Koa Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Koa Elementary School

5000 KOA ST, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Adah Schwartz   Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (41%)
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.](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

Koa Elementary School

5000 KOA ST, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

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

Koa Elementary School will inspire all students to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive learners and citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Koa Elementary School will work in partnership with its families and the community to ensure all learners develop the essential academic, social, and emotional skills needed for college and career readiness.

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
Terry, Ashton	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.
Yatsko, Kimberly	Other	.5 MTSS Coach, .5 Interventionist Supports teachers by facilitating MTSS meetings to plan interventions and ensure students with gaps in learning are getting needed additional instruction. Works with groups of low-performing students during intervention time.
Sanders, Erica	Assistant Principal	Erica Sanders assists the principal with supervision and evaluation of teachers and support staff. Oversees the student discipline decision-making process. Participates with principal and leadership team in visiting classrooms to monitor instruction, and provide timely and relevant feedback to teachers and support staff. Handles other school administrative functions as assigned by the principal.
Rosaly-Ortiz, Elsamarie	Other	Elsamarie Rosaly-Ortiz-ESOL Compliance
Patrick, Bonnie	Other	Bonnie Patrick-ESE Compliance
Russell, Kirsten	Instructional Media	
Moreno, Wanda	School Counselor	
Rieder, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach
Noyes, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/9/2020, Adah Schwartz

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.*
4

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (41%)
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	98	79	95	102	92	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	33	18	32	13	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	8	0	2	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	28	28	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	40	37	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	1	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	105	76	85	99	94	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	19	11	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	0	3	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	105	76	85	99	94	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	19	11	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	0	3	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	53%	57%	43%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	57%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	51%	53%	48%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	45%	55%	63%	41%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	59%	62%	45%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	51%	35%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	49%	53%	34%	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	44%	51%	-7%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	51%	-9%	58%	-16%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	54%	-19%	62%	-27%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	53%	-4%	64%	-15%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	36%	48%	-12%	60%	-24%
	2018	39%	52%	-13%	61%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
	2018	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	9	27	30	13	40	40	14				
ELL	33	49	47	32	48	38	26				
BLK	48	56		43	51	30	29				
HSP	45	53	48	43	54	50	41				
WHT	55	50		71	64						
FRL	44	52	45	44	51	39	42				
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	19	44	43	21	35	40					
ELL	37	48	54	35	52	33	5				
BLK	51	59	67	46	59	44	34				
HSP	48	54	50	44	57	38	34				
WHT	60	57		67	67						
FRL	51	56	51	49	60	48	34				
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	9	43	35	28	43	29	10				
ELL	28	39	39	35	40	44	19				
BLK	43	51	31	37	40	31	34				
HSP	40	57	52	41	43	38	32				
WHT	58	75		46	83						
FRL	41	56	50	39	42	36	32				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	43
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	49
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	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

In 2019, ELL students dropped to 10% Proficiency in ELA from 22% in 2018. While there was fluctuation among the ELL staff in 2018-2019, we anticipated growth in this area in 2020 before the cancellation of state testing. We had a consistent core ESOL team from start to finish, and there was a schedule which allowed our ESOL paras and compliance specialist to support students during class time, intervention time, and "Double Dose" intervention time.

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

ELL students in ELA. See prior question for details.

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.

In 2019, Math achievement was at 45% compared to the state average of 63% We are encouraged that we were predicted to improve to 46% in 2020 based on projections from the district's Research, Evaluation, and Accoutability (REA) team. We are concerned because Reading was projected to drop from 46% proficiency in 2019 to 38% in 2020, which would have been third-lowest in our district. Factors that contributed to this decline in reading included new formative testing (Dibels and NSGRA) which many teachers were uncomfortable with and will need continued training and support, as well as fluctuation in our literacy department during the year.

