School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Amy Flowers

Start Date for this Principal: 1/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	62%
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: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

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 KG-5	No	61%

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	B	B	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.

Education which inspires all to their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At St. Cloud Elementary we focus on the child and expect success to promote lifelong learners. We lead with vision because education must be a shared responsibility between the home, students, school and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Flowers, Amy	Principal	To administer the programs, facility and personnel of SCES and develop positive school-community relations with parents, students, community members, business partners, and other educational agencies.
Gray, Kelly	School Counselor	Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principles of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies.
Thai, Savannah	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with the team to plan and deliver professional feedback for new and returning staff members aligned to high priority initiatives and outcomes in the area of mathematics and science. Support the development of high quality/effective math and science instruction; observe and coach developing math and science teachers to improve instructional planning, teaching practice, and the use of data, assessment, and instructional technology. Work with various teams (administrators, teachers) to facilitate analysis of data provided by diagnostics, common assessments, and formative assessments. Help teacher teams develop both school wide and classroom intervention plans.
Savillo, Sandra	Instructional Coach	Provides direct intervention services to targeted students in reading and or math. Support individuals and collaborative teams in their effort to make data and research based instructional decisions to increase student learning.
Crawford, Melanie	Assistant Principal	Responding to disciplinary issues. Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed.
Haines, Lacey	School Counselor	
Larson, Suzi	Instructional Coach	Work with educators to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. Collaborate with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. Create teaching material for educators. Model lessons for new or struggling teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 1/21/2020, Amy Flowers

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	62%
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: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	110	142	141	143	143	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	9	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	145	146	150	157	149	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	12	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	21	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	145	146	150	157	149	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	12	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	21	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	53%	57%	67%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	63%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	51%	53%	49%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	72%	55%	63%	69%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	59%	62%	53%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	51%	36%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	49%	53%	68%	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	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
	2018	65%	48%	17%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	61%	48%	13%	56%	5%
	2018	62%	50%	12%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	54%	20%	62%	12%
	2018	73%	51%	22%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	53%	15%	64%	4%
	2018	68%	53%	15%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	65%	48%	17%	60%	5%
	2018	65%	52%	13%	61%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	45%	19%	53%	11%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	42	62	47	56	64	38	45				
ELL	48	50	43	59	62	41	63				
BLK	56	58		63	47						
HSP	57	50	34	64	56	32	55				
MUL	61	77		78	85						
WHT	69	62	60	79	63	42	78				
FRL	52	57	46	59	56	35	56				
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	45	47	29	45	43	31	47				
ELL	40	53	67	63	50	38	33				
ASN	73			91							
BLK	75	61		82	72		82				
HSP	57	52	47	64	45	48	61				
MUL	67			75							
WHT	77	60	50	76	61	43	81				
FRL	60	54	50	62	51	41	65				
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	22	31	26	29	38	28	6				
ELL	47	49	50	64	53	40	50				
ASN	81	54		75	50						
BLK	65	67		70	78						
HSP	55	61	53	64	55	36	57				

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
WHT	76	64	36	73	48	26	75				
FRL	59	58	49	62	49	33	59				

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	57
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	53
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	51
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	75
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	65
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	52
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.

ELA Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Lowest Quartile students showed the lowest performance. Lowest quartile students are showing growth in day to day learning and school-wide progress however this is not evident in FSA data. There is a disconnect between the learning observed and application to standardized measures.

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

Math learning gains for students in the lowest quartile dropped 7 points (35 from 48). An overall school-wide decline in literacy proficiency is directly impacting math achievement. Need to strengthen math literacy in all grades.

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.

ELA and Mathematics lowest quartile students are furthest from the state average.

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

Math learning gains for all students increased 4 percentage points (56 to 60). The use of mathematical mindsets and intensive, targeted intervention contributed to the gain.

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

Early Warning Systems indicate that our individual cases are very isolated. The potential problem based on current and previous EWS is the correlation between attendance and Level 1 and 2 students. This data needs to be monitored regularly.

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

1. ELA achievement
2. ELA learning gains
3. Math learning gains
4. SWD learning gains
5. ELL learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School-wide data for ELA achievement decreased 5 percentage points. The decline in literacy over time will directly impact achievement rates in math and science. School wide data for ELA gains, lowest quartile growth, SWD subgroup achievement continue to indicate a decline in student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will increase from 63% to 66%. ELA learning gains are expected to increase from 57% to 60% ELA Learning gain for the lowest quartile will increase from 46% to 49%. ELA ELL Achievement will increase from 48% to 51%. SWD will increase learning gains in the area of literacy from 62% to 65% .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide professional development opportunities for teachers that focus on reading strategies to increase student learning, monitor differentiation, and analyze common assessment data. Leadership team will monitor through collaborative planning meetings, progress monitoring and classroom observations completed through forms/teams. Embedded Coaching for those teachers working on reading endorsement will also student learning by supporting teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing professional development to support teachers with implementing effective high yield reading strategies which will increase student achievement.`(Hattie, 2011)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to implement Balanced Literacy in all K-5 Classrooms.
2. Utilize NSGRA in tandem with NWEA for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans for individual student's needs. Grades 3-5 NSGRA will also be used to individually assess and plan for students in MTSS Tier 2 & 3
3. School City will be used by PLC Teams for the purpose of analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on student progression on essential standards.
4. Intervention team continues to use guided reading with Tier 2 & 3 students.
5. Open Court reading foundational skills program will be used with K-2 students.

