

Collier County Public Schools

Osceola Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Osceola Elementary School

5770 OSCEOLA TRL, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/oes>

Demographics

Principal: Diana Little

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Collier 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Osceola Elementary School

5770 OSCEOLA TRL, Naples, FL 34109

<https://www.collierschools.com/oes>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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 Osceola Elementary is to provide our students with an outstanding education and opportunities that encourage each student to realize his/her fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Osceola Elementary School community is committed to creating and maintaining a safe and respectful learning environment where rigorous and appropriate teaching and learning take place, while children are stimulated to explore, motivated to learn, confident to question and encouraged to demonstrate strong character today and throughout their future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Little, Diana	Principal	Ensure high performance standards Data analysis School improvement Teacher observation and feedback Parent communications Budget Oversee PTO and SAC
Duffy, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Discipline Scheduling Attendance Assessments Data analysis Teacher observations and feedback
Boot, Annie	Reading Coach	Literacy development Coaching cycles Student improvement plans District Assessments
Ruben, Nancy	School Counselor	PBIS SEL strategies Attendance and academic awards Safety Patrol
Magers, Colleen	Teacher, ESE	Leadership Team Resource Teacher Instructional Support Resource Teacher Aspiring Leader
Lazo, Mimi	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team EL Contact Instructional Support EL Team
Wilk, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Instruction 3rd Grade Aspiring Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/26/2021, Diana Little

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.*

6

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

634

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	85	100	95	87	138	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	617
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	9	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	5	11	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	3	16	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	22	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	12	14	5	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	5	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

2020-21 - 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	71	87	78	127	111	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	71	87	78	127	111	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				79%	60%	57%	82%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	59%	58%	66%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	51%	53%	57%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				78%	68%	63%	79%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	64%	62%	74%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	55%	51%	60%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	59%	53%	83%	60%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	77%	61%	16%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	58%	18%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	77%	68%	9%	62%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	65%	11%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	67%	6%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade 1 ELA - i-Ready

Grade 2 ELA - i-Ready

Grade 3 ELA - Quarterly ELA Benchmark Assessments

Grade 3 Math - Quarterly Math Benchmark Assessments

Grade 4 ELA - Quarterly ELA Benchmark Assessments

Grade 4 Math - Quarterly Math Benchmark Assessments

Grade 5 ELA - Quarterly ELA Benchmark Assessments

Grade 5 Math - Quarterly Math Benchmark Assessments

Grade 5 Science - Quarterly Science Benchmark Assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(25/86) 29%	(55/93) 59%	(76/92) 83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(5/38) 13%	(17/42) 40%	(4/7) 57%
	Students With Disabilities	(1/6) 17%	(4/6) 67%	(5/7) 71%
	English Language Learners	(3/22) 14%	(12/22) 55%	(17/22) 77%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(40/86) 47%	(64/88) 73%	(83/93) 89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(9/41) 22%	(27/45) 60%	(3/4) 75%
	Students With Disabilities	(2/8) 25%	(6/9) 67%	(9/11) 82%
	English Language Learners	(6/23) 26%	(15/20) 75%	(18/20) 90%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(99/133) 74%	(98/132) 74%	(88/137) 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(36/62) 58%	(37/62) 60%	(30/63) 48%
	Students With Disabilities	(10/18) 56%	(6/16) 38%	(7/18) 39%
	English Language Learners	(25/47) 53%	(18/40) 45%	(13/40) 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(105/132) 80%	(108/132) 82%	(74/137) 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(43/62) 69%	(45/63) 71%	(24/62) 39%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/18) 67%	(12/16) 75%	(7/18) 39%
	English Language Learners	(30/46) 65%	(27/40) 68%	(12/41) 29%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(73/108) 68%	(77/109) 71%	(72/110) 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(24/45) 53%	(25/43) 58%	(24/44) 55%
	Students With Disabilities	(11/18) 61%	(9/17) 53%	(10/16) 63%
	English Language Learners	(14/27) 52%	(8/20) 40%	(10/22) 45%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(88/109) 81%	(83/110) 75%	(62/112) 55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(32/45) 71%	(28/44) 64%	(18/46) 39%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/18) 67%	(11/18) 61%	(9/16) 56%
	English Language Learners	(21/27) 78%	(13/20) 65%	(4/22) 18%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(76/113) 67%	(80/117) 68%	(76/119) 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(29/45) 64%	(33/50) 66%	(28/52) 54%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/10) 70%	(6/10) 60%	(6/11) 55%
	English Language Learners	(5/22) 23%	(5/21) 24%	(8/20) 40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(86/111) 77%	(90/118) 76%	(55/119) 46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(29/43) 67%	(34/50) 68%	(16/51) 31%
	Students With Disabilities	(8/10) 80%	(7/10) 70%	(3/11) 27%
	English Language Learners	(17/22) 77%	(14/21) 67%	(6/20) 30%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(67/110) 61%	(77/117) 66%	(78/118) 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(23/43) 53%	(28/50) 56%	(28/52) 54%
	Students With Disabilities	(3/10) 30%	(4/10) 40%	(4/11) 36%
	English Language Learners	(7/22) 32%	(9/21) 43%	(9/20) 45%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	55	69		72	77		58				
ELL	55	77	85	65	69	82	62				
ASN	64			93							
BLK	77			62							
HSP	61	68	67	66	68	62	63				
WHT	88	77		92	73		87				
FRL	64	72	69	69	72	76	67				
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	46	41	35	43	48	40	29				
ELL	58	59	61	62	75	67	45				
ASN	89			89							

