strategic focus needs to be placed on science core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to science interventions. The area of Nature of Science was the lowest scoring area on FCAT. Science instruction must be a targeted focus for grades K-5 to build to proficiency with the 5th grade Science FCAT Assessment. Highly trained personnel needs to serve students in grades K-5, particularly in the areas of ESSA to continue to increase science proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	With highly trained personnel and frequently monitored interventions put into place, continued growth to increase proficiency will occur on the Science assessment. We predict Science proficiency will increase by 22 points from 33% to 55%. In relation to district data, our school will meet district averages on all science assessments by the end of the school year. The achievement gap will begin to close as student are engaged in systematic intervention programs and core content instruction is aligned to the rigor of the Science standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Powerful classroom instruction on grade level begins with researched based curriculum, effective teaching strategies and an effective collaborative Professional Learning Community. Classroom teachers will use district created Curriculum Unit Plans for tier one instruction. District and PLC developed formative assessments will be used to frequently assess student progress and uploaded into School City for PLCs to easily access to analyze for grade level intervention decision making. Intervention opportunities will be offered by highly qualified instructional staff using district adopted Science curriculum. All Science decision making made by teachers and PLCs will be discussed with the Math/Science Coach and Leadership team to ensure constant support for teachers and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing quality classroom Science instruction with researched validated characteristics make a measurable, positive impact on all students. Teachers must be clear about the content objectives for the lesson and unit. Learning outcomes should be based on standards with appropriate differentiation to address the needs of all students. Appropriate and varied core and supplemental materials should be available to support different learning styles and needs. Students' scientific ability/understandings should be screened often and progress should be tracked using a valid measurement tool. Knowledgeable instructional coaches and mentors are available to assist teachers with instructional decision making based on data. 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

At the beginning of the school year, a Science intervention plan was developed to increase Science proficiency schoolwide. Each Wednesday classes will conduct a Science lesson targeting Nature of Science standards. This is protected time to focus on higher level thinking and problem solving skills. Curriculum choices and instructional decisions will be guided by the school's Math/Science Coach.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Science formative assessments will be on-going throughout the school year. Students will be assessed through PLC and district created assessments and checklists (Success Criteria) through teacher verification of learning. Assessments will be analyzed by PLCs and Math/Science Coach to monitor effectiveness of instruction. Coaching support will be offered by the Math/Science Coach.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will provide core instruction with interventions designed for the grade level through a Science Bootcamp (House of Science), with teachers selecting a skill to focus on for reteaching. Science instruction will be supplemented through a Science Block class in which students will visit in rotations throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Technology will be intentionally integrated into instructional practices to enhance engagement, provide immediate feedback and allow students toaccess technology as a learning tool using resources such as School City.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies and LSI techniques to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected by the grade level teams.

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

Individual data chats will be conducted with the leadership team three times during the school year to ensure teachers have guidance pertaining to instructional choices made for individual students.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Science Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school Science plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions.Three teacher mentors, two interventionist and a Science Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

Person Responsible Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

The School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress to the principal. William Dwyer, principal, will update Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Dr. Jane Respess, During their monthly check ins.

William Dwyer, will update the Cheif of staff, Dr. Scott Flowers, once a quarter on progress of the Areas of Focus.

