

School District of Osceola County, FL

Narcoossee 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Narcoossee Elementary School

2690 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Wendy Honeycutt

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (59%) 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Narcoossee Elementary School

2690 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

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	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

Narcoossee Elementary School's mission is:
"Learning and leading. Every one. Every day."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Narcoossee Elementary School's vision is:
"NCES-Where a foundation is built for a successful future."

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
Knoebel, Scott	Principal	The school principal is responsible for the management of the daily school operations and most importantly oversees the effectiveness of the academic programs and instructional practices of all staff. Determines the focus and vision of the team and school. The principal also monitors learning and instruction through classroom visits and observations as well as collection and disaggregation of student and school-wide data.
Guin, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Supports instructional focus in Math and Science. Creates, conducts, and redelivers professional development aligned to school-wide needs and goals. Supports PLC teams and builds teacher capacity through modeling and co-teaching with classroom teachers. Conducts classroom walkthroughs to gather data and analyze school-wide trends to support focus.
Omer, Julia	School Counselor	Leads the MTSS process for grades 3-5 in cooperation with school administration. The counselor tracks student data within Tiers, and supports teachers with paperwork. Conducts meetings for 504 and Gifted students as needed. Supports proactive behavioral and the mental health aspect of the school with specific focus groups.
Winter, Mandi	Teacher, K-12	Conducts 4 day a week interventions for grades K-5. Analyzes school-wide data to determine intervention needs for students. Utilizes EIR and CR to provide research based interventions to low performing readers. Supervises 3 paraprofessionals on the curriculum EIR and CR. Organizes and collects data on lowest performing readers.
Bynum, Rachel	Assistant Principal	Meets with Principal weekly to discuss agenda items and to align the focus for the leadership team meeting. Create the agenda based on discussion with principal and facilitate the leadership meetings. Monitors learning and instruction through classroom walkthroughs and observations. Collection and desegregating of student and school-wide data.
Staley, Kristen	Instructional Coach	Supports instructional focus in ELA. Creates, conducts, and redelivers professional development aligned to school-wide needs and goals. Supports PLC teams and builds teacher capacity through modeling and co-teaching with classroom teachers. Conducts classroom walkthroughs to gather data and analyze school-wide trends to support focus.
Cook, Richard	School Counselor	Supports proactive behavioral and the mental health aspect of the school with specific focus groups and classroom lessons.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Wendy Honeycutt

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (59%) 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	184	171	185	175	187	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1122
Attendance below 90 percent	129	124	124	110	128	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	3	3	5	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/30/2020

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	173	160	179	171	186	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1085
Attendance below 90 percent	19	42	44	38	43	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	4	9	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	2	4	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	0	1	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	

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	173	160	179	171	186	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1085
Attendance below 90 percent	19	42	44	38	43	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	4	9	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	2	4	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	0	1	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	

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	72%	53%	57%	68%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	65%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	51%	53%	46%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	55%	63%	69%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	59%	62%	57%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	45%	51%	43%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	49%	53%	66%	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	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
	2018	67%	48%	19%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	67%	48%	19%	56%	11%
	2018	64%	50%	14%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	51%	18%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	53%	17%	64%	6%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	66%	48%	18%	60%	6%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	45%	19%	53%	11%
	2018	67%	49%	18%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	35	52	45	29	49	53	42				
ELL	48	59	42	47	63	61	48				
BLK	66	65	55	66	74	58	53				
HSP	63	64	33	60	67	50	59				
MUL	89	46		89	92						
WHT	79	70	45	73	66	57	69				
FRL	65	66	48	61	64	58	57				
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	36	57	48	38	47	33	39				
ELL	40	64	56	42	59	58	40				
BLK	61	59	67	58	50	43					
HSP	65	65	57	64	63	46	63				
MUL	77	64		76	60						
WHT	72	63	36	75	66	45	77				
FRL	62	62	53	59	57	38	60				

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	31	47	41	40	47	44	38				
ELL	28	47	40	42	47	37	23				
BLK	43	40		37	40		60				
HSP	61	60	37	64	60	50	62				
MUL	69			75							
WHT	75	70	60	75	57	44	69				
FRL	53	53	41	58	51	35	51				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	54
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	58
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
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	62
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.

29% of our ESE students in math were proficient which was a 9% drop from the previous year. A contributing factor may be an increase in students qualifying for ESE services, in turn increasing the VE teacher case loads.

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

Our ESE students in math dropped their achievement level 9% from 38% to 29% of the students scoring proficient. A possible factor contributing to this decline may be that students identified ESE received more time accessing ELA interventions than math. EBD students had limited access to our VE support teachers during iii.

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 ELA our lowest quartile had the biggest gap in achievement with our school scoring 41% and the State scoring 53%. Last year was the first year introducing Corrective Reading to our lowest quartile student groups as an intervention component. This year we have prior year data with the program and know the program better to ensure proper placement of students in phonics as well as now the purchase of the comprehension component.