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
HSP	68	57	67	70	73	61	69				
MUL	92			92							
WHT	84	65	65	83	71	52	79				
FRL	69	55	62	62	71	56	56				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	62	68	57	45	56	41	40				
ELL	57	69	56	61	68	53	57				
ASN	77			92							
BLK	45			55							
HSP	79	65	59	71	68	52	79				
MUL	82			82							
WHT	86	69	68	84	76	74	87				
FRL	68	58	47	67	69	55	68				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	85
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

During the 20-21 school year, overall FSA ELA Achievement has dropped from 79%-76%. Hispanic students dropped from 68%-61% and ELL students dropped from 55%-51%. In ELA learning gains, there was an overall increase for students in 5th grade which includes all subgroups. ELA learning gain scores rose 11% from 62% to 73%. Our lowest 25% in 5th grade saw a 14% gain in ELA from 63% to 77%. A closer examination sees that students identified as Hispanic remained the same at 67% while all other groups made gains.

Overall Math Achievement increased from 78% to 81%. Hispanic students dropped from 70% to 66% and ELL students dropped from 60% to 59%. In Math learning gains, there was an overall increase for students in 5th grade. Math learning gain scores increased from 72% - 74%. A closer examination sees that students identified as Hispanic saw a 5% decrease from 73% to 68%. Additionally, the ELL subgroup dropped from 77% to 70%. Our lowest 25% in 5th grade saw a 21% gain in Math from 56% to 77%. A closer examination sees that students identified as Hispanic increased from 61% to 62% while all other groups made significant gains.

Students with Disabilities: increased in ELA achievement (46% to 65%), learning gains (41% to 69%) and lowest 25% gains (35% to 60%); in Math achievement (43% to 72%), learning gains (48% to 77%) and lowest 25% gains (40% to 86%); and Science (29% to 58%).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Overall FSA ELA achievement has dropped from 79%-76% and is trending in the wrong direction. Progress monitoring data for 2020-2021 for grades 3 and 4 also notes a drop in ELA achievement. ELA progress monitoring data for the 2020-2021 for grade 4 shows proficiency at 68% in Fall, 71% in Winter, and 65% in Spring. Similarly ELA progress monitoring data for grade 3 shows proficiency at 74% in Fall, 74% in Winter, and 64% in Spring.

For school year 21-22 school year in ELA, our Lowest 25% Gains will include 4th grade students. In ELA 20-21, progress monitoring data demonstrates that our level 1s and 2s increased in grade 4 from QBA1 to QBA3.

For school year 21-22 school year in Math, our Lowest 25% Gains will include 4th grade students. In Math 20-21, progress monitoring data demonstrates that our level 1s and 2s increased in grade 4 from QBA1 to QBA3.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors would include lack of fidelity with on grade level instruction and access to standards-aligned instruction.

New actions to be taken in ELA would include: implementation of BEST standards with fidelity; focus on grade level standards and grade level tasks assigned. New actions to be taken in Math would include using grade level content, differentiated student work to enrich and enhance by the use of productive struggle to problem solve. In addition, strategic instructional support based on student needs from an ELL teacher during differentiated instructional time and utilization of ELL instructional strategies in the classroom would assist in increasing Lowest 25% learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In the area of ELA overall Learning Gains for 5th grade students saw an increase of 11%.

In the area of Math overall Lowest 25% Gains for 5th grade students saw an increase of 21%.

Students with Disabilities saw an increase in Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% gains across all subjects. Reading Achievement increased from 46%-55%, Reading Making Gains increased from 41%-69%, and Reading Lowest 25% making gains increased from 35%-60%. Math Achievement increased from 43%-72%, Math Making Gains increased from 48%-77%, and Math Lowest 25% making gains increased from 40%-86%. Science Achievement saw an increase from 29%-58%

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In the area of reading small group targeted instruction was provided to students based on their deficiencies uncovered through i-Ready diagnostic testing, Standards Mastery and quarterly benchmark assessment.

