

St. Johns County School District

Osceola Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Osceola Elementary School

1605 OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY RD, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-oes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Jessley Hathaway

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Osceola Elementary School

1605 OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY RD, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-oes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

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	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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.

Osceola Elementary will be a family of learners working to become successful in academic and social settings. By nurturing determination, grit, and a growth mindset in all students, we will create life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Better Never Quits

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
Waldrop, Tina	Principal	
Evans, Stephanie	Other	
Jenkins, Faye	Other	
Keffer, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Harrison, Dana	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Jessley Hathaway

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

2

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	107	98	85	98	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609
Attendance below 90 percent	14	20	16	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	4	4	6	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	2	3	8	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	4	8	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Monday 6/22/2020

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	99	112	106	83	97	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	11	19	17	11	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
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	4	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	1	0	3	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	10	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	99	112	106	83	97	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	11	19	17	11	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
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	4	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	1	0	3	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	10	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	64%	75%	57%	52%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	67%	58%	51%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	59%	53%	38%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	77%	63%	64%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	69%	62%	69%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	59%	51%	62%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	72%	53%	55%	69%	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	57%	78%	-21%	58%	-1%
	2018	64%	78%	-14%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	77%	-6%	58%	13%
	2018	43%	74%	-31%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		28%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	58%	76%	-18%	56%	2%
	2018	43%	73%	-30%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	82%	-20%	62%	0%
	2018	68%	80%	-12%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	82%	-6%	64%	12%
	2018	62%	83%	-21%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	67%	80%	-13%	60%	7%
	2018	43%	79%	-36%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	73%	-17%	53%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	73%	-26%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	38	56	51	44	67	68	33				
BLK	50	69	64	59	74	56	44				
HSP	73	59		67	80						
WHT	66	67	54	75	74	76	69				
FRL	52	65	53	63	74	73	49				
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	27	23	19	37	28	11	17				
BLK	27	30	25	42	28	9	16				
HSP	63	40		63	47						
MUL	57	30		64	50						
WHT	61	38	23	67	44	19	60				
FRL	43	30	26	51	36	15	36				
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	21	46	48	35	54	45	27				
BLK	26	27	18	45	61	53	14				
HSP	63	68		53	68		55				
MUL	67			60							
WHT	59	56	61	73	70	67	68				
FRL	40	41	36	57	62	57	42				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	59
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	70
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	69
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	61
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 proficiency level for third grade in both reading and math declined by 7% in ELA and 6% in math. Some of the contributing factors were the newness of teachers to the grade level curriculum and the school community. This is not a trend. for the previous school year, the ELA proficiency was 64% and math was 68%.

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

The proficiency level in both ELA and math declined in third grade from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year. With teachers new to the grade level curriculum and expectations, this factor played a role in the decline in proficiency levels.

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.

While the data for lowest quartile in ELA is greater than the state average, it is the closest to the state percentage. Our ELA gains for the lowest quartile was 57% and the state average was 53%.

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

The area with the most improvement was the learning gains for the lowest quartile in math. For the 2017-2018 school year, the math gains percentage for the lowest quartile was 17%. For the 2018-2019 school year, the percentage increased to 74%. For the 2018-2019 school year, a math coach was hired to work with the lowest quartile students on a daily basis. A focused tutoring program for the lowest quartile was developed as an additional support system for these students

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

Increasing the overall attendance of students who have had more than average attendance rates. Traditionally the attendance of kindergarten and first grade students has been a concern. We will work with our families of these grade levels to educate them on the importance of school attendance.

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

1. 1. Student growth on FSA assessments, specifically the growth of the lowest 25%
2. Number of students scoring level 1 and 2 on state assessments
3. Attendance of Kindergarten and first grade students
4. Attendance overall
5. Number of students with 2 or more indicators

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</p>	<p>Increase 3rd grade proficiency in ELA and Math.</p> <p>Our assessment results showed that the proficiency levels for third grade decreased by 7% in ELA and 6% in math. Using a highly effective teacher interventionist in ELA and the math coach, we will improve proficiency levels for both math and ELA in third grade.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome:</p>	<p>We will increase third grade FSA ELA proficiency from 57% to the 62%. We will increase third grade FSA math proficiency from 63% to 68%.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>SIPPS assessment was used to create grade-level intervention groups. SIPPS, Phonics for Reading, and iReady Next Steps will be used to provide differentiated interventions for all students during the hour long intervention block. The math coach will provide support to teachers and students as well as participate in grade level collaborative team meetings. All teachers will engage in the processes as defined by the Professional Learning Communities at Work model and work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn.</p>
<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>SIPPS and Phonics for Reading are research based multi-sensory phonics programs that increase student phonics proficiency. The Professional Learning Communities at Work process is a proven on-going collaborative opportunity to help all students progress. The math coach provided interventions and coaching to 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year which resulted in a dramatic increase of proficiency and learning gains.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set tight and loose Collaborative Team expectations
2. Periodically assess student proficiency performance in ELA and math using formative and summative assessments
3. Students have been placed in SIPPS will have continuous monitoring following the fidelity of the program

