

School District of Osceola County, FL

Mill Creek Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Mill Creek Elementary School

1700 MILL SLOUGH RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Latricia Pinder

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2011

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 (52%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Mill Creek Elementary School

1700 MILL SLOUGH RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

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	86%

School Grades History

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

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.

Working as a team, the parents, community and staff will challenge our students to become healthy, responsible, self-motivated individuals who are lifelong learners in a diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Osceola School District will work in partnership with families and the communities to ensure all learners develop the essential knowledge and skills to strengthen our thriving community.

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
Cavinee, Susan	Principal	Oversee school management and instruction
Waggoner, Pauline	Assistant Principal	Assist in oversight of school management and instruction
Malotka, Joan	School Counselor	Counsel students, coordinate MTSS process, coordinate testing
Acosta, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	Coach teachers in math and science instruction, provide professional development for teachers in math and science, oversee district assessments at the school level for math and science, model lessons for teachers
Kocher, Connie	Instructional Coach	Coach teachers in reading and writing instruction, provide professional development to teachers in literacy, oversee district assessments at the school level in reading and writing, model lessons for teachers
Crouch, Derek	School Counselor	Counsel students, create and implement behavior interventions, assist with MTSS process, coordinate 504 process

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/28/2011, Latricia Pinder

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.*

1

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.*

56

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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 (52%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	103	127	138	140	121	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	787
Attendance below 90 percent	29	26	26	25	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	54	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	55	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	6	0	2	30	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	0	0	2	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 7/22/2020

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	125	129	135	129	165	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	852
Attendance below 90 percent	32	31	17	16	25	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	43	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	4	13	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	125	129	135	129	165	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	852
Attendance below 90 percent	32	31	17	16	25	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	43	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	4	13	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	48%	53%	57%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	57%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	51%	53%	58%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	56%	55%	63%	52%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	59%	62%	60%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	45%	51%	51%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	49%	53%	49%	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	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
	2018	47%	50%	-3%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	54%	4%	62%	-4%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	53%	-9%	64%	-20%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	55%	48%	7%	60%	-5%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	61%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	45%	9%	53%	1%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	26	26	16	45	44	33				
ELL	36	48	44	52	58	47	49				
BLK	40	51	53	46	51	38	60				
HSP	47	51	39	57	61	58	54				
WHT	63	47		66	66		70				
FRL	45	47	35	55	61	53	61				
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	15	35	33	22	46	38	17				
ELL	29	49	37	36	52	50	28				
BLK	43	52	55	52	60	64	50				
HSP	49	54	39	51	54	52	46				
WHT	60	46		63	54		59				
FRL	45	50	35	50	51	48	42				
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	19	24	33	19	45	46					
ELL	35	43	44	42	51	47	46				
BLK	29	53	64	39	54	50	14				
HSP	51	57	58	49	58	53	54				
WHT	65	59	60	67	72		54				
FRL	47	52	54	47	59	50	43				

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	54
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	51
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	48
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	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
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.

Students with disabilities had the lowest achievement level in ELA, Math, and Science. Contributing to this is the fact that students with disabilities in the general classroom are mostly more than one year behind in reading and, although we are closing the gap, they continue to be significantly below grade level.

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

The gains of our lowest quartile on the FSA ELA showed a drop of three percentage points, our largest decline from the prior year. Our staff was reduced for the 18-19 year by one intervention

teacher and one paraprofessional, so there were fewer adults able to work with students on interventions. Additionally, 42 students in the 3rd Grade in 17-18 were promoted to 4th Grade with good cause exemptions to the mandatory 3rd Grade retention law, yet were not on grade level. Our 4th Grade ELA results in 18-19 were down across all segments. Due to the Corona Virus we did not take the 2020 FSA. The above data is most current.

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.

4th Grade Math achievement was 20 percentage points below the state average. While our SWD subgroup showed huge gains in math achievement (going from 12% proficient in 17-18 to 60% in 18-19), it was not enough to significantly impact our overall math achievement. A big factor was that a large number of students in 4th Grade who were far below grade level in reading had that impact their ability to comprehend math word problem

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

Our greatest improvement was with students with disabilities in math achievement, going from 12% to 60% proficient in one year. Having four VE teachers in 18-19 and intensive intervention for many during PE (with a PE waiver) helped this group improve.

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

ELA achievement for ESE students and ELA achievement for ELL students are of particular concern, as they were at 13% proficient and 19% proficient, respectively.