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

ESE students improved from 20% proficiency in 2017-18 to 39% proficiency in 2018-19, a 19% increase. New actions taken and continued in 2019-20 were implementation of district resource materials with fidelity, consistent monitoring and feedback of ESE teachers and Support Facilitation environments from the leadership team, and deliberately scheduled and monitored interventions. We have several students in our Self-Contained EBD units that will count for proficiency in 2020-21. Both of our EBD teachers are returning to our team from last year and we are confident that their experience using district materials, working with our coaches, and already having relationships with the majority of the students, will contribute to our continued rise in this area.

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

In 2018-19, areas of concern noted were 44 students in testing grades with 2 or more EWS indicators, as well as 38 students with one or more suspensions. We have improved those areas dramatically, with 20 students in testing grades with 2 or more indicators in 2019-20, and 18 students with one or more suspensions in 2019-20. Our two greatest concerns at present time are attendance (123 students with attendance lower than 90%), and students with Level 1 test scores (74 students projected to score Level 1 in ELA and 66 Level 1 in Math).

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

1. English/Language Arts
2. Mathematics
3. Science
4. Social and Emotional Learning
5. Outcomes for Subgroups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will plan for and engage students in standards-based, differentiated instruction in Literacy to ensure learning for all students. Our school dropped from 17-18 to 18-19 in every measurable ELA category (Achievement, Learning Gains, Lowest 25% Gains, ELL Achievement, and ESE Achievement). We were also projected to drop in student proficiency in ELA before the 2020 FSA tests were cancelled.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Achievement-50% ELA Learning Gains-57% ELA Lowest 25% Gains-54% ELA Achievement of ELL Students-20% ELA Achievement of ESE Students-20%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Noyes (kimberly.noyes@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Action Steps Tracker via Stocktake process will be monitored weekly by Assistant Principal to ensure deadlines are met by point person or persons for each task/goal created by Leadership Team (LT). -Keep accurate and detailed agendas and minutes of weekly LT meetings to ensure areas of need are addressed in a systematic manner. -Continuously monitor student data such as NSGRA, district formative assessments, grade-level formatives, etc. For "grow" areas and goals set throughout year, establish LT member(s) in charge of addressing and improving the deficiencies by deadlines agreed-upon by the LT.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing formative assessment is tightly aligned to the imperative to track student learning to standards-and to ajust instruction as necessary while there is still time to help students who are falling throught the cracks. Formative assessment allows a teacher to keep a sharp focus on progress toward standards. Thus, there are no end-of-unit or end-of-year surprises for either teachers or students (Moore, Toth, Marzano 2017).

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Plan with LT prior to pre-planning to develop a procedure and timeframe for training all new teachers and re-training returning teachers as need to ensure fidelity with Beginning of Year NSGRA Testing.
2.) Implement NSGRA Testing with fidelity.
3.) Analyze NSGRA data via LT PLC process. Determine glows, grows, and next steps to follow-up with individual teachers and grade level departments.
4.) Monitor ELA classrooms consistently throughout school year ensuring that Curriculum Unit Plans set forth by district are followed, and that teachers are implementing instructional best practices and data-driven strategies in whole group, small group, and intervention sessions.
5.) Repeat steps 1-4 during Mid-Year and End-of-Year testing cycles.
6.) During school year, Literacy Coach and LT will use formative assessment, classroom visit, and other data to identify struggling students and teachers to support. Will also identify teachers with strong data to use as models and mentors.

