

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Osceola Virtual Franchise (Secondary)



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

## Osceola Virtual Franchise (Secondary)

1907 MICHIGAN AVENUE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

### Demographics

**Principal: Marcia Clevenger**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: I (%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Osceola Virtual Franchise (Secondary)

1907 MICHIGAN AVENUE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

### School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	2%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

### School Grades History

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

The Osceola School District's mission is to inspire all learners to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive citizens.

Osceola Virtual School's mission is to provide enriching educational online choice options to enhance students' potential in the future.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Osceola Virtual School's vision is to provide a K-12 virtual education that is powerful, personalized, and learner-centered with experiences through competency-based, blended and full-time online learning.

### 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
Hodges, Peter	Principal	Evaluation and monitoring of teacher and student performance to ensure high levels of learning are taking place.
Ortiz, Jeriel	Other	Provide schedules for assessments of students
Vergon, Kelley	School Counselor	Scheduling and monitoring student's academic progress.
Santiago, Johana	Assistant Principal	Testing Administrator, API

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Marcia Clevenger

**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.*

0

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

22

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: I (%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	58	54	56	230
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 7/30/2020

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	9	15	24	32	97
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	9	15	24	32	97
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	80%	57%	56%	100%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	48%	51%	0%	47%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	42%	0%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	72%	46%	51%	59%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	72%	41%	48%	36%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	45%	0%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	71%	69%	68%	0%	71%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	70%	73%	77%	70%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	82%	47%	35%	52%	30%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		82%				
Cohort Comparison		82%				
08	2019	100%	49%	51%	56%	44%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		100%				
Cohort Comparison		100%				
09	2019	93%	47%	46%	55%	38%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		93%				
Cohort Comparison		93%				
10	2019	81%	47%	34%	53%	28%
	2018	88%	49%	39%	53%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	45%	-45%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	30%	-30%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	80%	42%	38%	48%	32%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	76%	62%	14%	67%	9%
2018	92%	68%	24%	65%	27%
Compare		-16%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	81%	62%	19%	70%	11%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	68%	-68%
Compare		81%			

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	52%	-52%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	76%	44%	32%	57%	19%
2018	77%	39%	38%	56%	21%
Compare		-1%			

## 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
HSP	75	56		54	91						
WHT	83	64		93	60		80	90		92	45
FRL	67	50								90	
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
HSP	92	75		55	50					92	
WHT										82	
FRL										92	9
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
HSP				50							
WHT										79	21
FRL										86	17

## 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	71
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	76
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	69
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.

The lowest component with the lowest performance was in English learning gains at 56 %. The contributing factors was increase of enrollment and limited resources for online learning.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in English learning gains dropping from 75 to 56%. The contributing factor was the increase of enrollment and limited resources for online learning.

#### 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.

The component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was in English learning gains.

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

The most improvement was made with student enrollment. The total number of full-time students increased 67% from previous year.

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

Based on the EWS data from Part I (D), one area of concern is the drastic increase in student enrollment in the online learning platform. It increased by 67% compared to previous year.

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

1. Monitor and increase ELA learning gains
2. Monitor and increase Math learning gains
3. Monitor and increase Science data
4. Monitor and increase graduation rate
5. Ensure process and procedures to increase student support and completion of course due to increase of student enrollment.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The leadership team helps to maintain cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement and teacher instructional growth rather than the operational management of a physical school. Effective instructional leadership teams are essential to improvement of school wide system and processes as well as instructional. The implementation to a mentoring program for instructional staff is essential to the building of effective instruction and team leaders.

**Measurable Outcome:** Opportunities to pursue leadership roles is 91% for 2020 - 2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Peter Hodges (peter.hodges@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Increase teacher leadership roles through a mentoring program within the school will improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities. It will also allow the desired future teacher leaders to obtain leadership experiences through the mentoring role.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students-and what they themselves-need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school-improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, to learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teacher leader teams will collaborate to examine data and decision making based on student needs.
2. Teacher leader teams will meet monthly to plan and implement instructional strategies to improve student learning and to increase teacher experts in specific areas.
3. Teacher leader teams will cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline and accountability.
4. Teacher leader teams will meet monthly to create action plans that meet their goals.
5. Teacher leader teams will support and encourage each other to continue striving to be expert teacher and leaders in their content areas.

**Person Responsible** Peter Hodges (peter.hodges@osceolaschools.net)



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

The 2019-2020 school data indicates that 80% of students demonstrated proficiency in math. The goal is to increase to 85%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase math proficiency by %5.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Peter Hodges (peter.hodges@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. In addition, collaborative analysis of formative and summative data to adjust instruction will result in significant learning gains for all students to include students with disabilities and language barriers. Also, the implementation of the MTSS model and differentiating has a positive effect on student's educational and emotional success.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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 conative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. All teachers will be trained in best practices for increasing student engagement in Math through quality instruction and effective monitoring to improve student engagement.
2. Content relevant strategies will include one to one conferences and whole group via email and/or video chats to meet the individual needs of all students.
3. Teacher training will be offered to ensure effective student engagement and success in a virtual setting.
4. Teachers will be trained in instruction that is differentiated, research-based and tiered interventions.
5. Teachers will use common planning and assessments during PLC's to analyze student data and needed intervention to ensure student success.
6. Teachers will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in math or who are at risk of becoming non-proficient.
7. School counselor and administration will provide 504, IEP and ELL strategies to teachers to ensure fidelity of accommodations as needed.

