

School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud Preparatory Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

St. Cloud Preparatory Academy

3101 PROGRESS LANE, St. Cloud, FL 34769

<https://www.saintcloudprep.org>

Demographics

Principal: Kim Santana

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-07-01
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

St. Cloud Preparatory Academy

3101 PROGRESS LANE, St. Cloud, FL 34769

<https://www.saintcloudprep.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)
Combination School KG-12	No	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	47%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

To create a safe, engaging, K-12 learning community that educates the whole child to become effective, bold, leaders of a changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Enter to learn, prepare to lead!

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
Murphy, Jennifer	Principal	Oversees curriculum and instruction, observes and evaluates instructional practices, maintains a positive school culture and ensures a safe, engaging learning environment. Works with the governing board and business manager to ensure that there are effective and adequate materials, equipment and supplies to ensure safety and successful learning. Oversees the MTSS process, coordinates master schedule to maximize learning time, ensures school safety through the school discipline processes and policies. Observes and evaluates instructional practices.
Carpenter, Tamara	Other	Conduct classroom walk-thru's with leadership team, collect and analyze data and distributing resources for teachers. Oversees the mentor teacher program, coaches struggling teachers by modeling lessons, facilitate problem-solving in regards to the SIP. Ensure safety by enforcing the Student Code of Conduct, builds relationships with at-risk students, implements and communicates school-wide positive behavior plan. Communicates with staff and families both positive and areas of needs improvement in regards to behavior and learning.
Roldan, Zayda	Registrar	Works with families to ensure a smooth registration process, ensures that all appropriate paperwork gets to administration/teachers when a student registers, works with the school counselor to ensure that FIT families are identified. Maintains and oversees student database and CUM folders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/31/2020, Kim Santana

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

42

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-07-01
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	46	67	41	50	47	59	56	58	49	28	32	20	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	4	2	4	4	1	8	5	4	3	1	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	5	1	8	5	4	3	1	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	9	10	10	9	3	11	5	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	10	14	19	13	5	6	3	0	78
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	13	11	5	8	4	0	60

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	1	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/1/2020

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	45	65	42	50	47	58	53	57	49	27	30	20	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	6	6	4	6	2	5	3	4	8	2	4	5	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	10	10	10	2	11	5	0	62

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 1 1 2 0 1 2 0 7

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 1 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Number of students enrolled 45 65 42 50 47 58 53 57 49 27 30 20 0 543

Attendance below 90 percent 6 6 4 6 2 5 3 4 8 2 4 5 0 55

One or more suspensions 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 4

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 0 6 8 10 10 10 2 11 5 0 62

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 1 1 2 0 1 2 0 7

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 1 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	56%	61%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	57%	59%	48%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	54%	39%	54%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	49%	52%	62%	36%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	42%	55%	59%	35%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	49%	52%	35%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	49%	56%	34%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	75%	78%	57%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	51%	17%	58%	10%
	2018	65%	51%	14%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	51%	17%	58%	10%
	2018	65%	48%	17%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	60%	48%	12%	56%	4%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	48%	48%	0%	54%	-6%
	2018	60%	46%	14%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
07	2019	42%	47%	-5%	52%	-10%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2019	60%	49%	11%	56%	4%
	2018	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	29%	47%	-18%	55%	-26%
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
10	2019	35%	47%	-12%	53%	-18%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	54%	19%	62%	11%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	53%	7%	64%	-4%
	2018	65%	53%	12%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	37%	48%	-11%	60%	-23%
	2018	80%	52%	28%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-43%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
06	2019	38%	45%	-7%	55%	-17%
	2018	34%	43%	-9%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
07	2019	35%	30%	5%	54%	-19%
	2018	33%	29%	4%	54%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	46%	47%	-1%	46%	0%
	2018	48%	43%	5%	45%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	45%	-6%	53%	-14%
	2018	78%	49%	29%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-39%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	26%	42%	-16%	48%	-22%
	2018	29%	42%	-13%	50%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	62%	-18%	67%	-23%
2018	77%	68%	9%	65%	12%
Compare		-33%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	73%	-1%	71%	1%
2018	56%	70%	-14%	71%	-15%
Compare		16%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	49%	0%	61%	-12%
2018	46%	52%	-6%	62%	-16%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	44%	-8%	57%	-21%
2018					

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	16	42	47	16	24	12	11				
ELL	23	40	38	26	20	18	12				
BLK	59	69		44	25						
HSP	51	50	35	42	34	13	31	70			
MUL	54	50		45							
WHT	56	55	54	51	48	37	48	65	71		
FRL	47	47	46	44	42	34	27	59			