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

Our ELL ELA achievement data and math lowest quartile data was most improved by 8% in each area. In ELA our ELL para used Corrective Reading as a structured program. Overall the school used ELlevation, ELL accommodations training, and differentiated instruction training for staff. In math, coaches in 4th and 5th were given the opportunity to intervene with lowest quartile students during iii and core instruction.

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

The area of concern at this point in the year are then number of students who have two or more early warning indicators in 4th and 5th grade and the number of students with attendance below 90%. This concern of the number of students below 90% attendance is in grades 1-5.

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

1. ELA lowest quartile learning gains
2. Math lowest quartile learning gains
3. Science achievement
4. AVID implementation
5. PLC process

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of****Focus**

Based on the 2018-2020 school data, our ELA lowest quartile learning gains score is 41%, which is below the district and state averages. The goal is to increase our learning gains to 51% while focusing on our SWD, ELL, Hispanic, White, and Free/Reduced Lunch students.

Description and Rationale:**Measurable Outcome:**

The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase ELA lowest quartile learning gains by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will utilize flexible grouping during our iii time to meet the needs of our lowest learners as well as use guided reading in grades K-3 to assist during core instruction. We will also integrate our literacy coach into core instruction in one 4th and 5th grade as a co-teach to target lowest quartile students. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize the Read, Write, Talk, Solve strategy during learning. The leadership team will conduct focused walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement. Studies show that 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 assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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. Continue implementation of WICOR (Read, Write, Talk, Solve) beginning in August.
2. Utilize prior year/current data to build lowest quartile groups for interventionist and 4 paraprofessionals
3. Utilize flexible grouping during iii time and guided reading during core instruction
4. Continue implementation of Corrective Reading (3-5) and Early Interventions in Reading (1-2)
5. ELL paraprofessionals provide iii interventions to students needing language support utilizing CR (3-5) and EIR (1-2) as well as ELLevation.
6. VE teachers provide intensive interventions with CR and EIR.
7. Utilize literacy coach as a co-teach, push-in model during core instruction in one 4th/5th grade classroom
8. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect data utilizing FORMS and send weekly school-wide trends to all teachers every Wednesday
9. Meet monthly at MTSS and Stocktake to monitor fidelity of interventions.
10. Reading coach will offer modules for teachers to secure their reading endorsement.

Person Responsible

Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2020 school data, our math lowest quartile learning gains score is 54%, which is above the district and state averages. Even though our students are scoring about the district and state, our goal is to increase our learning gains to 64% while focusing on our SWD, Black, Hispanic, White, and Free/Reduced Lunch students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase math lowest quartile learning gains by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize flexible grouping during our iii time to meet the needs of our lowest quartile students' needs as well as use the standards for mathematical practice during core instruction. We will also integrate our math coach into core instruction in one 4th and 5th grade as a co-teach to target lowest quartile students. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize the Read, Write, Talk, Solve strategy during learning. The leadership team will conduct 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 of the Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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. Math formative assessments will be on-going throughout the school year. Students will be assessed through PLC and district created assessments, checklists, and fluency checks.
2. Assessment data will be analyzed at the PLC team meeting and the leadership team meeting following each formative assessment.
3. Teachers will provide interventions for Enrichment, Tier 1, 2, and 3 in math 4 days a week.
4. Continue implementation of learning goals, targets, scales, and alignment of student tasks.
5. Utilize math coach as a co-teach, push-in model during core instruction in one 4th and 5th grade classroom
6. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect data utilizing FORMS and send weekly school-wide trends to all teachers every Wednesday.
7. Students establish and track goals based around beginning of the year math assessment/NWEA.
8. VE teachers will provide intensive support to ESE students during iii time to meet their individual learning needs.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2020 school data, our science achievement score is 65%, which is above the district and state averages. Even though our students are scoring above the district and state, our goal is to increase our achievement to 70% while focusing on our SWD, ELL, Black, Hispanic, and Free/Reduced Lunch students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase science achievement by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue to implement J & J Science Bootcamp curriculum with grades 3-5. Students and teachers will utilize learning goals, targets, scales, and interactive notebooks (when applicable) to monitor learning. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize the Read, Write, Talk, Solve strategy during learning. The leadership team will conduct 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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. Ensure usage of learning goals and scales, interactive notebooks and WICOR (Read, Write, Talk, Solve)
2. Provide professional development to all 3-5 grade teachers on J & J Bootcamp not previously trained..
3. Monitor implementation of J & J Science Bootcamp in grades 3-5.
4. Monitor Science instruction is happening daily in all 3-5 classrooms by weekly walkthroughs.
5. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect data and assist teachers/grade levels with best practices..
6. Meet monthly at Stocktake to monitor fidelity of programs and learning.
7. Provide support during PLC planning time for all grades in Science.
8. Students will track their own learning through utilization of learning scales.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2020 ESSA data, our school did not have any subgroups score below the ESSA level of 41%, although our students with disabilities scored at 45%. This can have a significant impact on our learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase to 50% in ELA and 55% in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all students. Students will also receive specific services related to their IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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

Action Steps to Implement

1. 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.
2. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches, VE teachers, interventionists, and administration.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals for not only our SWD students, but all students.
4. Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction to support Read, Write, Talk, Solve and focused engagement for students.
5. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention in Tier 1,2,& 3.

