# Ventura Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Ventura Elementary School

## 275 WATERS EDGE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

### www.osceolaschools.net

---

## Demographics

---

## Principal: Joyce Graham                    Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: C (51%)<br><br>2015-16: B (54%) |
| **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.](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

# Ventura Elementary School

### 275 WATERS EDGE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

### www.osceolaschools.net

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 94% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 92% |

## 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.**

Meeting the needs of all students in the 21st century.

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

Ventura Elementary School will outperform all other schools in the Osceola County School District.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Condo, Ashley | Principal | monitoring implementation through classroom walk-throughs |
| Ivey, Vivian | Assistant Principal | Administration- monitoring implementation through classroom walk-throughs |
| Rosario, Irma | Other | ESOL Specialist - monitoring data and providing strategies to use with ELL students |
| Bundy, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | Literacy coach - Monitoring data and providing ideas for reading interventions. |
| Pierre, Ricky | School Counselor | Monitoring EWS and providing behavior support |
| Brennan, Philip | Instructional Media | PLC Lead |
| Calvillo, Nora | Instructional Coach | RCS |
| Rivera, Jacqueline | Instructional Coach | MTSS Coach |
| Fosgreen, Erika | Instructional Coach | Math/Science Coach |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 6/9/2020, Joyce Graham

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

4

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

8

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

54

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: C (51%)<br><br>2015-16: B (54%) |
| **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 | 120 | 127 | 125 | 131 | 143 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 777 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA | 10 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Course failure in Math | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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**

Tuesday 6/9/2020

### 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 | 127 | 147 | 140 | 136 | 142 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 838 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 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 | 36 | 41 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

**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 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

**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 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**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 | 127 | 147 | 140 | 136 | 142 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 838 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 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 | 36 | 41 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

**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 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

**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 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

## 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 | 47% | 53% | 57% | 47% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 56% | 58% | 53% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 59% | 51% | 53% | 53% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 50% | 55% | 63% | 46% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 59% | 62% | 54% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 45% | 51% | 58% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 30% | 49% | 53% | 45% | 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 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 58% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 57% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 58% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 48% | -10% | 56% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 37% | 48% | -11% | 56% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 50% | -4% | 55% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 62% | -8% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 41% | 51% | -10% | 62% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 43% | 53% | -10% | 64% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 53% | -16% | 62% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 45% | 48% | -3% | 60% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 52% | 0% | 61% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 29% | 45% | -16% | 53% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 49% | -5% | 55% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| 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 | 15 | 43 | 52 | 17 | 48 | 36 | 5 | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 50 | 67 | 44 | 54 | 53 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 62 | | 44 | 52 | | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 52 | 58 | 50 | 56 | 48 | 29 | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 30 | | 61 | 40 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 48 | 61 | 46 | 54 | 41 | 25 | | | | |
| 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 | 10 | 30 | 36 | 19 | 47 | 50 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 40 | 41 | 40 | 56 | 58 | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 50 | | 40 | 53 | | 42 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 54 | 44 | 49 | 60 | 55 | 48 | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 63 | | 50 | 54 | | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 52 | 46 | 47 | 59 | 55 | 45 | | | | |

| 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 | 9 | 50 | 52 | 18 | 68 | 62 | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 54 | 61 | 33 | 56 | 63 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 43 | 42 | 49 | 42 | | 58 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 55 | 55 | 44 | 58 | 60 | 43 | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 52 | | 55 | 52 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 52 | 52 | 39 | 53 | 60 | 33 | | | | |

## 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 | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 67 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 405 |
| 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 | 49 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 data component that performed the lowest was the Science achievement for SWD. This is not a trend from previous years since this component does not tend to perform this low.

**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 the Science achievement for SWD.

**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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science achievement with a -24%.

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

There were two components that showed the most improvement 4th grade ELA achievement with a +9% and 3rd grade Math achievement with +13% improvement. For our ELA achievement improvements we added new programs to our triple i - intervention time which allowed the teachers to intervene to close the achievement gap. For the improvement in 3rd grade math achievement we created a intervention program every Wednesday that was target to work on each student's deficiency.