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	23	44	42	18	44						
ELL	31	71	73	31	79						
BLK	71	83		47	58						
HSP	63	67	67	49	72	61	50	75			
MUL	50			40							
WHT	57	54	39	53	64	66	57	47	31		
FRL	56	61	53	49	65	59	51	55	40		
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	17	37	38	17	33	25					
ELL	20	43	30	11	23						
BLK	44	33		25	27						
HSP	44	49	25	27	29	42	31				
MUL	43	50		29	50						
WHT	51	48	45	41	38	30	33	64	69		
FRL	43	43	36	33	37	39	33	67	53		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	49
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	44
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	50
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	54
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest data component for St. Cloud Preparatory Academy was learning gains for our lowest twenty five percent in math. A contributing factor was teacher absence due to difficult pregnancy and in middle school an ineffective teacher. The data indicates a decline from 2018-2019 school year decrease in students that participated in the Florida State Assessment State Test. Our biggest achievement gap is students identified as "bubble" students, those students close to a level 2 or 3, but remained or dropped to a level 1 or 2. Our goal is to move our level 1 and level 2 students up a minimum of one level and/or a year's worth of growth.

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 year prior is our ELL and SWD math learning gains within our lowest quartile. Increase population in both ELL and SWD, learning gaps from new students, and teacher turnover contributed to this decline. For math the data component of the group that performed the lowest was our students with disabilities (SWD), however, our ELL students saw a significant decline in English/Language Arts. While traditionally, our trend has been gains year over year, this is not the case this year. Our goal is to work diligently to increase and contribute to an upward trend in all sub groups, particularly our ELL and SWD sub groups.

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.

When compared to the state average our greatest gap is our lowest twenty- five percent in math. Contributing factors include an increase in our ELL and SWD population, teacher absences due to pregnancy (4), ineffective teacher performance, and teacher turnover and/or movement.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the middle school acceleration. In the 2017-2018 school year our students achieved 31% to 71% in 2018-2019 school year. In addition, our social studies achievement amongst our students identified as white. Students increased social studies achievement from 47% in the 2017-2018 school year to 65% in the 2018-2019 school year. In order to promote college and carer readiness for our students we increased the number of accelerated classes offered at both the middle and high school levels.

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

Two potential areas of concern for St. Cloud Preparatory Academy are students with attendance below 90% and students with an achievement of one. Specifically, much of our focus needs to be on our ELL and SWD's. In addition, our learning gains within our lowest quartile for math school-wide is also a concern.

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

1. Students with attendance below 90%
2. Learning gains lowest quartile for Math
3. Overall achievement for SWD and ELL
4. Overall Science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Ensure high levels of achievement for all students in math. Providing teachers the opportunity to collaborate in groups to produce engaging lessons that utilize effective instructional strategies and best practices. Furthermore, teachers will continually monitor achievement of standards to best plan future instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

Math achievement will increase by 10% in all subgroups. Once an assessment is taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on errors by standard to clarify any misconception about the strategy being used. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Murphy (jennifer.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Math stations
 Station 1- Multiplication
 Each week the students receive a higher level of the skill.
 Station 2- Division
 Each week the students receive a higher level of the skill.
 Each week the students receive a higher level of this skill.
 Station 3 - Fractions
 Each week students are given another skill needed to complete the level we are learning. This would include equivalent fractions, factors, multiples, adding/subtracting fractions with different denominators, comparing fractions, multiplying/dividing fractions, etc.
 Station 4 - Small group
 This allows students to get help with any station they are struggling with and also help with current grade level math they are working on in a small group.
 Station 5 - Computers/ Partner work
 Students have all completed their pre-test for math. Moby Max/IXL/edmentum will start them at their current level and guide them through new skills. This will allow them to go up to 12th grade math.

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. Through small-group instruction teachers are able to differentiate the pace and teaching strategies for the needs of students. Using student assessment data, teachers can develop groups based on learning levels to administer more individual based teaching to improve learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. (Marzano 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common Planning for teachers.-Master schedule for both elementary and secondary time for daily planning at a minimum of 45 minutes.
2. Additional time for PLC and vertical articulation-allows teachers of other grades/subject area to collaborate a minimum of once per week.
3. Professional Development and Mentoring Program-Teachers are able to attend various district professional development. In addition, St. Cloud Prep is offering professional development focusing on progress monitoring, lesson planning and higher order thinking. Mentoring program includes beginning teachers and teachers new to St. Cloud Prep. Mentoring includes specific professional development, observations, modeling lessons with feedback, and weekly check-in meetings.
4. Use of Mastery Up and Math Nation for Math instruction. All math teachers in grades 3-12 are provided

with these materials, as well as trained, these materials are documented in lesson plans and used daily in the classroom.

