School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Nathan Deright

Start Date for this Principal: 2/4/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, 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 PK-5	Yes	89%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Kissimmee Elementary School will provide an enriched and rigorous learning environment within a diverse community where all children succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kissimmee Elementary will unlock the full potential of all students by empowering learners as they journey to academic success.

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
DeRight, Nathan	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.
Perez, Adah	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.
Durinick, Candace	Instructional Coach	To provide instructional support, professional development, and data analysis in all content areas in order to ensure high levels of achievement and learning gains in ELA, Math and Science. To provide small group instruction for students identified as part of the lowest quartile in ELA.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 2/4/2020, Nathan Deright

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.*

11

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	142	144	196	183	177	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1024
Attendance below 90 percent	0	116	113	141	132	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	2	10	35	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	127	143	180	174	163	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	968
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	8	18	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	52	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	1	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	127	143	180	174	163	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	968
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	8	18	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	52	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	1	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	52%	53%	57%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	58%	58%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	51%	53%	62%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	55%	63%	73%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	59%	62%	78%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	45%	51%	76%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	49%	53%	73%	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	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	36%	48%	-12%	56%	-20%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	54%	6%	62%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	51%	3%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	53%	14%	64%	3%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	47%	48%	-1%	60%	-13%
	2018	74%	52%	22%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
	2018	54%	49%	5%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
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	28	50	67	47	64	65	36				
ELL	47	62	54	66	70	59	41				
BLK	36	64		56	91						
HSP	53	62	56	69	70	57	46				
WHT	61	72		81	72		67				
FRL	46	62	59	63	67	58	43				
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	41	66	61	58	73	65	38				
ELL	37	58	61	62	75	69	51				
BLK	43	38		74	75						
HSP	51	63	58	73	80	67	67				
WHT	56	64		86	84		75				
FRL	49	58	53	72	78	63	62				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	16	56	58	40	72	73	42				
ELL	30	54	58	62	76	75	51				
BLK	22	44		54	73						
HSP	47	59	60	73	78	76	72				
WHT	70	55		87	82						
FRL	44	57	61	72	78	74	68				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
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	57
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.

ELA students in the lowest quartile declined five percentage points from the previous year as identified by FSA (60% to 55%). The needs of the lowest performing students in ELA are not being met during Guided Reading. Classroom teachers are not providing specific differentiation when meeting with students in small group for this subcategory

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

Science demonstrated the greatest decline (-18%) as identified by the Statewide Science Assessment. The inclusion of the FAIR game standards were not as strongly supported in classroom instruction. In addition the content was taught in isolation with little connection between standards/real world scenarios. We recognize that this core group of students struggled with reading informational passages which proved to be a disadvantage to their performance in science.

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.

FSA ELA achievement demonstrated the greatest gap when compared to the state average (17% gap raw data). The identified trend that continues to impact student achievement is directly related to the lack of on level readers that come from the lower house of elementary to the upper grades in elementary. This lack of foundational skills inhibits students from reading on grade level, which directly impacts student achievement.

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

FSA ELA achievement for SWD/ESE demonstrated the highest improvement with a gain of three percentage points. The targeted interventions implemented during the 2018-2019 academic year were inclusive of this subgroup. Students were strategically placed in general education classrooms in order to provide support. The data was reviewed monthly allowing for appropriate adjustments to the interventions implemented.

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

The 2018-2019 FSA Reading results indicated that 31 students scored at a level 1. As a result, the identified students are involved in weekly interventions specific to the needs of each student in order to close the achievement gap. Students are continuously monitored for growth and instruction is adjusted in order to meet their identified needs. Our data also indicates that we increased our student suspensions (9 to 15) from the previous school year. As a result, our school will implement Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS).

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

1. ELA Learning Gains (lowest quartile)
2. Learning Gains in ELA for SWD
3. Science Proficiency
4. Learning Gains in Math (lowest quartile)
5. Increase proficiency in ELA for ELL students

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 ELA (ESE/ELL Proficiency) Based on 2018-2019 FSA results, 52% of students were proficient in ELA. Our goal is to increase this by 3% points.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase in all subcategories in this area by 5% by the end of the 2020-2021 academic year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Next Steps to Guided Reading provides a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Classroom teachers will implement the various components of this particular guided reading program to ensure they are attending all aspects of literacy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Corrective Reading and LLI provide a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Corrective Reading is a powerful direct instruction remedial reading series that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers, even if they have failed with other approaches. Explicit, step-by-step lessons are organized around two major strands, decoding and comprehension, which may be used separately or together to customize instruction for particular student needs (NIFDI 2019). This particular program will be implemented to assist in the academic growth of our ELL/ESE students as well as our general education students that scored a Level 1 as identified by the FSA. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop and provide systematic approach to meeting the needs of students in lowest 25%
2. Identify trends through the implementation of the NSTGR lesson plan
3. Increase the frequency of grade level data chats in order to monitor this subcategory on an ongoing basis
4. Monitor PLC discussions/action steps regarding the students in this subcategory
5. Continue supporting our current interventionist position that provides targeted small group instruction for students and appropriate guidance for classroom teachers

