School District of Osceola County, FL

Ucp Osceola Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ucp Osceola Charter School

1820 ARMSTRONG BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.ucpcharter.org

Demographics

Principal: Alejandro Lozano

Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2020

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)	Alternative 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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: F (9%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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

Ucp Osceola Charter School

1820 ARMSTRONG BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.ucpcharter.org

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	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18
Grade	F

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of UCP is to empower children with and without disabilities to achieve their potential by providing individualized support, education, and therapy services in an inclusive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing enriching, individualized, quality academic experiences through rigorous yet differentiated instruction, project-based learning, and the integration of educational technology and the arts.

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
Morris, Beth	Principal	The primary role of the school principal is oversight of campus-based instructional programs . This includes a participatory role in the selection and implementation of English Language Arts, mathematics, science and social studies programs; training of staff in the use of these programs; oversight of data collection and MTSS processes; development of the campus tutoring program; formation and oversight of professional learning communities; implementation of agency teacher mentorship programs; and oversight of preparation for state standards-based assessments. Another vital role of the school principal is oversight of compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). A large percentage of students with disabilities at UCP Osceola (approximately 66%) are supported by an Individualized Education Program, or IEP; the school administrator works closely with staff to ensure that IEP plans are carried out, that IEP timelines are fulfilled with fidelity, and that IEP goals, benchmarks, services, and accommodations are met to the greatest extent possible. A third role of the school administrator is to work with all school stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, and UCP administration to ensure that the school fulfills all applicable safety, educational and therapeutic best practices and compliance requirements.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/30/2020, Alejandro Lozano

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

0

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
15

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)	Alternative 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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: F (9%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	26	23	19	26	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	9	7	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Thursday 10/1/2020

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	32	17	31	15	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	32	17	31	15	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0%	53%	57%	0%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	58%	0%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	63%	0%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	59%	62%	0%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	51%	0%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	49%	53%	0%	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	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	53%	-53%	64%	-64%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	48%	-48%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
	2018					
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	40			45							
HSP	30			40							

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	9			9							
HSP	10			10							
FRL	10			10							

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	74
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

All students showed 37% and Hispanic students showed 35%, meaning we scored below 41% for all students and Hispanic students. We are an Alternative school, so we now receive a School Improvement Rating (SIR) from the state rather than a School Grade. This is a better way to score our students because the majority of our students have special needs and are multiple grades below grade level. Even if our students show significant progress, they are still behind, and an achievement score will always be low. We also had very few students last year, not making the group size for a SIR.

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

We did not have a large enough comparison group for the prior year.

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.

See above.

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

See above.

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

The area of continuing concern is the number of students achieving level 1 in reading and/or math.

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

1. Increase percentage of students achieving learning gains in reading
2. Increase percentage of students achieving learning gains in math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using a student-centered strategy requires a great deal of planning to create engaging and rigorous standards-based activities. It is the process of identifying students' learning profile to modify student instruction to meet their diverse needs. Students enter a classroom with a wide range of skills, and this approach allows an educator to find alternative paths for students to reach their goals.In order for students that are significantly behind academically achieve mastery on grade level standards, they must gain more than one grade level of learning each year.
Measurable Outcome:	A minimum of 45% of FSA and FSAA student assessments, including assessments for ESE, ELL, Black, Hispanic and FRL, as well as All Students, will show learning gains in literacy, as measured by FDOE standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that utilizing data to guide next steps in instruction positively impacts both the students and teachers. Additionally, it strengthens collaboration within the Professional Learning Community. UCP will implement intentional strategies to target specific deficits in reading, based on iReady scores, portfolios and benchmarks and previous FSA/FSAA scores. Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and I meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher teams will track every student by standard using a tracker, on the spot formative assessments, common formative assessments, and summative assessments to track the progression of standards mastery.
2. Teachers will provide individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with subsequent data chats.
3. Teachers will provide Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.
4. Teachers will provide Tier 3 instruction based on gaps in literacy foundations: phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency.

Person Responsible Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

5. The administration team will develop a professional development/training calendar that will focus on ensuring a shift in teacher instruction that will increase math achievement in ESE, ELL, and lowest 25%. Teachers will participate in a minimum of two professional development workshops a month. These

workshops will be led by model teachers, instructional coaches, district coaches, and administrators.
6. Once an assessment has been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on deficient content. Students will then receive additional resources and support to sharpen their comprehension.

Person Responsible Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

7. The Administration 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 off of data collected through Leadership Walks.