Person Responsible Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>From Pre-K through high school and beyond, social-emotional development helps people acquire and apply knowledge, attitudes, and skills to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.</p> <p>Our school implements Leader in Me which is a CASEL-endorsed SEL process where students learn personal and interpersonal effectiveness by applying The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People to their academic and personal goals. CASEL or the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning is the leading authority in the advancement of SEL in education. Through their collaborative work with researchers and educators, CASEL has identified five core Social-Emotional Learning competencies that have been embraced by programs and organizations across the U.S. and abroad. The competencies are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. While Leader in Me and CASEL have different competency names, their underlying outcomes are so closely related that as LiM students develop leadership competencies, they are also developing CASEL's competencies. This aligned development provides students with the skills needed to be lifelong learners and Life-Ready Leaders.</p> <p>We collected SEL data using the Panorama Survey and Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment. According to the 2019-2020 Panorama Survey, 55% of students who completed the survey responded "favorable" to the Self-Management competency. According to the Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment, 70% of students who completed the survey scored as "moderately effective" in the Personal Effectiveness category, showing a need for growth.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the 2020-2021 Panorama Survey 65% of students will perceive their own social emotional skills in a favorable manner. On the 2020-2021 Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment, 80% of students will score their personal effectiveness as effective.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julia Omer (julia.omer@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 these 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 will plan activities that are engaging/relevant, identifying and building on students' individual strengths, interests, and goals.
2. Teachers will create an environment of belonging and team development within their classrooms.
3. Teachers will increase student voice through DEAL time, class meetings, and student clubs.
4. Students will be involved in shared-leadership through a Student Lighthouse Team and teacher Action Teams.
5. Teachers will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness. This will include the teaching of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective

People and guidance counselors teaching SEL lessons.

7. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.

8. The school will provide students with the opportunity to complete the Panorama Survey and LiM Measurable Results Assessment to determine effectiveness of programs and processes supporting SEL.

Person Responsible Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students (District Assurances Requirement)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of post secondary education for all students-not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it 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:	Based on the 2018-2020 FSA results 72% of students were proficient in ELA, 68% in Math, and 65% in Science. In 2020-2021 73% of students will be proficient in ELA, 71% in Math, and 70% in Science. While focusing on this goal we will need to ensure that SWD, ELL, Black, Hispanic, and Free and Reduced Lunch students are receiving support to meet this goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will continue to implement AVID within our school ensuring that students understand the importance of college and career readiness. AVID will be implemented in grades K-5 and teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize the Read, Write, Talk, Solve strategy during learning. The leadership team will conduct 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 on the and Area of Focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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. Implementation of AVID in grades K-5.
2. Train K-5 teachers in AVID who have not been trained.
3. Ensure usage of learning goals and scales, interactive notebooks and WICOR (Read, Write, Talk, Solve)
4. Purchase additional AVID foundations books at each grade level if needed.
5. Conduct monthly AVID Site Team meetings with a grade level representative from every grade.
6. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect data and assist teachers/grade levels with best practices with WICOR strategies.
7. Meet monthly at Stocktake to monitor fidelity of programs and learning.
8. Monthly PD for any teachers that support with planning for WICOR by the Math and ELA coaches.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will continue to meet weekly with monthly stocktake meetings to ensure our school is focused and on-track to meeting these goals.

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 staff in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students and staff and the school leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building climate and culture. For example; collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in data, student work is displayed throughout school, and specific site-based programs are in place like AVID and Leader in Me. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look trends among student groups. This data along with information like discipline referrals, attendance, and more support discussions of the progress for particular groups within the school along with next steps.

The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers, students, and parents to assume leadership roles. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. Our SEL lessons and teaching of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People work to support this.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council and climate surveys. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students is a critical component to the school's success. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students and ensure equity for all.

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				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	0043 - Narcoossee Elementary School	General Fund		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Corrective Reading, Early Interventions in Reading, and Story Works resources. These funds will be used to assist our lowest quartile learners and ESSA subgroups. Story Works assists all learners as it is on-level content.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$795.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	359-Technology-Related Repairs and Maintenance	0043 - Narcoossee Elementary School	General Fund		\$795.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of www.generationgenius.com site license.</i>			
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				\$8,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0043 - Narcoossee Elementary School	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Leader in Me site license.</i>			
	1142		0043 - Narcoossee Elementary School	Other		\$3,800.00
			<i>Notes: 7 Habits Families Certification training and materials.</i>			
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students (District Assurances Requirement)				\$434.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0043 - Narcoossee Elementary School	General Fund		\$434.50
			<i>Notes: Purchase of 5 AVID Foundation books (if needed).</i>			
Total:						\$14,029.50