Person Responsible	David Kane (david.kane@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the statewide science assessment results, 49% of students were determined to be proficient on this assessment. This is a decrease of 18% points from the previous school year. It is our goal to increase the overall proficiency level of students in 5th grade by 21% points (70%).
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency will increase from 49% to 70% by the end of the 2020-2021 academic school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging students in cognitively complex, inquiry based tasks aligned to the grade level standard(s) is essential to the development of a solid foundation for scientific understanding. By implementing cross-curricular inquiry based scientific tasks that support the complexity of the standard and build autonomy and problem solving in students, student achievement will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If classroom teachers appropriately plan for rigorous and inquiry based tasks, and allow students to productively struggle toward standard attainment through appropriate scaffolding and cross-curricular connections of the content, then student understanding of scientific concepts will increase thus increasing student achievement. Inquiry-based science challenges students' thinking by engaging them in investigating scientifically orientated questions where they learn to give priority to evidence, evaluate explanations in the light of alternative explanations and learn to communicate and justify their decisions (Gillies 2020).
	Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.
	School Stocktake will take place monthly.
	Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop small group instruction focused on specific reading strategies that can be implemented during science class to ensure understanding of the informational text
2. Ensure that students are engaged in hands-on exploration of the content when appropriate
3. Engage students in science wars as a means of review/preparation on a consistent basis
4. Collect walk through data/trends with regard to science instruction in order to provide timely actionable feedback consistently

Person Responsible Vivian Colon (vivian.colon@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2018-2019 FSA mathematics results, 69% of students were proficient on the state assessment. It is our goal to increase the overall proficiency level of students in 3rd to 5th grade by 6% points (75%).

Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% by the end of the 2019-2020 academic school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging students in cognitively complex mathematical tasks aligned to the grade level standard(s) is essential to the development of a solid foundation for more complex mathematics. By implementing mathematical tasks that support complexity of the standard and build autonomy in students, student achievement will increase. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If classroom teachers appropriately plan for rigorous standard based mathematical tasks and allow students to productively struggle toward standard attainment through appropriate scaffolding of content, then student understanding of mathematical concepts will increase thus increasing student achievement. Doing math requires students' to comprehend and understand mathematical connections. These tasks require students to monitor their own process of thinking, while using applicable knowledge to work through the task. In order to complete the task students must analyze the task, which requires considerable cognitive effort. These tasks may ensue apprehension for students, because there is no certain process to solve for the solution. (Smith & Stein 1998).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify classroom trends with regard to task-standard alignment and levels of engagement in mathematics
2. Provide professional development in support of the adopted mathematics text
3. Provide coach support for teachers that need additional guidance with the implementation of standards-based instruction
4. Utilization of district and school based mathematical assessment results to drive instruction
5. Monitor and provide teachers with timely actionable feedback on a consistent basis in order to shift academic instruction as necessary

Person Responsible	Adah Perez (adah.perez@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2018-2019 FSA results, 50% of ESE students demonstrated a learning gain in this subgroup in the 2018 to 2019 testing year in ELA. We acknowledge that teachers were unclear and VE support staff/IND teachers neglected their use of appropriate targeted interventions. Based on 2018-2019 FSA ELA results, 17% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency. Classroom teachers did not have a clear understanding of how to develop a systematic, targeted approach to purposeful instruction that meets the individual needs of students. In addition, teachers did not appropriately identify students in this subcategory on an ongoing basis.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase learning gains for ESE students by 5% by the end of the 2020-2021 academic year (50%-55%). Regarding ELL students, the goal is to increase performance from 17% proficiency to 20% proficiency through targeted weekly interventions and through the implementation of specific ELLevation strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adah Perez (adah.perez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Next Steps to Guided Reading provides a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Classroom teachers will implement the various components of this particular guided reading program to ensure they are attending all aspects of literacy. Corrective Reading and LLI provide a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. This particular program will be implemented to assist in the academic growth of our ESE students as well as our general education students that scored a Level 1 as identified by the FSA. The appropriate implementation of ELLevation strategies build the capacity of teachers to serve multilingual learners, and empower students with the academic language necessary for success in school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn next to move forward. Ongoing observation of your students, combined with systematic assessment enables you to draw together groups of students who fit a particular instructional profile (Fountas & Pinnell). If classroom teachers and VE support teachers appropriately plan for differentiated ELA instruction utilizing the Next Steps to Guided Reading and targeted interventions are implemented and monitored with fidelity, then student achievement increases. If teachers appropriately plan and implement ELLevation strategies in support of ELL students, then student achievement increases.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative planning meetings between VE support teachers and general education classroom teachers.
2. Guidance with the collaborative teaching model in support of a strengthened approach to differentiated instruction specific to the IEP of every student
3. Strategic approach to small group reading instruction provided by VE teachers
4. Appropriate scheduling for VE teachers (case loads)
5. Develop and provide appropriate support with regard to ELLevation implementation in the classroom