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

Two areas of concern are increasing our ELA achievement and our Science Achievement.

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

1. Instructional Practice specifically related to ELA
2. Instructional Practice specifically related to Math
3. Instructional Practice specifically related to Science
4. Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All students
5. ESSA subgroup specifically relating to outcomes for SWD
6. Culture and Enviroment Specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning
7. Leadership specially relating to Instructional Leadership Team

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school data, ELA proficiency 47%, which is below the state average of 55%. The goal is to increase to increase to the state average of 55% while focusing on all students subgroups.<br>Ensure high level of learning for all students in literacy. If teachers utilize their Tier 1 Instruction effectively, using appropriate instructional strategies and differentiation when need it, we will be able to ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase our ELA proficiency Level from 47% to 52% proficient. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jennifer Bundy (jennifer.bundy@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Guided Reading |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Guided reading helps students to develop strategies to apply independently because it focuses on processes integral to reading proficiently. Students learn skills and strategies that allow them to read difficult texts<br>independently, while teachers uses grade level literature to strengthen reading comprehension strategies.<br>For the student, the guided reading lesson means reading and talking (and sometimes writing) about an interesting and engaging variety of fiction and nonfiction texts. For the teacher, guided reading means taking the opportunity for careful text selection and intentional and intensive teaching of systems of strategic activity for<br>proficient reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). |

### Action Steps to Implement

1) Literacy Coach will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based on data collected through Leadership walks, Stocktake meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Cycle Visits.
2) All students will be monitored using the DIBELS Universal Screener at the beginning of the year, Osceola Writes three times a year, Next Steps to Guided Reading Assessment three times a year, and NWEA assessments three times a year.
3) Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of highly effective instruction. Tier1 Core Instruction will be strengthened by the provision of ongoing professional development provided by the District for grade levels K-8.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Bundy (jennifer.bundy@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

4) Students will be provided Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Bundy (jennifer.bundy@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school data, Math proficiency 50%. The goal is to increase to increase to the state average of 55% while focusing on all students subgroups. Ensure high levels of mathematics achievements for all students. If teachers effectively implement strategies in their classroom that support discourse-based mathematics, then we will be able to ensure high levels of mathematics achievements for all students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase our Mathematics proficiency level from 50% to 55% proficient. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Erika Fosgreen (erika.fosgreen@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Math Talk |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Math Talk allows students to talk about their solutions and others' solutions paths, given them an opportunity to make sense and take ownership of their thinking. It also helps students have conceptual understanding and reasoning on math concepts. Math Talk creates a safe space for exploratory math discussions and supports discourse-based mathematics for all students. Ensure your students are comprehending their math lessons--talking in the classroom helps ensure math retention. Silbey (2003) |

## Action Steps to Implement

1) The Math Coach will deliver Professional Development on Math Talk to all Mathematics teacher. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based on data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Learning Cycle Visits.
2) The Math Coach will be implementing coaching cycles with our math teachers to ensure best practices are being utilized. She will complete model lesson for teachers and then observed teachers complete their own lesson to provide feedback ad continue the coaching cycle.
3) Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

| **Person Responsible** | Vivian Ivey (vivian.ivey@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

4.Teacher teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative Team.
5. All students will be monitored using the NWEA assessments three times a year.

| **Person Responsible** | Vivian Ivey (vivian.ivey@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Ensure high levels of Science achievement for all students. If teachers effectively teach essential Science vocabulary, then we will be able to ensure high levels of Science achievement for all students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase our Science proficiency level from 30% to 50% proficient. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Erika Fosgreen (erika.fosgreen@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Essential Vocabulary - Academic Vocabulary |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Making emphasis on academic vocabulary is important because the students' knowledge of Science topics are encapsulated in the terms they know about the related topic. Students knowledge of Science topics are summed up in the words they know the more vocabulary they know the more proficient they will be. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1) The Leadership Team will use District Science Progress Monitoring Assessment and Science Diagnostic assessment data to monitored student progress and instruction during our monthly Stocktake meetings.
2) The Math/Science Coach will deliver Professional Development on strategies on how to teach academic vocabulary to all Science teachers. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based on data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Learning Cycle Visits.
3) The Leadership team will ensure that the time assigned for teaching science is being used with fidelity by performing a series of classroom walkthroughs.
4) Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students . And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Vivian Ivey (vivian.ivey@osceolaschools.net) |