In the area of math, 3rd-5th grade students received standards based grade level instruction, morning mathletes for our lowest 25% with the implementation of the ALEKS program. Departmentalization of high performing math teachers in 5th grade was also a factor in improvement.

The focus on Students with Disabilities was a priority throughout the year. Strategic scheduling of resource teachers with targeted instruction of grade level standards and strategic grouping of students allowed for improvement in this area. The implementation of collaborative planning to identify gaps in student learning and use of formative assessment data analysis also contributed to the increase in student achievement for Students with Disabilities.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In the area of Reading, the implementation of BEST Standards and a focus on grade level instruction with student access to standards-aligned instruction is paramount in accelerating learning. Second, collaborative planning in the area of Literacy is focused on building background knowledge and vocabulary while utilizing grade level text.

In the area of Math, the use of productive struggle within the classroom will be used to accelerate learning.

In addition, overall strategic scheduling of resource teachers to provide instruction during differentiated instructional time and the subsequent use of data will be used to match interventions or enrichment for individual students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

BEST standards training will be provided during professional learning days throughout the school year. Our literacy coach will provide professional learning and collaborative planning activities during collaborative planning with all grade levels.

Repeated Reading: Using repeated reading, in Language Arts as first read to familiarize with text and second read to familiarize vocabulary understanding and strengthen comprehension strategies.

Professional development in establishing goals and selecting tasks for productive struggle which would include: goal setting, identifying the selection of a good student task, and teacher support of productive struggle.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Administration will continue to monitor lesson plans and instruction to ensure for fidelity to BEST standards training.

Administration will continue to monitor differentiated instructional time to ensure it is used effectively in providing students with their targeted area of need.

Teachers will use their awareness and knowledge of productive struggle to sustain rigorous math instruction to assist students in becoming mathematical problem solvers.

The expansion of Morning Mathletes services to additional L25 students will allow more students to bridge their gaps in achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data indicated ELA Achievement decreased from 82% to 79% from 2018-2019. School year 20-21 FSA data indicates the same pattern exist where achievement decreased from 79% in SY 18-19 to 76% in FY21. Examining ELA progress monitoring data for the 2020-2021 for grade 4 shows proficiency at 68% in Fall, 71% in Winter, and 65% in Spring. Similarly ELA progress monitoring data for grade 3 shows proficiency at 74% in Fall, 74% in Winter, and 64% in Spring.
Measurable Outcome:	If students receive BEST standards based, grade level instruction in ELA with an emphasis on repeated reading to build fluency and comprehension, then the number of students attaining achievement on FSA in May will increase from 76% to 79%.
Monitoring:	Non-evaluative walkthroughs to monitor implementation of BEST standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diana Little (littld@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Repeated Reading is an academic practice where a students are asked to read aloud short text passages multiple times. The student rereads the passage to achieve fluency and increased comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to use repeated reading, in Language Arts as first read to familiarize with text and second read to familiarize vocabulary understanding and strengthen comprehension strategies. Vocabulary development, language acquisition and comprehension will improve student reading proficiency. This will allow students to be better prepared for the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

The following action steps will be taken to address the Area of Focus in order to increase achievement in ELA.

Implement repeated reading as a strategy in reading instruction.

Teacher plans for and provides students with materials at grade level with appropriate scaffolding.

Teacher provides student reinforcement.

Teacher monitors student progress.

Person Responsible Annie Boot (bootan@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data indicated ELA Lowest 25% Gains for 5th grade students increased from 63% to 77%. This does not take into account historical FSA data where Lowest 25% gains were at 57% in 2018 and 63% in 2019 in tested grade levels. Additionally, students identified as Hispanic remained at 67% for both 2019 and 2021. School year 20-21 progress monitoring data demonstrates that our level 1s and 2s increased in grade 4 from QBA1 to QBA3.
Measurable Outcome:	If students receive BEST standards based, grade level instruction in ELA with an emphasis on instructional conversations and literature logs, then the percentage of Lowest 25% students making gains on FSA in May will increase from 77% to 80%.
Monitoring:	Non-evaluative walkthroughs to monitor implementation of BEST standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diana Little (littld@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Conversations are small-group discussions. Acting as facilitators, teachers engage English language learners in discussions about stories, key concepts, and related personal experiences, which allow them to appreciate and build on each other's experiences, knowledge, and understanding. Literature Logs require students to respond in writing to prompts or questions related to sections of stories. These responses are then shared in small groups or with a partner.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to use instructional conversations and literature logs, in Language Arts to facilitate discussions to enhance comprehension and vocabulary development. Literature logs will enable students to respond in writing to text based questions. This will allow students to be better prepared for the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

The following action steps will be taken to address the Area of Focus in order to increase achievement in ELA.