Person Responsible	Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will plan for and engage students in standards-based, differentiated instruction in Mathematics to ensure learning for all students. Our school dropped from 17-18 to 18-19 in Math Achievement, Learning Gains, and ELL Achievement. We were also projected to have 46% proficiency in Mathematics on the 2020 FSA tests, which would have been a 1% improvement but short of the goal of 47% proficiency set in last year's Schoolwide Improvement Plan,
Measurable Outcome:	Math Achievement-47% Math Learning Gains-59% Math Lowest 25% Gains-50% Math Achievement of ELL Students-20% Math Achievement of ESE Students-40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Rieder (cynthia.rieder@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Action Steps Tracker via Stocktake process will be monitored weekly by Assistant Principal to ensure deadlines are met by point person or persons for each task/goal created by Leadership Team (LT). -Keep accurate and detailed agendas and minutes of weekly LT meetings to ensure areas of need are addressed in a systematic manner. -Continuously monitor student data such as district formative assessments, grade-level formatives, etc. For "grow" areas and goals set throughout year, establish LT member(s) in charge of addressing and improving the deficiencies by deadlines agreed-upon by the LT.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is important to consider how to use each assessment, formatively or summatively, and which assessments to administer independently or in common. All team members must give common assessments, and they must use these data for collaborative analysis and response. It is also important to identify which learning targets might need extra instructional attention and what type of learning they require of students (Buffum, Matos, Malone 2018).

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Plan with LT prior to pre-planning to develop a procedure and timeframe for implementing Beginning of Year Formative Testing with fidelity.
2.) Implement Beginning of Year FormativeTesting with fidelity.
3.) Analyze data via LT PLC process. Determine glows, grows, and next steps to follow-up with individual teachers and grade level departments.
4.) Monitor Math classrooms consistently throughout school year ensuring that Curriculum Unit Plans set forth by district are followed, and that teachers are implementing instructional best practices and data-driven strategies in whole group, small group, and intervention sessions.
5.) Repeat steps 1-4 during Mid-Year and End-of-Year testing cycles.
6.) During school year, Math & Science Coach and LT will use formative assessment, classroom visit, and other data to identify struggling students and teachers to support. Will also identify teachers with strong data to use as models and mentors.

Person Responsible	Ashton Terry (ashton.terry@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will plan for and engage students in standards-based, differentiated instruction in Science to ensure learning for all students. The majority of students taking the Grade 5 FCAT/Statewide Science Assessment did not reach a proficient score in past several school years.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Science Achievement on the Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment from 42% to 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Rieder (cynthia.rieder@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-District and school-generated formative assessments -Supplemental lab and test-spec practice activities. Data tracked for each student and class by grade level. -All grades K-5 will have data that will be used to inform science next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The American Sociological Association finds that a school's level of efficacy and its collectively held expecations for student success may be the leading indicator in whether students attend postsecondary education (Jones, 2008).

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Plan with LT prior to pre-planning to develop a procedure and timeframe for implementing Beginning of Year Science Testing with fidelity.
2.) Implement Beginning of Year Testing with fidelity.
3.) Analyze Science data via LT PLC process. Determine glows, grows, and next steps to follow-up with individual teachers and grade level departments.
4.) Establish schedule and systems to ensure all K-5 classrooms are implementing one or more hands on science experiences per week.
5.) Monitor Science classrooms ensuring that Curriculum Unit Plans and embedding Science in ELA as set forth by district are followed, and that teachers implement best practices and data-driven strategies.
6.) Repeat steps 1-5 during Mid-Year and End-of-Year testing cycles.
6.) During school year, Math & Science Coach and LT will use assessment and walkthrough data to identify struggling students and teachers to support. Will identify teachers with strong data to use as models and mentors.

Person Responsible	Ashton Terry (ashton.terry@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-19, areas of concern noted were 44 students in testing grades with 2 or more EWS indicators, as well as 38 students with one or more suspensions. While we have improved in those areas, we still had 20 students in testing grades with 2 or more indicators in 2019-20, and 18 students with one or more suspensions in 2019-20. Our two greatest concerns at present time are attendance (123 students with attendance lower than 90%), and students with Level 1 test scores (74 students projected to score Level 1 in ELA and 66 Level 1 in Math).
Measurable Outcome:	-We will reduce the amount of students in 2020-2021 with attendance lower than 90% to fewer than 100. -Students in every class from grades K-5 will participate in Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) coursework as outlined by the school district.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Monitoring student attendance, and contacting parents of students with excessive absences -Document all work within Tier II and III behavior plans -Monitor student discipline and ensure that students with multiple discipline infractions are placed on an age-appropriate behavior plan that is tracked with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is important to focus on the impact changes have on a young person's life. IF the young person is struggling with school, avoiding social engagements, or no longer enjoying the things they used to enjoy, it is possible that a mental health problem exist (National Council of Behavioral Health, 2016)