5. All students will be monitored using the NWEA assessments three times a year.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Vivian Ivey (vivian.ivey@osceolaschools.net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **#4. Other specifically relating to ThePost Secondary Culture for All Students** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | A college-going culture builds the expectations of postsecondary education for all students - Not just the best students. It inspires the best in every students, 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 a norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before. If we provide all students with high levels of instruction in literacy, numeracy, soft skills and college and career activities, then we will be preparing them to have access to a successful future. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase by 20% the participation of staff and students in our College and Career week events. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Philip Brennan (philip.brennan@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Schools witl 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 in their efforts to reflect on their future alld should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons studellts alone.{Poliner & Lieber 2004). To inspire the best in every student as they prepare for a full range of post-secondary options. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. All students will be exposed to career lessons through the morning announcements.
2. Promote College and Career Week
3. The Leadership team will ensure that rigorous academic instruction is being deliver with fidelity by performing a series of classroom walkthroughs.
4. All 5th grade students will be provided with post-secondary inventories by the counselors.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Philip Brennan (philip.brennan@osceolaschools.net) |

| #5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 that our school had one subgroup below the ESSA level of 41 %. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | ESSA data for 2018-2019 for SWD was 31% and it will increase in 2020-2021 to be above 41%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nora Calvillo (nora.calvillovasquez@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 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 ad 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. Teacher will focus on creating learning goals and target for individual students.
2. SWD students will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.
3. SWD students will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2 and Tier 1 individual needs.
4. The ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the RCS to ensure all SWD are supported in all courses by providing ESE instructional strategies and professional development.
5. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that that scaffold content for SWD.

| **Person Responsible** | Nora Calvillo (nora.calvillovasquez@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better<br>test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include<br>skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively<br>about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcome, ranging<br><br>A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for<br>learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic<br>competencies they need to succeed in life. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed that 43% of students answered favorable for self management. In 2020-2021 these questions will increase by 10%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Ricky Pierre (ricky.pierre@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be<br>flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Social and Emotional leaming (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<br>on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983). |

### Action Steps to Implement

1) Teachers have Safer, Smarter Kids lessons and activities embedded in their unit plans to complete with their students each month.
2) Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students identifying and building on students individual assets and passions
3) School will use the PBIS - framework with correctly and fidelity to support students social emotional learning.
4)Teachers will plan to buil an environment of beloging.
5) School will develop structures, relationships and learning opportunitites to support SE development.
6) AII surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plan will
be developed.
7) The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop inventions as required.

| **Person Responsible** | Ricky Pierre (ricky.pierre@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

| **#7. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school is the main priority of leadership teams. Effective instructional leadership Teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders and other school leaders and ca provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities. It is found through the Insight Survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2019 - 2020 Increase survey responses on opportunities to pursue leadership role from 4% to 10% during 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Vivian Ivey (vivian.ivey@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Increase teacher leadership roles within the school. Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adult, leading to improve self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers. |
| **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 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, learn from one another and become experts in specific areas. This team dynamic in which everyone plays a role and is valued provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making more likely than good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019) |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken everyday towards goals.
2. Select the team so that it has a balance of visionaries and integrators. Both are equally valuable and necessary especially with leadership team.
3. Meet on a montly basis with team to access and revise progress towards goals.
4. Proffessional Development will be provided by the School PLC Lead on how to be an effective PLC leader.

| **Person Responsible** | Vivian Ivey (vivian.ivey@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**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 meetings will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Areas 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.**

## 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
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 particular 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 | $0.00 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | $0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: ThePost Secondary Culture for All Students | $0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | $0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |