
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 | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts

4201 RHODODENDRON AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Kimberley Dos Santos

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 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* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts

4201 RHODODENDRON AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 93% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Poinciana Academy of Fine Arts will inspire all learners to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Poinciana Academy of Fine Arts will work collaboratively as a staff and within the community to ensure ALL of our students develop necessary skills to be successful lifelong learners.

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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Dos Santos, Kimberley | Principal | Lead implementation of plan, follow-up on plan throughout the school year, problem-solve in areas of need, ensure resources outlined in plan are available, and provide assistance to team members when needed (facilitate stocktake process monthly). |
| Kalloo, Annette | Assistant Principal | Lead implementation of plan, follow-up on plan throughout the school year, problem-solve in areas of need, ensure resources outlined in plan are available, and provide assistance to team members when needed (facilitate stocktake process monthly). |
| Murphy, Denise | Instructional Coach | Lead Literacy on campus, monitor student learning/achievement in literacy, coach/mentor teachers, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus area 1 at monthly stocktake). |
| Martin, Jamie | Instructional Coach | Lead MTSS on campus, monitor students in all tiers, update MTSS database throughout school year, schedule MTSS meetings, coach/mentor teachers, monitor PLCs and PLC progress, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus area 1 at monthly stocktake). |
| Booker, Rafael | Instructional Coach | Lead Math and Science on campus, monitor student learning/achievement in math and science, coach/mentor teachers, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus area 1 at monthly stocktake). |
| Weeks, Michelle | School Counselor | Lead core character education on campus, assist with behavior interventions campus-wide, monitor students receiving behavior interventions, communicate with MTSS coach in reference to students receiving behavior interventions, mentor/coach teacher in utilizing behavior interventions and collecting data on students receiving behavior interventions, track student attendance, schedule meetings on students with high absenteeism, promote college and career readiness, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus areas 3 and 4 at monthly stocktake). |
| Scanlon, Elyse | Instructional Coach | Elyse Scanlon: Lead differentiation on campus, monitor students in ESSA subgroups, coach/mentor teachers, monitor PLCs and PLC progress, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus area 2 at monthly stocktake). |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/4/2018, Kimberley Dos Santos

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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

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* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 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 | 123 | 104 | 120 | 114 | 128 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 686 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 28 | 15 | 18 | 27 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/24/2020

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 42% | 53% | 57% | 40% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 56% | 58% | 49% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 51% | 53% | 39% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 40% | 55% | 63% | 43% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | 59% | 62% | 50% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 45% | 51% | 43% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 49% | 53% | 39% | 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 | 32% | 51% | -19% | 58% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 51% | -13% | 57% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 48% | 51% | -3% | 58% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 35% | 48% | -13% | 56% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 56% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 55% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 32% | 54% | -22% | 62% | -30% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 36% | 51% | -15% | 62% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 53% | -9% | 64% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 53% | -14% | 62% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 33% | 48% | -15% | 60% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 52% | -2% | 61% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 45% | -10% | 53% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 49% | 4% | 55% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 12 | 24 | 27 | 23 | 47 | 50 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 38 | 29 | 23 | 37 | 25 | 22 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 54 | 42 | 44 | 43 | 30 | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 47 | 42 | 38 | 48 | 50 | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 52 | 43 | 38 | 45 | 45 | 38 | | | | |

| 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 | 20 | 44 | 42 | 28 | 41 | 39 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 56 | 58 | 27 | 49 | 45 | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 47 | 41 | 41 | 43 | 22 | 52 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 59 | 57 | 45 | 53 | 47 | 53 | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 57 | | 50 | 57 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 55 | 63 | 44 | 51 | 32 | 55 | | | | |

| 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 | 16 | 35 | 41 | 18 | 54 | 50 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 43 | 32 | 30 | 54 | 47 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 51 | 42 | 39 | 39 | 29 | 39 | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 47 | 35 | 42 | 55 | 49 | 37 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 53 | | 59 | 50 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 46 | 42 | 40 | 49 | 42 | 36 | | | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 61 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 372 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 33 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 39 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| 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.

Math achievement was our lowest performing area. Contributing factors are inability to read and understand problems (what is being asked), complete simple mathematical tasks with accuracy, and closing gaps in mathematical knowledge. Not only did our achievement decrease, but our learning gains also decreased. ELA proficiency decreased as well which is listed as a contributing factor to the low achievement in mathematics.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline from prior year. Contributing factors are decrease in reading and writing skills and inability to problem solve in science. Lack of experience in science and thorough exposure to science content also contributes to this issue.

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.

Math achievement has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors are inability to read and understand problems (what is being asked), complete simple mathematical tasks with accuracy, and closing gaps in mathematical knowledge. Not only did our achievement decrease, but our learning gains also decreased. ELA proficiency decreased as well which is listed as a contributing factor to the low achievement in mathematics.

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

Math lowest quartile showed the most improvement from year prior. We implemented a math lab for our lowest quartile students to provide more support in closing the achievement gaps in math skills.

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

Attendance (tied to SEL)

Low performance on state assessments (in ELA and Math)

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

1. Reading proficiency
2. ESSA Subgroups (ELL, ESE, White)
3. Attendance
4. SEL
5. Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

The data from our district formative assessments and state assessments show that students are below grade level. This impacts overall student achievement because gaps in learning continue to increase causing proficiency to decrease.

Description and**Rationale:****Measurable****Outcome:**

We expect to see an increase in all FSA ELA categories (including the ESSA subgroups) by at least 4% in each category.

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

Research shows that well-prepared teachers and high-quality teaching closes the achievement gap for students, especially those who face many challenges including being multiple grade levels below grade level (Rice, 2003; National Research Council, 2001). There is a positive impact on student achievement when teachers have a better understanding of what they are teaching and take the appropriate steps to plan what and how they will teach their content.

Evidence-**based****Strategy:**

Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale**for****Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

If teachers are trained in standards-based PD aligning tasks to standards and engage in data-driven planning, then student achievement will increase because teachers are better prepared to deliver solid standards-based instruction and tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

1. LC will host school-wide PD on standards-based instruction and task development within the first month of school.
2. LC and LT will support task development in PLCs each week. Members will assist grade levels in digging in to relevant data.
3. LT will complete weekly learning walks to observe implementation of tasks and provide feedback. Progress will be discussed at monthly stocktake meetings.
4. School will provide parent nights including Literacy Night to bring awareness and to encourage parental involvement in ELA processes (RWTS).
5. LC will provide follow-up trainings during December-February to continue to grow teachers and support the work on campus. RCS and LT members will provide additional PD on differentiation and Universal Design for Learning (UDL).
6. LC will meet with the ELL/ESE Task forces each month to discuss data and plan to support ELLs/SWDs in the classroom. LC will monitor overall effectiveness.

Person**Responsible**

Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus**

The data from our district formative assessments and state assessments show that students are below grade level. This impacts overall student achievement because gaps in learning continue to increase causing proficiency to decrease.

Description and**Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:**

We expect to see an increase in all FSA Math categories (including the ESSA subgroups) by at least 4% in each category.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

Research shows that well-prepared teachers and high-quality teaching closes the achievement gap for students, especially those who face many challenges including being multiple grade levels below grade level (National Research Council, 2001). There is a positive impact on student achievement when teachers have a better understanding of what they are teaching and take the appropriate steps to plan what and how they will teach their content.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If teachers are trained in standards-based PD aligning tasks to standards and engage in data-driven planning, then student achievement will increase because teachers are better prepared to deliver solid standards-based instruction and tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Title I funded Math/Science Coach (MC) will provide PD on SB instruction and task development (incorporating RWTS) within the first month of school.
2. MC and LT will support task development in PLCs each week. Members will assist grade levels in digging in to relevant data.
3. LT will complete weekly learning walks to observe implementation of tasks and provide feedback. Progress will be discussed at monthly stocktake meetings.
4. School will provide parent nights including STEM Night to bring awareness and to encourage parental involvement in math.
5. MC will provide follow-up trainings during December-February to continue to grow teachers and support the work on campus. RCS/LT members will provide additional PD on differentiation and Universal Design for Learning (UDL).
6. MC will meet with the ELL/ESE Task forces each month to discuss data and plan to support ELLs/SWDs in the classroom. MC will monitor effectiveness.