6. Identify trends through weekly walk through data collection and appropriate next steps specific to the data collected

Person Responsible	Carol Gonzalez (carol.gonzalez@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well implemented programs to foster SEL are associated with positive short term and long term goals 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 being prepared for class on a daily basis. 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 68% of students answered favorably for school belonging. In 2020-2021 this question will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adah Perez (adah.perez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting their different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Teachers will implement the various tools and strategies provided by Panorama Education in order to facilitate a greater use of self regulating strategies.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging through the implementation of PBIS strategies.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experimental, and project-based activities.
5.The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups an develop interventions as required.

Person Responsible	Candace Durinick (durinicc@osceola.k12.fl.us)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college bound culture assists in the creation of a postsecondary pathway for all students. Students who have parental, school and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as a norm. This notion may seem unattainable for low achieving, middle to low income level students, immigrant students, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college in the past. Kissimmee Elementary is committed to providing rigorous, relevant, and differentiated opportunities for all students in an environment that promotes college and career readiness.
Measurable Outcome:	Post-secondary culture refers to the environment, attitudes, and practices in schools and communities that encourage students and families to obtain the information, tools, and perspective to enhance access to and success in post- secondary education. If Kissimmee Elementary exposes their students to the post high school career options, ranging from college to technical training, and trade schools, they will be more likely to choose a Middle School 6th grade elective or club geared toward achieving their post-secondary goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adah Perez (adah.perez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Kissimmee Elementary will convey the expectation that all students can prepare for the opportunity to attend and be successful in post-secondary education as related to college and career goals. The school culture and climate directly affect student learning and engagement. Kissimmee Elementary will set high expectations, nurture the development of a growth mindset, and ensure academic preparations and tools are present, so students will meet or exceed expected academic results. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to prompting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons alone (Poliner and Lieber 2004). Kissimmee Elementary will operate with a culture/environment or practice within the school and its surrounding community that encourages students and families to obtain the information, tools, and perspective to enhance access to and success in post-secondary education.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guidance counselors will provide character education school-wide during block to begin August 10, 2020
2. The school will host community engagement events during and after school to provide information for post-secondary opportunities available to their student.
3. Students in the fifth grade will attend a series of seminars/presentations on various career options available to them within the community upon graduation.

5. A relationship will be formed with the Arts and Music department of the neighboring middle school in an effort to expose students to program and club options upon being promoted to sixth grade.

Person Responsible   Candace Durinick (durinicc@osceola.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The school engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction. Staff is held accountable for the implementation of any changes. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from various stakeholders such as students, families and school personnel has been created and implemented in support of a well structured learning environment. Teachers meet weekly in PLCs to routinely examine disaggregated data in order to identify areas of strength and growth related to academic success. Discipline referrals, in-and-out of school suspensions, and attendance continue to provide the necessary data essential to understanding the ever evolving needs of our students. Administration ensures that teachers have resources, training and on-going support through timely and actionable feedback in the continued effort to develop all staff in our effort to meet the needs of our students. School staff are also afforded the opportunity to provide administration with feedback on school-wide procedures and policies. In addition, the master schedule ensures that teachers have the opportunity to work collaboratively with regard to standards-based planning. The school's curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diver interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as decision-making SAC council. Parents are also afforded the on-going opportunity to meet with classroom teachers on a regular basis in support of their child's academic success. Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

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				$113,782.22
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0042 - Kissimmee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$51,835.00
			Notes: Our interventionist provides small group interventions for students in the lowest quartile 2nd grade to 5th grade.			
	6400	100-Salaries	0042 - Kissimmee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$61,947.22
			Notes: Our staff member provides small group interventions and professional development for our staff. She guides the MTSS process and provides the necessary coach support for the interventions that are implemented in the classroom in support of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
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				$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students				$0.00
					Total:	$113,782.22