**Person Responsible**

Peter Hodges (peter.hodges@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 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)

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for the 2020-2021 is to increase ELA proficiency and gains by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. In addition, collaborative analysis of formative and summative data to adjust instruction will result in significant learning gains for all students to include students with disabilities and language barriers. Also, the implementation of the MTSS model and differentiating has a positive effect on student's educational and emotional success.

**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. All teachers will be trained in best practices for increasing student engagement through quality instruction and effective monitoring to improve student literacy and engagement.
2. Content relevant strategies will include one to one conferences and whole group via email and/or video chats to meet the individual needs of all students.
3. Teacher training will be offered to ensure effective student engagement and success in a virtual setting.
4. Teachers will be trained in instruction that is differentiated, research-based and tiered interventions.
5. Teachers will use common planning and assessments during PLC's to analyze student data and needed intervention to ensure student success.
6. School counselor and administration will provide 504, IEP and ELL strategies to teachers to ensure fidelity of accommodations as needed.

**Person Responsible** Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ESSA data showed that OVS did not have groups below 41%.

**Measurable Outcome:** To maintain subgroups are below 41%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will differentiate instruction to ensure positive learning environments for all students.

**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 and staff will monitor students individual needs in order to ensure their success.
2. MTSS coach will monitor student intervention data along with teachers.
3. Teachers and staff will ensure that data is monitored to ensure subgroups remain 41% or lower.
4. Monthly data digging PLC will occur with counselors, MTSS coach, teachers and staff.
5. Teachers and staff will continue to communicate in regards to student's interventions and support needed.

**Person Responsible** Jeriel Ortiz (jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Programs designed to foster social emotional learning have positive outcomes to include higher test scores , higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. Students are healthier when they are competent in their ability to socialize, collaborate with others, handle changes and challenges, adjust to new norms, and maintain an overall positive mindset.  
A positive school climate includes a safe environment for all students. The development of positive rapport among students, teachers, and families is essential to the growth of our students social and emotional learning.

**Measurable Outcome:** Conversations and communication with students and teachers indicated that established positive rapport has improved their learning. In 2020-2021, teachers and students will increase communication and allow for more one to one time for all full-time online learners.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelley Vergon (kelley.vergon@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students learn in many different ways and styles. It is imperative to continue to assess students' learning styles and teachers will be open minded and understanding to ensure student's needs are being met.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students passions and assets.
2. Teachers will create a safe learning environment.
3. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's decision making through action planning.
4. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching.
5. Teachers will establish positive relationships with student via one to one communication.

**Person Responsible** Kelley Vergon (kelley.vergon@osceolaschools.net)

**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Science education allows students to cultivate and develop scientific habits of the mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry and how to reason in a scientific context. It allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also a subject that allows for hands on learning and project based inquiry making Science an imperative subject that allows for students to develop a strong foundation of education.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2019-2020 science achievement was 90%. In 2020-2021, science achievement will increase by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Science curriculum will be made relevant to students by ensuring lessons are in context with factual meaning and purpose . Teachers will teach concepts that matter to student's lives and provide opportunities for students to explore and solve complex problems.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** 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. Teachers will analyze and discuss achievement data from formal assessments during monthly PLC meetings.
2. Teachers will participate and discuss pacing, standards and re-teaching in monthly PLC meetings.
3. Teachers will participate in training that will educate them on differentiation of instruction as needed for student success.
4. Teachers will implement instructional strategies that are hands on and evoke critical thinking.
5. Administration will provide requested professional development and training as requested by teachers.
6. School counselor and administration will provide 504, IEP and ELL strategies to teachers to ensure fidelity of accommodations as needed.

**Person Responsible** Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

**#7. 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 post secondary education whether it will be a community college, four year university, or a trait 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 level students and those students who will be first generation to attend college.

**Measurable Outcome:** The goal is to increase college awareness by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelley Vergon (kelley.vergon@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Schools that promote a strong future and engage all students in planning for life after graduation are more likely to increase the college mindset. Students will participate in academic planning and future goal setting with their teachers and counselors.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone. (Poliner & Lieber 2004)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will support students of their post-secondary goals through encouragement and open lines of communication.
2. Teachers will work with student and school counselor to identify actions steps towards post-secondary goals.
3. School counselor will communicate with students to provide resources on college information, technical schools, and financial information.
4. School counselor will ensure student has access to resources that will facilitate research on post-secondary plans.
5. School counselor will communicate resources and information to all students and families quarterly.
6. School counselors and teachers will discuss quarterly goals and academic interventions with students to ensure post secondary plans and success.

**Person Responsible** Kelley Vergon (kelley.vergon@osceolaschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school leadership team will address remaining school wide improve priorities by meeting monthly to evaluate data through MTSS meetings, stocktake meetings, PLC's and continuous communication with stockholders.**

## 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.

Students, families, and faculty share the understanding and vision that the our student's academic and emotional well being is a priority. Our teachers engage our students in high-quality instruction and establish positive rapport with all students and families to ensure the success of our kids. Our school leaders, teachers, staff, and counselors ensure best practices in all of the following areas :

1. collaborative planning and assessments
2. Solutions oriented planning and disintegrated data
3. Students, teachers, families, and counselors have clear communication by being accessible at all times
4. All students are enrolled in college and career ready curriculum

Teachers meet monthly through PLCs to plan, discuss, analyze and set goals/plans for student achievement. Our teachers and staff have also established process and procedures that allow for our families to maintain communication and availability to continue to work together for the success of every student. Our teachers participate in training that allows for instructional growth and they also serve as mentors to each other to ensure the academic growth of our kids and themselves.

### **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.	<b>Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
4	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>