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Utilize pre-planning to train staff in updated best practices related to Sanford-Harmony and other best practices to support all students' Social and Emotional Learning (SEL).
2.) Work with guidance counselor and LT to establish a schedule to ensure that all classes receive SEL competency courses as set by the district.
3.) Establish a plan which will support students' behavior and other demonstrations of SEL instability. Have procedures for responding promptly to assist teachers and staff when these issues become unsafe and/or disruptive to the learning environment.
4.) Include in all LT PLC's and Stocktake the opportunity to discuss students with SEL concerns and those on an MTSS Tier II or III Behavior Plan.
5.) Continue to promote positive behavior via Positive Referrals, "Koala-ty Bucks" store, Helping Hands Award, Safety Patrol, Student Ambassadors, etc.

Person Responsible	Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As noted in the 2019-2020 Schoolwide Improvement Plan, the Federal Index Percentage of our Students with Disabilities was only 27%
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2020-2021, our Federal Index Percentage of Students with Disabilities will be 41% or greater.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bonnie Patrick (bonnie.patrick@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction as shown through lesson plans, classroom visits, and observations. Teachers of ESE students will be expected to provide equitable accommodations for all ESE students that will still provide students opportunities to show proficiency and growth on grade-level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student academic success and skill development are matters of survival for many, espcially in a world that is quickly moving away from the industrial model into a knowledge-based conomy. The needs of society are changing faster than many schools' ability to create positive momentum, especially for our most vulnerable populations. Improving skill and effectiveness is essential in the quest to provide every student with a quality and useful education (Muhammad & Cruz, 2019).

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Prior to the 2020-2021 school year, the LT will meet to analyze and review the previous data, procedures and systems set in place to meet the needs of our students with disabilities (SWD).
2.) Determine which procedures and strategies were effective and make adjustments to the weakest components to ensure meet the academic needs of our SWD.
3.) Throughout the school year, LT will track and monitor SWD to ensure accommodations are being implemented with fidelity in accordance the the student's IEP and students are making adequate academic growth. If SWD are not being successful academically, the RCS, VE Teacher(s), Classroom Teacher(s), and the LT will collaborate and develop a plan to provide the proper support for the student.

Person Responsible	Bonnie Patrick (bonnie.patrick@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of postsecondary education for all students- not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and supports students in achieving their goals. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle-to-low income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, 75% or more of our intermediate level teachers will implement an AVID-style organizational system to help students manage their workload in and out of school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	One of the WICOR strategies is organization. Implementing an AVID-style system will allow students to engage in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based systems that teach students organizational skills, this will become a seed for healthy post-secondary work habits. This will help shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID students outperformed their classmates on various standardized tests and attended school more often than their classmates. More underrepresented students are being prepared for college (Watt, Powell, & Mendiola, 2004).

Action Steps to Implement

1.) By the end of the first semester, the school will secure binders for every student in grades 4 and 5. We have received many by donation from local organization.
2.) Teachers will be trained on how binders should be set up for students. This will be done in PLC's or supplemental PD time.
3.) Teachers will implement binder/notebook organizational system no later than January 2021. This will be monitored by school leadership team.
4.) The school will survey parents, students, and teachers as to how they judge the effectiveness of this system. Will also compare student grades from first to second semester to identify data trends.