Person Responsible

Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

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

The data from our district formative assessments and state assessments show that students are below grade level. This impacts overall student achievement because gaps in learning continue to increase causing proficiency to decrease.

Description and**Rationale:****Measurable****Outcome:**

We expect to see an increase in all FSA Science categories (including the ESSA subgroups) by at least 4% in each category.

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

Research shows that well-prepared teachers and high-quality teaching closes the achievement gap for students, especially those who face many challenges including being multiple grade levels below grade level (National Research Council, 2001). There is a positive impact on student achievement when teachers have a better understanding of what they are teaching and take the appropriate steps to plan what and how they will teach their content.

Evidence-**based****Strategy:**

Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale**for****Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

If teachers are trained in standards-based PD aligning tasks to standards and engage in data-driven planning, then student achievement will increase because teachers are better prepared to deliver solid standards-based instruction and tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Title I funded Math/Science Coach (MC) will provide PD on SB instruction and task development (incorporating RWTS) within the first month of school.
2. MC and LT will support task development in PLCs each week. Members will assist grade levels in digging in to relevant data.
3. LT will complete weekly learning walks to observe implementation of tasks and provide feedback. Progress will be discussed at monthly stocktake meetings.
4. School will provide parent nights including STEM Night to bring awareness and to encourage parental involvement in math.
5. MC will provide follow-up trainings during December-February to continue to grow teachers and support the work on campus. RCS/LT members will provide additional PD on differentiation and Universal Design for Learning (UDL).
6. MC will meet with the ELL/ESE Task forces each month to discuss data and plan to support ELLs/SWDs in the classroom. MC will monitor effectiveness.

Person Responsible Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Three of our subgroups did not meet the state proficiency threshold requirement of 41% proficient--Our Students with Disabilities (34%), English Language Learners (33%), and White Students (39%). This impacts overall student achievement because gaps in learning continue to increase causing proficiency to decrease.

Measurable Outcome: We expect to see an increase in all ESSA subgroups by at least 4% in each category.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elyse Scanlon (elyse.scanlon@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that when teachers utilize best teaching practices that specifically target the needs of diverse students, then student achievement increases because student learning needs are met (Freeman, Freeman, & Ramirez, 2008). Best teaching practices to be implemented with our ESSA subgroup students include corrective reading, collaborative teaching, ellavation strategies, RWTS (Read, Write, Talk, Solve) strategies, multi-sensory teaching, and extended learning day. There is a positive impact on student achievement when teachers are able to meet specific learning needs of all students.

RCS and EES will train teachers and support teachers in the classroom when it comes to implementing these best teaching practices.

School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share/update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers utilize best teaching practices that specifically target the needs of diverse students, then student achievement increases because student learning needs are met.

Action Steps to Implement

1. LT will create schedule for teacher PD. Teachers will be trained on best practices (monthly).
2. RCS and EES will visit classrooms every week to monitor teacher use of best teaching practices.
3. LT will work together to support teachers through implementation (providing actionable feedback).
4. RCS and EES will monitor student data and report at monthly Stocktake to problem-solve and create needed next steps to support teachers and students.

Person Responsible Elyse Scanlon (elyse.scanlon@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: According to our Panorama Student Survey, 35% of our students feel confident in their social emotional skills. This impacts students ability to regulate emotions and focus on their academic demands.

Measurable Outcome: We expect to increase our percentage of students who feel confident in their social emotional skills from 35% to 40%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Weeks (michelle.weeks@osceolaschools.net)

Research shows that when students increase their social emotional skills, they are able to focus on academic work. This results in an increase in student achievement. There is a positive impact on student achievement when students are able to focus on academics (Weissberg, 2016).

Evidence-based Strategy: School counselor will do monthly counselor lessons with students to teach social emotional lessons. Counselor will meet with teachers to support social emotional learning in the classroom.

School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If students are taught more social emotional strategies, then student confidence will increase resulting in an increase in student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School counselor will schedule monthly push-in lessons to teach students SEL skills.
2. School counselor will implement pre-assessment with students.
3. SC will teach SEL lessons to students and train teachers on how to incorporate SEL in the classroom through Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS).
4. SC will monitor PBIS implementation and support PBIS in the classroom.
5. SC will implement post-assessment to track learning.