Person Responsible William Dwyer (william.dwyer@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA data in 2018-2019 indicated the school had two sub groups below the ESSA level 41%, The two sub groups falling below 41% were Students with Disabilities (36%) and Black/African American Students (28%). These scores affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA data for 2018-2019 ESE- 36% and Black/African American- 28% will increase in 2020-2021 to exceed 41% in both sub groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lakisha McCain (lakisha.mccain@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Each student will have a unique path to success. Forcing all students to learn the same way means some will always struggle, a few will be very successful and the majority will just get by. Teachers will be prepared with various teaching styles for the same material to give each student the opportunity to learn with the class. Even on separate paths, students can reach their learning goals. Teachers will individualize instruction, engage students through multiple learning modalities, be flexible and diagnostic, and attend to ESE student's IEP goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools spend precious time creating the foundations of inclusive programs for students with disabilities. Careful thought goes into scheduling co-taught classes, creating balanced classroom rosters, training co-teaching partners, developing collaborative relationships, and providing appropriate supports for students with disabilities (Walther-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin, & Williams, 2000). Differentiate instruction using flexible grouping, providing activities that appeal to various learning-style preferences, giving students choices, and creating alternative activities and assessments (Tomlinson, 2001).Provide opportunities for students to work in small groups and in pairs. If cooperative learning strategies are used, five conditions must be present: (a) The task must be authentic, worthwhile, and appropriate for students working in groups; (b) Small-group learning must be the goal; (c) Cooperative behavior should be taught to and used by students; (d) Group work should be structured so that students depend on one another to complete a task successfully; (e) Students should be held individually accountable (Putnam, 1998).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will share common planning (Professional Learning Communities) on a weekly basis 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 conjuntion with 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 ESE students and attend to the learning needs of individual students. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies and ESE support strategies.
5. ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the RCS/VE teachers/classroom teacher. Professional development focusing on meeting the needs/goals indicated on the IEP and best practices ESE teaching models will be conducted by the ESE specialists on campus and from the district office.

Person Responsible	Lakisha McCain (lakisha.mccain@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well implemented programs designed to foster Social Emotional Learning (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 38% of students responded favorably to the perception of student physical and psychological safety at school. This score in this area was 7 percentage points below the district average in this area of 45%. In 2020-2021 the percentage of students responding favorably will increase by 7 percentage points to 45% of students responding favorably in the area of school safety.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosani Morales (rosani.morales@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Building a safe learning environment through inclusion and acceptance of all students Modeling and teaching positive, effective communications skills Providing opportunities for flexible groupings
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Relational capacity is the degree of trust and level of safety among members of a group. In an educational context, this specifically refers to the established level of trust and safety between teachers and students, as well as directly between students. Classes that are low in relational capacity are often teacher-centered, with little dialogue or collaboration among students. Alternatively, classes that are high in relational capacity are characterized by energy and comfort, where students feel mutual ownership in the expectations and learning within the classroom. 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. Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will incease 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 such as, hands-on, experimental, and project-based activities.
6. Teachers will integrate SEL strategies into curriculum such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness through Sanford Harmony curriculum and AVID strategies.
7. Teachers will facilitate collaborative learning, class building and team building.
8. The school will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support SEL development.
9. Surveys will be analyzed and interventions adjusted to support schoolwide SEL implementation by the Leadership/MTSS Team.

Person Responsible Rosani Morales (rosani.morales@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure a schoolwide post-secondary culture for all students. Schools must convey the expectation that all students can prepare for the opportunity to attend and be successful in post-secondary education. School culture and climate directly effect student learning and engagement as wellas college aspirations and preparation. When high expectations are set, a growth mindset is developed and academic preparations and tools are present, students will meet or exceed expected academic results.
Measurable Outcome:	AVID Schools become certified using the Elementary Coaching and Certification Instrument (ECCI). Schools are assessed in four areas Instruction, Systems, Leadership and Culture. In each area of the ECCI the goal is to be a sustaining AVID Elementary School. In the area of Instruction WICOR will be evident consistently in all grade levels (70%) throughout the school. In the area of systems- 60% of teachers will be AVID trained, the Site Team will meet monthly to address schoolwide needs and assess AVID SMART Goals and at least 70% of students receive proficient or better on report cards. In the area of Leadership- The school leadership team actively participates in AVID site team meetings. In the area of Culture- 70% of classrooms display college decor throughout the school and at least five places in the building. 50% of students experience appropriate college prep activities goal setting, time manage, etc)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) will be implemented with fidelity schoolwide. AVID is a nonprofit that assists schools to shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach to close the opportunity gap to prepare all students for college, careers , and life. Our school will embed AVID strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading) into all content areas to engage students in learning, develop student success skills and develop a growth mindset in teachers, parents and students. By teaching and reinforcing academic behaviors and higher-level thinking at a young age, AVID Elementary teachers create a ripple effect in later grades. A college going culture on campus encourages students to think about their college and career plans. AVID impacts Leadership, Systems, Instruction and Culture within the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research suggests there are nine critical interrelated elements that help schools build and strengthen a college going culture: college talk, clear expectations, information and resources, comprehensive counseling model, testing and curriculum, faculty involvement, family involvement, college partnerships and articulation. The AVID program supports all these areas not only in the secondary setting, but laying the foundation of these elements in Elementary school. Nationwide AVID impacts more than 2 million students and has trained more than 80,000 educators. Of students enrolled in the AVID program, 94% completed four-year college requirements. AVID aligns with the school and district goals to accelerate and enhance student success. Students should be supported ill 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 content alone.{Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. An AVID Site team is organized and will guide the work of promoting a college going culture at the school by meeting monthly to discuss goals, progress and assess the needs of the school.
2. At the beginning of the school year, an AVID Site plan was developed by the AVID Site Team. A goal was set for each of the four domains. These goals will be monitored throuoghout the school year by the School leadership team and AVID Site Team.
3. The team selected to focus on Writing to Learn as a target strategy in the instructional domain. This focus aligns with the strategy the district selected for all schools.
4. Students will be assessed three times per year to determine the impact of WICOR implementation at the school. Students will be assess in Notetaking, Agenda, Organizational Tool and Levels of Thinking.