Person Responsible	Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

-Leadership Team (LT) will implement a consistent and systematic routine of observing classrooms. As we have struggled with achievement from our ESOL students, we will ensure to monitor those classrooms while looking for specific ELLevation strategies that will provide equity and the necessary accommodations these students need.
-Monitor formative and school-wide data of our ESOL students as well as all students in Reading, Math, and Science. This will allow our LT to constantly identify areas of success as well as areas of improvement.
-LT will collect walk-through data through Microsoft Forms, and keep a database of student test scores to be able to collaborate virtually as well as through weekly live LT meetings and the monthly Stocktake.
-Administration will actively monitor next steps and timelines laid out in the Stocktake Action Steps Tracker. LT members will be held accountable for adhering to these plans and timelines once they are established, and expected to communicate with administration and other LT colleagues when issues arise that put goals or timelines in jeopardy of being met.
-LT will reach consensus on their Seven Stage PLC Level at Beginning, Middle and End of school year. At each point in identifying current stage level, LT will identify next steps if Stage 6 has yet to be met.

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.

To promote a positive culture among teachers and staff within the building, there are several activities and awards that are done on a routine basis. This includes, traveling treats for the teachers and staff served by the principal and AP, meals for the staff on special occasions such as Thanksgiving, a Sunshine Committee comprised of staff members that put on breakfasts and other treats for the employees, and awards such as the "Heart & Hustle Award" and "Coaches Award" that recognizes teachers and staff who go above and beyond.

To promote a student-first climate within our school, we have several systems in place with reward students for positive choices, and help students who are struggling with issues making it challenging for them to be successful each day. These systems include our "Koala-ty Bucks" which are given to students for making positive choices. Students can spend Koala-ty Bucks in a school store on toys, games, etc. We also have a mentoring system where we assign students with academic, social-emotional, or other behavioral difficulties to a staff member who provides a direct support system to the child. We also have a positive referral system. Students whose teachers write them a positive referral get Koala-ty bucks and a visit from the

principal or AP, and have their names shared on the morning announcements. The school also has a "Helping Hand" award given to students who make choices that positively impact safety or well-being in our school.

We provide many activities during and after-school to promote parent participation and motivate our students. We have quarterly awards which parents are invited to, recognizing students for grades, behavior, and attendance. We also held a "Climbing Koala Awards" ceremony to recognize student achievement and learning gains on the FSA tests. We also provide students with a variety of after-school activities including running club, cross country, Odyssey of the Mind, Battle of the Books, gardening, basketball, and more.

We provide many opportunities for parents and volunteers to engage in supporting our students. One example of this is our "Bookmark Buddies", in which community members volunteer to work with struggling readers. During 2019-2020, all 33 students who were identified for this program were able to receive reading support each week from an OASIS-certified volunteer.

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				$4,465.23
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$305.00
		Notes: Materials for school's Literacy Night				
	5100	520-Textbooks	0300 - Koa Elementary School			$1,924.88
		Notes: Corrective Reading Workbooks				
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,235.35
		Notes: Paying certified teachers for reading tutoring after school.				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$332.45
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$332.45
		Notes: Math Manipulative Clocks to support students with their ability to tell time per the Florida State Standards.				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$1,486.86
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	120-Classroom Teachers	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$375.54
		Notes: Pay 6 teachers to work 2 hours each for STEM night.				

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$290.00
		Notes: Materials and Supplies to support STEM night.				
	5100	510-Supplies	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$821.32
		Notes: Science lab supplies to support students' learning in the area of science.				
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$3,842.04**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	120-Classroom Teachers	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$375.54
		Notes: Teachers will provide assistance and facilitate activities during the Cultural festival.				
	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$290.00
		Notes: Materials and Supplies for the Cultural Festival.				
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,100.00
		Notes: Three teachers will attend a workshop Achievement for Students in Poverty. The three teachers will come back and train the instructional staff the concepts learned from the training. This opportunity would allow teachers to close the achievement gap with our students living in poverty and address socio emotional concerns.				
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0300 - Koa Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,076.50
		Notes: Leadership team members will participate in a PLC in July to prepare for the upcoming school year. The focus will be centered around planning for the social emotional learning for students.				
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0300 - Koa Elementary School			$0.00
		Notes: We are doing in house PLCs and other activities to support SWD students. There isn't a cost associated with this activities.				
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all students**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$10,126.58**