Person Responsible Michelle Weeks (michelle.weeks@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Data shows that students are in need of skills to assist them in transitioning throughout their K-5 schooling as well as life after post-secondary education.

Measurable Outcome:

We expect to see an increase in awareness of post-secondary options and how to prepare for post-secondary life. Additionally, we expect to see an increase by at least 4% in FSA ELA and Math scores for students in grades 3-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Weeks (michelle.weeks@osceolaschools.net)

If students are exposed to AVID Strategies and other post-secondary options/supports, then awareness of post-secondary options and student achievement will increase because students are provided with tools and knowledge about skills and options that will help them be more prepared for post-secondary life (Watt, Powell, Mendiola, & Cossio, 2006).

Evidence-based Strategy:

Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research shows that if students are introduced to and trained on strategies that will help them be successful in school, then those strategies can be transferred into life outside of school and help students be successful in a post-secondary world.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Counselor and AVID Site Team will review annual AVID Plan for the 20/21 school year to ensure teacher training and student exposure is planned for and supported.
2. AVID ST will conduct monthly trainings during PLCs to share AVID Strategies. Various teachers attend AVID 2 day training when available.
3. Counselor will coordinate College Week. Counselor will work with 3-5 grade teachers to discuss college and career throughout the year. Counselor will coordinate with Valencia College to plan for school visits to introduce students to college and careers.
4. Counselor will work with various Businesses on providing Financial Literacy education for our students and parents.
5. Counselor will collect data from students/parents via survey and/or interviews during the year (3 times a year). Counselor will review this data with the LT to plan to meet the needs of all students and help in raising awareness of post-secondary options.

Person Responsible

Michelle Weeks (michelle.weeks@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance is one other area of concern. As a school, we will continue to utilize our PBIS systems to encourage learners so they feel more confident at school. We will also provide more supports in the area of Social/Emotional Learning to assist students in feeling accepted and happy at school. Research shows that when students increase their social/emotional skills, they are able to attend to task more. This results in an increase in student achievement. There is a positive impact on student achievement when students are able to focus on academics (Weissberg, 2016). We will also meet as a leadership team (attendance focus group) to discuss students with chronic attendance issues and provide supports to help them improve attendance including supports for parents.

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.

We are a Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports (PBIS) school. We have established STARS Expectations and these expectations are communicated to students and families in a variety of ways. We publish them in our school newsletter as well as our student/parent handbook. We also communicate these expectations and other school news via social media (Facebook, Twitter, website, etc.). Additionally, we provide a district Code of Conduct for every family which was created using input from a variety of stakeholders.

Student success is at the core of all we do. We work together as a school and community to make sure our students can be successful. Our school holds grade level PLCs each week and a school-wide PLC every month. We collaborate on best teaching practices and cultivate a growth mindset community which allows all staff to grow professionally. We hold meetings with parents to involve them in education decisions and to help them support their children at home.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$27,500.00 |
|--|---|--|-----------------|-----|---------------------|--------------------|
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 | |
| 5100 | 150-Aides | 0901 - Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts | Title, I Part A | | \$25,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: para-professional to support learning on campus through small group instruction and in class intervention/supports</i> | | | | | | |
| 5000 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0901 - Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts | Title, I Part A | | \$2,500.00 | |
| <i>Notes: tutoring teacher for after school tutoring one day a week for 10-12 weeks (focus lowest performing students)</i> | | | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$55,000.00 |
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 | |
| 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0901 - Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts | Title, I Part A | | \$55,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Math/Science Coach position to analyze data with teachers, provide PD for teachers and support staff, and work with small groups</i> | | | | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$0.00 |
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 | |
| 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0901 - Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts | Title, I Part A | | \$0.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Math/Science Coach position to analyze data with teachers, provide PD for teachers and support staff, and work with small groups</i> | | | | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | | | | \$55,000.00 |
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 | |
| 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0901 - Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts | Title, I Part A | | \$55,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Learning Resource Specialist monitoring all students through our MTSS framework and working with teachers, support staff, and students to increase achievement</i> | | | | | | |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students | | | | \$1,000.00 |
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 | |
| 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0901 - Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts | Title, I Part A | | \$1,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: AVID Training for teachers</i> | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | \$138,500.00 | |