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

5. A college going culture will be displayed visually throughout the school and in the classrooms. This includes bulletin boards, college pennants, college flags and street signs.
6. A trained AVID Coordinator has been selected to lead AVID implementation at the school. Her role will be to provide professional development, mentor teachers, select resources, organize family AVID events and promote support for AVID schoolwide.
7. AVID Ambassadors will be selected by the AVID Site Team. Ambassadors will serve as examples of how AVID can impact student positively. Ambassadors will have a leadership role at the school, welcoming new
students and assisting students and teachers with implementing WICOR strategies throughout the school.

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

8. Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies and LSI techniques to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.
9. Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the AVID Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school AVID implementation plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions.

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

10. Three teacher mentors, two interventionist and a AVID Coordinator will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices

Person Responsible Neroli Rogers (neroli.togers@osceolaschools.net)

11. ESE and ELL students will be provided AVID strategy scaffolds to meet expectations to be prepared to be post secondary ready.

Person Responsible Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

The School Stocktake team meets monthly to report progress to the principal. William Dwyer, principal, will update Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Dr. Jane Respess, During their monthly check ins. William Dwyer, will update the Chief of staff, Dr. Scott Flowers, once a quarter on progress of the Areas of Focus

Person Responsible	William Dwyer (william.dwyer@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and holds 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 schoolwide 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 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 translati on, 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). Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.
The school engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high quality instruction, and holds staff responsible for implementaint any changes. We frequently communicate high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: Collaborative planning is solution orientated and based on disaggregated data, student work is displayed throughout the building and student are beging prepared to be success in college/carrer using AVID strategies. Aclear code of conduct for students and adults with input from stakeholders has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely disaggreagate datato look for patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, ISS and OSS, and attendance also forms the basis for discussion and problem solving for particular group in school. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable fro reducing discipline referrals. Implementing evidence based alternatives to exclusionary discipline and provide training and feedback to teachers on implmenting best practices approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training and ongoing support and provide frequent, constructive feedback and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. Leadership actively solicts feedabk on school procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume leasdership roles. The master schduele includes collaborative planningand ensures it is rooted in data on student progress. The school provides orientationfor new teachers and ongoing support form a mentor teacher.
Teachers esablish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another with teacher modeling. The schools, curriculum and teacher's lesson plans draw on the diverse interests ans experineces 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. Seeking input from families on how the school supports

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**				**$96,742.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0931 - Flora Ridge Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$96,742.00
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$51,536.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0931 - Flora Ridge Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$51,536.00
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$48,371.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0931 - Flora Ridge Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$48,371.00
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$50,583.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0931 - Flora Ridge Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$50,583.00
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$247,232.00**