Implement instructional conversations and literature logs as strategies during reading instruction.

Teacher plans for and provides students with materials at the appropriate reading level.

Teacher provides student reinforcement.

Teacher monitors student progress.

Person Responsible Annie Boot (bootan@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data indicated Math Lowest 25% Gains for 5th grade students increased from 56% to 77%. This does not take into account historical FSA data where our Lowest 25% Gains were at 60% in 2018 and 56% in 2019 for tested grade levels. Additionally, students identified as Hispanic increased 1% from 2019 to 2021. School year 20-21 progress monitoring data demonstrates that our level 1s and 2s increased in grade 4 from QBA1 to QBA3.
Measurable Outcome:	If students receive consistent, standards based, grade level instruction in Math then the percentage of Lowest 25% students making gains on FSA in May will increase from 77% to 80%.
Monitoring:	Non-evaluative walkthroughs will be used to monitor standards/target aligned work.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diana Little (littld@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing productive struggle in learning mathematics. Students will be provided with the opportunity and support to engage in productive struggle as they work through mathematical ideas and concepts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students with the opportunity to comprehend and master mathematical concepts through various problem solving avenues with a focus on grade level student work. This allows students to learn math with understanding and result in deeper learning while engaging in productive struggle. Teachers will use district adopted standards aligned resources. This will allow students to be better prepared for the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

The following action steps will be taken to address the Area of Focus in Math Lowest 25% Gains.

Teachers will collaboratively plan for instruction that provides students with the opportunity to employ their own solution to the math problem selected and presented.

During instruction the:

Teacher will use probing questions to guide students to travel towards the correct solution.

Teacher will praise students for problem solving or persistence toward the solution of the problem.

Teacher will display work that demonstrates student problem solving.

Teacher will provide collaborative opportunities to solve grade level problems.

Person Responsible Colleen Magers (magersc@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

2019-2020 no reported incidents on the SafeSchoolsforAlex site. The culture and environment of the school will be monitored using FOCOS reports and Panorama surveys.

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.

We focus on PBIS at Osceola Elementary and look to reward positive behaviors. Each week, a student is chosen by the teacher to be the "Chief of the Week". This student is chosen to represent the class based on exhibiting the school-wide expectations: be respectful, be responsible, and be a problem solver. We also hold monthly champion awards that are focused on student achievement in ELA, math, writing and related arts. Students are also given a "Chief Card" for displaying the chief qualities during the school day.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is another important component of positive culture and environment. Our guidance counselor and leadership team also supports SEL. This includes the 30/60 initiative, the use of the buddy bench, acknowledging and working with our handle with care students, and promoting GRIT around our school campus. New students, our "New Chiefs on the Block", have a monthly meet and greet where they will receive an OES spirit bracelet and a healthy snack. We also have staff members who will serve as connection coaches this year to support students with social-emotional needs called "Who is Your One". Students will take ownership of their Leadership Portfolio (student data binder) of their work including iReady scores, math assessments, writing sample and nonacademic recognition (certificates). Quarterly, students are recognized for academic achievement and excellence (certificates) based on their report card.

"Connect for Success" is a district wide initiative that allows every child the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with their school staff and fellow students. Students will engage in "Connect for Success" activities provided by their teacher every Tuesday and Thursday morning during the school year. The goal of this initiative is for students to increase their sense of belonging and connectiveness to others within the school community. This includes developing a relationship with a trusted adult who understands their needs and to whom they can talk. The development of this program allows for an environment where

students can learn and grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Each student in grades 3-5 will keep an electronic reflection journal of their "Connect for Success" activities.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

In the broader community, Osceola partners with various organizations including Osceola PTO, Sports Club and other external community organizations to support the vision and mission of Osceola Elementary School. When feasible, parents and guardians are encouraged to volunteer and to participate in the decision making process at school.

The school's PBIS Leadership Action Team is representative of all grade levels and instructional facets of the the school's culture and environment. Some functions of the PBIS Leadership Action Team include review of the 7 Habits, maintenance and operation of the PBIS Incentive Program, student certificates for their Leadership Portfolio, "New Chiefs on the Block", and other positive culture building events.

Building positive relationships with all stakeholders by providing meaningful input allows all to have a voice within the Osceola community.

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
Total:			\$0.00