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

1. ELA achievement for ESE students
2. ELA achievement for ELL students
3. Math achievement for ELL students
4. Culture and Environment - increase percentage of students who feel they belong to the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 FSA ELA - overall; 48% of students were proficient, 13% of ESE student were proficient, and 19% of ELL students were proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	Reading proficiency will increase to 52%. Reading proficiency of ESE students will increase to 15%. Reading proficiency of ELL students will increase to 21%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Connie Kocher (connie.kocher@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading interventions for students in iii will be based on the NSGRA decision tree and in place by September. At weekly MTSS meetings, data will be reviewed by the team and students either will move among the tiers according to progress or have a change to their intervention as needed. All interventions are research-based. 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 the half-way progress checkpoint on the progress of this Area of Focus. We will be able to respond quickly to the progress monitoring data and make changes to the intervention, again using a research-based means of intervention. By tracking and measuring student progress (or lack of progress), we will make decisions based on quantitative data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Base intensity of interventions (Tier 2 or Tier 3) on decision tree after NSGRA testing.
2. Create iii interventions using research-based methods.
3. Train teachers and paraprofessionals in best methods for intervention.
4. Monitor progress weekly at MTSS meetings.
5. Adjust interventions and/or move students up or down tiers as data indicate.
6. Plan and host Title I-funded homework help nights, with hands-on activities for students in Pre-K-5th. This event will depend on the status of Corona Virus guidelines.
7. SWD will receive grade level instruction.
8. SWD will receive Support Facilitation based on his/her IEP requirements.
9. SWD will receive intervention support in Tier 3 and Tier 2 based on individual needs.
10. ELL students will have instruction differentiated base on individual needs.

Person Responsible Connie Kocher (connie.kocher@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

On the 2019 FSA Math - overall; 56% of students were proficient, 60% of ESE student were proficient, and 13% of ELL students were proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

Math proficiency will increase to 58%.
Math proficiency of ESE students will increase to 60%.
Math proficiency of ELL students will increase to 35%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Acosta (jacqueline.acosta@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Math coach will provide tutoring for FSA Level 2s for current 4th and 5th Grade students when allowed due to the Corona Virus. Using formative assessment data, 1st-4th grade students will be selected to participate in math remediation. Due to the Corona Virus, the paraprofessionals will meet with students in the classroom. All of these students will participate in math lessons and activities that are aligned to the current standards. During MTSS meetings, data will be reviewed. All interventions are research-based. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress on the Areas of Focus. Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We are pursuing this strategy to increase math achievement levels and learning gains. We are confident these students, many of whom have been identified in our ELL and ESE subgroups, will benefit from this additional intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review current formative assessment data. Select students based on results and teacher input.
2. Create and host a Title I-funded STEM night for students and parents to participate in hands-on math activities.
3. Math formative assessments will be throughout the year. Students will be assessed with teacher and district-created assessments, checklists, and fluency checks. Assessments will be analyzed by PLCs and the Math Coach to monitor the effectiveness of instruction. Coaching support will be offered by the Math Coach.
4. School will host a Title I funded Family Math Night for all PreK -5th grade students and their families to participate in hands-on math activities.
SWD will receive grade level instruction.
5. SWD will receive Support Facilitation based on his/her IEP requirements.
6. SWD will receive intervention support in Tier 3 and Tier 2 based on individual needs.
7. ELL students will have instruction differentiated base on individual needs.es.

Person Responsible

Jacqueline Acosta (jacqueline.acosta@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: On the 2019 Science Assessment 58% of 5th grade students were proficient in Science.

Measurable Outcome: Science proficiency for 5th grade will increase to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jacqueline Acosta (jacqueline.acosta@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ensure that science is being taught correctly and in accordance with the CUPs, then provide students with opportunities to revisit standards from prior grades as they solve problems and compete in House of Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students in 5th Grade must integrate science learning from all prior grades, so it is essential to shore up "fair game" standards, especially those relating to the nature of science, an area that has been consistently a weaker area. Hands-on activities and competitions between classes are ways to continuously review previous and current standards. Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Model lessons and provide guidance for teachers in use of CUPs for science.
2. Organize 5th Grade House of Science challenge to begin in late September or later depending on status of the Corona Virus guideline.
3. School will host a Title I-funded STEM night for students and parents, with hands-on science learning activities is allowed due to the Corona Virus restrictions.
4. SWD will receive grade level instruction.
5. SWD will receive accommodations as needed to assist in academic achievement.
6. ELL students will receive accommodations as needed to assist in academic achievement.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Acosta (jacqueline.acosta@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 FSA Reading, 13% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students with disabilities scored at the proficient level. On the 2019 FSA Math, 60% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students with disabilities scored at the proficient level.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2021 FSA Reading, 15% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students with disabilities will score at the proficient level. On the 2021 FSA Math, 60% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students with disabilities will score at the proficient level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacqueline Acosta (jacqueline.acosta@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading interventions for students in iii will be based on NSGRA decision tree and will begin in early September. We will discuss specific students at our MTSS meetings and the sub group in general at our Stocktake meetings. Math interventions for students will take place in their classrooms with the teacher and paraprofessionals. We will discuss specific students at our MTSS meetings and the sub group in general at our Stocktake meetings. Data will be shared with the Elementary Assistant Superintendent by the principal. The strategies implemented will be researched based and should increase achievement levels for SWD in reading and math. Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning Teachers following and implementing these strategies will increase achievement and also build in SEL to the lessons. Marzano (2003) first coined the term "guaranteed and viable curriculum" in his book What Works in Schools. Simply put, no matter who teaches a specific course, all students should have the same opportunity to learn the same content with the same quality of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review formative assessment data.
2. Review NSGRA and NWEA data.
3. Train paraprofessionals in providing effective interventions aligned to the standards.
4. Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
5. Academic Coaches along with administration will support and participate in weekly PLC meetings.
6. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include ELLEVATION training, and ESE support strategies.

7. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and VE teachers ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies.

8. Students will participate in targeted intervention in Tiers 1, 2, & 3.

Person Responsible Connie Kocher (connie.kocher@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After taking the equity training and sharing data from Panorama, we will focus on building a sense of belonging for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Using data from the 2020-21 Panorama survey, 61% of students in 3rd ,4th, and 5th grade had a feeling of belonging to the school. We will increase this to 65% on the 2021 Panorama survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derek Crouch (derek.crouch@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Making a connection between equity, belonging, and achievement we will genuinely welcome students each day, support them with time, resources, and opportunities they need to access the curriculum and acknowledge that students may be feeling stressed due the the Corona Virus, possible parent unemployment, and unrest throughout our country.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students feel acknowledged and valued they will have a better feeling of belonging to the school. 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. Recognize students for academic achievement.
2. Ask teachers to share what they are doing to build relationships with face-to-face and digital students .
3. Announce student birthdays each day, including ones occurring over the weekend/holidays.
4. School counselors will meet with students individually as needed for specific issues or to build relationships.
5. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.
6. Teacher will plan an environment of belonging for all students.
7. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
8. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
9. Surveys will be analyzed to identify interventions that will support SEL.
- 10.The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop inventions as required.

Person Responsible Derek Crouch (derek.crouch@osceolaschools.net)

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

At the elementary level, we want to increase students' understanding of the number of choices they will have upon graduation.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

After receiving the Career Exploration lessons, the percentage of 5th grade students who have a career intention will double.
For kindergarten through 4th grade students, the number of students wearing college shirts or college colors on assigned days will increase from 20% to at least 30% by the end of the school year.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Derek Crouch (derek.crouch@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Through our guidance department, our school counselors will present the researched based Career Exploration to 5th Grade students. This will allow students to have a clear understanding of their choices after high school graduation: college, career licensing, certifications, military, etc
We will designate one day a month for student and faculty to wear a college shirt or college colors.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

This researched based Career Exploration program is selected by the school district guidance department and is an effective way to introduce young students to career options after high school. We will promote this mindset before and after these specific lessons are taught.
Students need to attend schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. Students need to experience success in which they then aspire to a quality life beyond school.
The article "Shortage of Skills: Construction and Skilled Trades" (Career Education Colleges and Universities 2016) states that school leaders can create an opportunity to develop pathways so students can work on career skills and industry certifications in a competency-based system. Marzano, Warrick, Rains, DuFour 2018.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Participate in College and Career Week; encourage students to dress each day for the theme of the day.
2. Have College Shirt Day or Military Day once a month.
4. During our annual Read-In, (if it can occur due to the Corona Virus) have guests share information about their career.
5. Throughout the year, promote college interest by having students learn about their teachers' colleges and offer prize incentives for those who participate.
6. Show promotional videos from various colleges/universities during lunchtime in the cafeteria.

**Person
Responsible**

Joan Malotka (joan.maltka@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Listed above.

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 meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and Remind. Due to the Corona Virus, meetings will take place virtually or through the phone system. 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 the writing of the plan. The principal and assistant principal attend every school event together to continue to build positive relationships with students, parents, and other family members. Due to the Corona Virus, events will be limited by number of participants or will need to take place virtually. We will continue to use social media to communicate with parents on a regular basis.

Our school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral

expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently

communicates high expectations for all students through morning announcements, class discussions, and when administrators and/or school counselors are meeting with students.

Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns and finding where students are succeeding and where they are not.

The PBIS committee meets to review discipline referrals and in-and out-of-school suspensions. The MTSS committee reviews attendance data and designates team members to reach out to parents.

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet their needs and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles if they would like.

The master schedule allows for collaborative planning and encourages teachers to use the time to review data on student progress and needs.

The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from mentor teachers and the academic coaches.

As a PBIS school, 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. Students also have opportunities to earn Gator Bucks for positive behavior.

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				\$851.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	100-Salaries	0701 - Mill Creek Elementary School			\$851.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$851.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	100-Salaries	0701 - Mill Creek Elementary School			\$851.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$798.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	100-Salaries	0701 - Mill Creek Elementary School			\$798.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0701 - Mill Creek Elementary School			\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0701 - Mill Creek Elementary School			\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School-wide Post Secondary Culture				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0701 - Mill Creek Elementary School			\$0.00
Total:						\$2,500.00