Person Responsible Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We need to increase achievement in our sub-group areas. Schoolwide math achievement is at 72%. SWD math achievement was 56% , ELL achievement is 48%. Our goal is to increase mathematics proficiency of essential standards for SWD and ELL students to reflect achievement scores commensurate with schoolwide achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Math proficiency schoolwide are expected to increase from 72% to 73%. Math learning gains are expected to increase from 60% to 64% Math Learning gains for the lowest quartile will increase from 38% to 42%. Math ELL Achievement will increase from 59% to 62%. SWD will increase learning gains in the area of math from 64% to 67% .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Crawford (melanie.crawford@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide professional development opportunities for teachers that focus on math strategies to increase student learning, monitor differentiation, and analyze common assessment data. Leadership team will monitor through collaborative planning meetings, progress monitoring and classroom observations completed through forms/teams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing professional development to support teachers incorporate effective high yield math strategies which will increase student achievement. Analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making. Collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Dufour, et. al. (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to implement Number Talks and Math Tasks in all K-5 classrooms.
2. School city will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on student progression on essential standards.
3. Ensure VE teachers and ELL support teachers participate in professional development opportunities.
4. Master schedule will reflect common planning for VE teachers and their gen-ed counterparts in order to facilitate PLC, common planning.
5. ELL Task force will be created to monitor and support learning gains for all ELL's.

Person Responsible Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed that in 2018-2019 the school has zero subgroups below the ESSA level of 41%. The two subgroups that are most at risk both identified at 51% were the Hispanic subgroup and the Students with Disabilities subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	Although our school is not applicable for an ESSA category we see room for improvement. Our goal is to bring up our three lowest subgroup to 53%. Hispanic from 51% to 53%. SWD from 51% to 53%, and Economically Disadvantaged from 52% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiated instruction 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 the students need to learn. Process- how student make sense of the content being taught. Product - how student demonstrate what they have learned. Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
2. Teachers will work on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
3. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1, 2, & 3.
The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL Compliance Specialists and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development will include AVID WICOR, ELLevation training, and ESE support strategies.
5. Teachers that share common planning time will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.

Person Responsible	Melanie Crawford (melanie.crawford@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research based programs designed to foster social emotional learning (SEL) are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and improved social behavior. The increased possibility of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) occurring during school shut down makes SEL an imperative part of the 20-21 plan. The five core SEL competencies include, responsible decision making, self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, and relationship skills. A positive school climate includes a safe environment , strong student and staff relationships, and positive supports for all students. It provided the foundation that students need to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they needs to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome:	2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey response shows 66% of students answered favorable for school belonging and 59% favorable for school safety. It is our goal to increase school belonging to 70% and safety to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@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 emotional learning is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies ans practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build a 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. Identifying and building on
students' individual assets and, passions.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence.self
efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching - collaborative learning.
8. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities lllat support students' SE development.
9.AII surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plan will
be developed.
10. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop inventions.

Person Responsible	Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college going culture builds the expectation of postsecondary education for all students- not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student and 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 staff 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:	In 2019-2020 the grade distribution at the end of the year was as follows: A- B- C- D- F- In 2020-2021 there will be an increase in grades A, B, and C by 5% each grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing postsecondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school.. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported ill 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. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post-secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequence activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a postsecondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities ttiat will practice 21st-century life skills.
5.Leadership team and the Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.
6. The school will create a plan that creates an environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually cutting across the exclusionary social groups.

Person Responsible	Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Fifth grade data showed a decrease in overall science achievement. Strengthening our science content knowledge across all grade levels will increase our ability to ensure high levels of learning for all students. Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	St. Cloud Elementary decreased their overall science achievement from 72% to 66% proficient from 2018 to 2019. This still exceeds the state and district average, but our expectation is to be at or above 72%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving 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 attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning PLC

2 Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards

3. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.

4. Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an

instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.

5. ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL. Compliance specialist

and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses.

6. Teachers will provide individual student data chats .

7. The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request and need arises.

8. Teachers will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level .standards data, student tracking,

collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Savannah Thai (savannah.thai@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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 engage families, students. and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: •Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data • Student work is displayed throughout school • All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension. And attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. 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. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. 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 underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Funds to be used in order to support area of focus regarding Instructional practice in ELA			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Funds to be used in order to support area of focus regarding Instructional practice in Math			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Funds to be used in order to support area of focus regarding Instructional practice in Culture & Environment/Social Emotional Learning			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students				$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
					Total:	$1,500.00