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jennifer.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

5. The leadership team 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.
6. Students will track their own learning through teacher provided rubrics.
7. Teachers will provide Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.
8. Students in Tier 3 will be provided with small group instruction in areas identified by standard based data.

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jmurphy@saintcloudprep.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students. Providing teachers the opportunity to collaborate in groups to produce engaging lessons that utilize effective instructional strategies and best practices. Furthermore, teachers will continually monitor achievement of standards to best plan future instruction. Providing teachers with professional development in content area reading strategies and vocabulary.

Measurable Outcome: Science achievement will increase by 10% in all subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Murphy (jmurphy@saintcloudprep.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategy: Our evidence based strategy for science instruction is a focus on content area reading strategies and vocabulary. Teachers will conduct data chats with students and the leadership team will meet with teachers to conduct data chats based on beginning, middle and end of the year testing. Teachers will use inquiry-guided instruction to provide rigorous education to their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be using Bloom's Taxonomy to push their science instruction. Specifically, students will be "analyzing" vocabulary terms and comprehension within close read science texts which are technical and complex. Evidence shows that targeted vocabulary instruction is beneficial for all students in all content areas and more so in the science classroom. (Bloom's Taxonomy 1950)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common Planning for teachers.-Master schedule for both elementary and secondary time for daily planning at a minimum of 45 minutes.
2. Additional time for PLC and vertical articulation-allows teachers of other grades/subject area to collaborate a minimum of once per week.
3. Professional Development and Mentoring Program-Teachers are able to attend various district professional development. In addition, St. Cloud Prep is offering professional development focusing on content area reading strategies and vocabulary. Mentoring program includes beginning teachers and teachers new to St. Cloud Prep. Mentoring includes specific professional development, observations, modeling lessons with feedback, and weekly check-in meetings.
4. Use of Mastery Up for science instruction. All science teachers in grades 3-11 are provided with these materials, as well as trained, these materials are documented in lesson plans and used daily in the classroom.

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jmurphy@saintcloudprep.org)

5. Individual data chats will be conducted with the leadership team three times during the school year to ensure teachers have guidance pertaining to instructional choices made for individual students.
6. Tier 2 interventions-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 enhance their comprehension of the material.
7. Teachers will track data by standard. After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores on the tracker. Teachers will provide the necessary interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning.
8. Students will track their own data.
9. Teachers will conduct individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with continuing data chats.

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jmurphy@saintcloudprep.org)

#3. Other specifically relating to attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ensure attendance is at 90% or above. Once an effective attendance policy is put into place and monitored effectively, the attendance rate will increase, maximizing the amount of instructional time a student receives.

Measurable Outcome: Attendance will increase by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Zayda Roldan (zroldan@saintcloudprep.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that student attendance directly correlates with student achievement data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will be using the student-centered multi system approach to maintain a healthy attendance requirement for all students including those with disabilities. Studies show that having everyone be held responsible for a child’s school attendance is an effective response rather than resulting in truancy help.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will ensure that all staff members, parents and students understand the attendance policy-attendance policy was revised by the SCPA leadership. One page outline of policy changes were placed in first day packets for all students. Attendance is monitored weekly, parents are contacted and attendance contract meetings are scheduled.
2. Attendance policy added to school-website and social media page.
3. Families and student must sign they have read and understand the parent/teacher/student compact.- This was provided in the first day packet.

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jennifer.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Other specifically relating to School Wide Post-Secondary Culture for all Students.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	College-going culture is built on how teachers, staff and administrators view their role. When educators present a college-going attitude they not only view themselves as teachers but also college advocates. Having this attitude presented throughout the school will promote and inspire the best in every student. Each student will feel supported in achieving their goal and even if college is out of reach; students will still feel supported to achieve their goals.
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2020-2021 seniors will be our first graduating class. For the 2020-2021 school year, student grades will be at least the following percentages: A- 10%, B-30%, C-25%, D- 25% and F, 10%. For the following years there will be an increase in grades A, B, and C by 5% each grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Murphy (jmurphy@saintcloudprep.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and staff will be trained in elements of College-Going culture by Professor Patricia McDonough of UCLA. Teachers will begin focusing on college talk, information and resources, testing and curriculum, college partnerships, faculty involvement and encouraging family involvement. Having teachers and staff engaging in student's life after graduation will help shape a culture of success in which student's life to a quality life beyond school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons in the classroom. (Poliner & Lieber 2004) Teachers and staff will be supporting students to reflect on their future and have multiple opportunities to do so.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised and encouraged in an environment that promotes post-secondary college and career readiness for success in school and life.
2. Teachers will plan to implement activities for day to day life skills.
3. The school will create a plan that creates an environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually cutting across social groups.
4. The school will present college day opportunities for local colleges to come and speak with students and their families.
5. Teachers will strengthen students study skills and meta cognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management and planning.

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jennifer.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school data, ELA proficiency 55%, which is just under the state average of 61% and the district average of 56%. The goal is to increase to the state average of 61% while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic and FRL students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase ELA proficiency by 6%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tamara Carpenter (tcarpenter@saintcloudprep.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that analyzing student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Simply put data should drive instruction. In addition, teachers collaborating and analyzing data to adjust instruction procedures will increase significant learning gains for all students; including those with disabilities. Studies also show that MTSS differentiation in the classroom highly impacts the performance on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research states that using common assessments throughout school will have a great impact on student achievement. Using common assessments, rigorous and standard aligned curriculum also has a correlation with student achievement. Using the two methods together will highly increase student success. (Marzano 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in Ron Clark's Essential 55 for best practices to increase student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.
2. Teachers will meet in collaborative meetings to analyze data and plan rigorous lessons
3. Teachers will meet with the MTSS coordinator to discuss student's progress and placement
4. Leadership team will monitor student assessment data, classroom observations, and teacher lesson plans
5. Instructional staff will use monitoring data, classroom observations and progress to identify individual student needs
6. Teachers will communicate with students family to discuss student progress and ways to help the child at home to continue to make gains

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jennifer.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 the school had two subgroups below the ESSA level 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.

Measurable Outcome: ESSA Data for the 2018-2019 ESE 24% and ELL 31% will be increase in 2020-2021 to be above 41% in both sub groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tamara Carpenter (tcarpenter@saintcloudprep.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Teachers will be considering and implementing Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) (within) within their classroom and instruction for student individual needs. There are four main subgroups:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- Content- the standards and information the student needs to learn
- Process- how students understand the content they are learning
- Product- how students model what they have learned
- Affect- the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Solid programs that are created with SEL in mind result in positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional skills consist of 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 and finishing assignments on time. Having a positive school environment promotes a strong student and staff relationship for learning. It provides the foundation that students need to develop social, emotional, and academic skills they need to succeed in life.

Measurable Outcome: Based on conversations with students it would be suggested that 48% of students seem to favor school belonging. Going forward we will use a survey system to take more of a critical data analysis of how students favor school belonging. For the 2020-2021 school year we want to increase data by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tamara Carpenter (tcarpenter@saintcloudprep.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students are extremely diverse in so many ways, emotionally and physically. None the less their learning styles are diverse too. It is crucial that teachers assess the differences within each of their students and be flexible for the diverse needs the students have.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not a one fits all curriculum. However, with a variety of teaching strategies and practices that cover all students a curriculum is fit for their needs. Teachers will use techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills. (Gardner, 1983)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Students will complete a survey for teachers and staff to use for planning.
2. Teachers will build classroom families that are blended and built for understand and differences
3. Teachers will take students strengths and build activities and lessons based on those
4. Teachers will use a variety of teaching strategies to target all students and their learning style
5. Teachers will collaborate with their peers
6. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as needed
7. Students will complete a survey about their thoughts on school, self and community

Person Responsible Jennifer Murphy (jennifer.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Our school will be connecting and engaging with families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction. Staff will be responsible for implementing any changes and updated as needed to stay within compliance. All parties will be in communication and encourage high expectations for all students, including those with disabilities (e.g. college-going or work readiness). Leaders will be of example of expectations through the school building. For example:

- Student work throughout the school
 - Collaborative planning is held across grade levels/subject areas and based on standards and data
 - All students are planning for college or being prepared for work readiness
 - Communication is open at all times for students, families and faculty to reach out to the leadership team
- Teachers will be meeting in weekly PLC's with their grade levels to discuss data, student progress and look for themes/patterns among student groups. The school schedules various academic nights, parent information meetings, ESOL meetings, and so forth, to build a common school language and expectations.

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: attendance	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Wide Post-Secondary Culture for all Students.	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup:	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00