Person Responsible Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Interpreting and desegregating student data allows the teacher to identify needs of their class, as well as individual student needs. Students also learn to take account of their own learning, set measurable goals, and identify their strengths and weaknesses.
Measurable Outcome:	A minimum of 50% of FSA and FSAA student assessments, including assessments for ESE, ELL, Black, Hispanic and FRL, as well as All Students, will show learning gains in Math as measured by FDOE standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that utilizing data to guide next steps in instruction positively impacts both the students and teachers. Additionally, it strengthens collaboration within the Professional Learning Community. UCP will implement intentional strategies to target specific deficits in math, based on iReady scores, curriculum based assessments and benchmarks and previous FSA/FSAA scores. The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

1. School administration will identify students that scored a 1 on the FSA/FSAA Math test and will provide those students with individualized tutoring targeted to close academic deficits.
2. Grades 3, 4 and 5 teachers will discuss progress monitoring data using the iReady and Ready Math formative and summative assessments and will establish instructional strategies during ongoing professional learning community meetings
3. School-wide and classroom incentives will be in effect to recognize individual achievement and reinforce academic growth
4. Students that are identified as struggling readers in the iReady program will be provided additional small group instruction in the designation interventions block during the school day.
5. Once an assessment has been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on errors made. Students will then receive interventions based on those errors to clarify any misconceptions about a particular strategy used.

Person Responsible Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

6. Teachers will track student data by Standard - After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to

monitor their learning.
7. Monitor and Support - During PLC's teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs.
8. Student Self-Tracking - Students will track their own learning through teacher provided success criteria.
9. Teachers will provide individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with subsequent data chats.

Person Responsible Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

10. The Administration 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 off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks.
11. Teachers will provide Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.
12. Teachers will provide Tier 3 instruction based on gaps in mathematics contents.

Person Responsible Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 the school had one sub groups below the ESSA level 41 %. The score for All Students was also below 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is CS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA Data for 2018-2019 All Students- 37% and ELL - 35% will be increase in 2020-2021 to be above 41% in both groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)
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 lmbeau (201 O) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

#4. 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 test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome:	When provided a school survey question regarding Social Emotional Learning: 75% of parents will report that their student has increased self-modulating skills. 75% of parents will report that their student has an increased ability to verbalize emotions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline strategies and techniques will be fully implemented in every classroom in the school. Teachers, (especially new teachers) will be trained in Conscious Discipline and materials will be utilized with fidelity. Conscious Discipline evaluates its effectiveness in many ways. Practitioners, independent researchers, and Loving Guidance, LLC. have conducted many quantitative and qualitative research studies. Study designs and methodologies include action research conducted by teachers, school-based data collection including observations and surveys, pre- and post-impact studies, and quasi-experiments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	RESEARCH SHOWS THAT CONSCIOUS DISCIPLINE: Improves the social and emotional skills of students Improves the social and emotional skills of teachers Increases student academic readiness Increases student academic achievement Improves the quality of student-teacher interactions Improves school climate Decreases aggression in preschool children Decreases impulsivity and hyperactivity in “difficult” students https://consciousdiscipline.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/Research/Early-Research-Impacts-and-CD-Theory-Summary.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development will be provided for all teachers and support staff during the pre-planning period before school starts.
2. Principal and designee will conduct regular walk throughs to provide feedback and ensure program is implemented with fidelity.
3. One aspect of Conscious Discipline will be highlighted at each weekly PLC meeting, and ideas will be shared and a time for questions will be provided.
The elements of Conscious Discipline will be displayed throughout the school common areas and teacher work areas.

Person Responsible	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An expectation of postsecondary education for all students inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that post secondary education is the next step after high school see it as the norm, However, the idea that post secondary education 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. Because 85% of our students have disabilities, expectations need to be individualized and high reaching.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 50% of our students taking the FSA or FSAA test will show learning gains as measured by state assessment scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	UCP Osceola will implement a strong future orientation that engages all students in planning for life after graduation. Adults within and associated with our school will highlight our own post secondary education with alumni's school memorabilia and accomplishments. UCP Osceola will also have at least one career fair highlighting the varied options for postsecondary education and careers within our community.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported ill their efforts to reflect on their future alld should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting studellts' aspirations for continuing tlleir education must expand beyond just lessons studellts alone.{Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. Other specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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 import.ant part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	When provided pre and post tests in science, students will show 25% growth by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)
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 consortium wide assessments during weekly common planning PLC.
2. Time for professional development in science will be dedicated to at least 2 PLC meetings per month. including StemScopes and consortium developed and provided workshops.
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 facilitate individual student data chats.
7. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level standards. data, student tracking,
collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Beth Morris (bmorris@ucpcfl.org)

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.

Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better
test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively
about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared.
A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for
learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.
In Spring 2020 UCP Osceola Charter School fully implemented the Conscious Discipline program for SEL. Each teacher is trained in the techniques of Conscious Discipline, and all materials have been purchased and received. UCP Osceola is actively engaging parents with virtual information meetings and teachers and members of administration are adding information and activities related to SEL on each of our Google classroom sites.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00