4. Teams meet weekly to regularly monitor and plan interventions for all students

Person Responsible

Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Increase learning gains for lowest quartile in ELA</p> <p>Our assessment results showed that the embedded professional development for teachers in ELA and the support that was provided to students helped increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in 4th and 5th grade.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the FSA ELA lowest 25% gains from 57% to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>A phonics assessment was used to create grade-level intervention groups. SIPPS, Rewards, and iReady Next Steps will be used to provide differentiated interventions for all students during the hour long intervention block. The interventionist will provide support to teachers and the lowest quartile of students as well as participate in grade level collaborative team meetings. All teachers will engage in the processes as defined by the Professional Learning Communities at Work model and work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn. A spreadsheet is used to track student summative and iReady data as well as list any interventions that are in place for that individual. Teachers update this sheet after standards based summative assessment.</p> <p>SIPPS and Rewards are research based multi-sensory phonics and comprehension programs that increase student proficiency. The Professional Learning Communities at Work process is a proven on-going collaborative opportunity to help all students progress. The interventionist provided interventions and coaching to 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year which resulted in a dramatic increase of proficiency and learning gains.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Set tight and loose Collaborative Team expectations
2. Periodically assess student proficiency performance in ELA using formative and summative assessments
3. Students have been placed in SIPPS will have continuous\ monitoring following the fidelity of the program
4. Teams meet weekly to regularly monitor and plan interventions for all students
5. Develop a spreadsheet for lowest quartile and subgroup data to be discussed every 4 weeks in CORE team meetings

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Increase learning gains for lowest quartile in math</p> <p>Our assessment results showed that the embedded professional development for teachers in math and the support that was provided to students helped increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in 4th and 5th grade.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>On the 2020 FSA Math, the lowest 25th percentile of students will improve from 74% to 79%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)</p> <p>iReady Next Steps will be used to provide differentiated interventions for all students during the designated intervention block. The math coach will provide support to teachers and the lowest quartile of students as well as participate in grade level collaborative team meetings. All teachers will engage in the processes as defined by the Professional Learning</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Communities at Work model and work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn. A spreadsheet is used to track student summative and iReady data as well as list any interventions that are in place for that individual. Teachers update this sheet after standards based summative assessment.</p> <p>iReady Next Steps are provided to teachers to differentiate to meet the needs of the students in their classroom. The Professional Learning</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Communities at Work process is a proven on-going collaborative opportunity to help all students progress. The math coach provided interventions and coaching to 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year which resulted in a dramatic increase of proficiency and learning gains.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set tight and loose Collaborative Team expectations
2. Periodically assess student proficiency performance in math using formative and summative assessments

3. Teams meet weekly to regularly monitor and plan interventions for all students
4. Develop a spreadsheet for lowest quartile and subgroup data to be discussed every 4 weeks in CORE team meetings

Person Responsible Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Conscious Discipline implementation school-wide Rationale: OES is a title 1 school that serves a population of students who experience difficult life situations. Our students have difficulty regulating their emotions and it often disrupts the classroom and results in students missing valuable learning time.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will utilize the skills of composure to deescalate behaviors and improve school culture reducing the number of behavior referrals and increasing time spent in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tina Waldrop (tina.waldrop@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to create a positive learning environment and reduce student behavior referrals in all grade levels, Osceola Elementary School will implement the language, strategies and tools for self-regulation and pro-social skills from the Social and Emotional model of Conscious Discipline. Data shows that the number of referrals we have written were for defiance and disrespect.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline targets students that often become frustrated and unreachable. Using referrals, data will be tracked for students on behavior plans. It will also be tracked through RTI/MTSS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All classrooms will model conscious discipline strategies and offer a safe place in their classrooms for students to manage their emotions. Teachers will practice breathing techniques with the students and use those techniques when appropriate/necessary. The administration team will offer support and training to teachers throughout the school year.
2. Classrooms will offer multiple resources that celebrate various cultures and cultivates diversity awareness.

Person Responsible Rebecca Keffer (rebecca.keffer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

.

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.

For the 2020-2021 school year, a continued focus on Conscious Discipline will be used schoolwide. PBIS has continues to be refined to help meet the social and emotional needs with our students. Through small group and individual counseling, guidance services are offered focusing on targeted issues like bullying, career awareness, Character Counts week, and personal safety. Individual and group counseling is available, based on need, through a district Mental Health Counselor and through the Children's Home Society. A school Social Worker assists us with those families/students requiring home visits and assistance in targeting individual needs and strengthening the home-school connection. Osceola Elementary is partnering with other businesses/district employees as well as Big Brothers, Big Sisters to find positive one on one mentor-ships for our students.

Parental Involvement is critical to the success of our Title 1 program. Jointly developed, our school distributes a school parental involvement policy to all families. Parents, teachers, and students sign our compact that focuses on shared responsibility for student achievement. These and other aspects of our Title 1 program are explained at our 1st parent teacher conference and at the Virtual Open House. The district coordinates with the Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

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: ELA	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00