

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Canoe Creek K 8



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>32</b>

## Canoe Creek K 8

3600 CANOE CREEK ROAD, St. Cloud, FL 34772

<https://www.osceolaschools.net/cck8>

### Demographics

**Principal: David Noyes**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>32</b>

## Canoe Creek K 8

3600 CANOE CREEK ROAD, St. Cloud, FL 34772

<https://www.osceolaschools.net/cck8>

### 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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

### School Grades History

Year	2020-21
Grade	

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Canoe Creek K-8 will engage students with a rigorous and innovative environmental STEM education while providing the instructional building blocks to develop 21st century global citizens. Through hands-on investigation and problem solving, students will become critical thinkers who are empowered to build sustainable and informed communities.

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

Canoe Creek K-8 is a student-centered organization delivering excellence in education. We are committed to cultivating tomorrow's innovators where academics, well-being, and experiences combine to prepare students for success today and in the 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
Noyes, David	Principal	To be responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To be responsible for all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To develop positive school- community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public.
Miller, Amy	Assistant Principal	To be responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To be responsible for all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To develop positive school- community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public.
Rivera, Francisco	Assistant Principal	To be responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To be responsible for all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To develop positive school- community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public.
Petrangeli, Kodie	Instructional Coach	Focus on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high fidelity implementation of Florida Standards in Literacy through research based strategies.
Woollet, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Focus on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high fidelity implementation of Florida Standards in Math and Science through research based strategies.
Reid, Nicole	Dean	Focus on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementation of the Florida Standards in all content areas through research based strategies in addition to providing support for struggling students by using scientifically based strategies and programs.
Booth, Erika	Instructional Media	Responsible for planning and implementing a comprehensive school instructional media program that provides equity and access to address the needs of students in growth and development, social, academic and career.
Garcia, Sonia	School Counselor	Responsible for planning and implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that provides equity and access to address the needs of students in growth and development, social, academic and career. Counselor will serve as a consultant to the student, teacher(s) and parents, provides leadership and organization to all school counseling activities within the school.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Haynes, Robert	School Counselor	Responsible for planning and implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that provides equity and access to address the needs of students in growth and development, social, academic and career. Counselor will serve as a consultant to the student, teacher(s) and parents, provides leadership and organization to all school counseling activities within the school.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, David Noyes

**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.*

0

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

64

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,067

**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.**

26

### 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	99	110	102	105	119	119	136	120	110	0	0	0	0	1020
Attendance below 90 percent	20	33	37	29	27	32	15	23	12	0	0	0	0	228
One or more suspensions	3	1	0	1	1	4	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	14	25	17	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	9	13	13	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	28	12	13	34	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	19	15	26	36	0	0	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	16	28	12	13	34	0	0	0	0	103

#### 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				3	1	0	3	3	6	9	0	0	0	25

#### 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Number of students enrolled														
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA														
Course failure in Math														
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment														
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	70	72	70	86	85	69	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	521	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	28	12	13	34	0	0	0	0	103	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	19	15	26	36	0	0	0	0	114	

**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	3	1	0	3	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

**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					56%	61%		58%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					57%	59%		58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					55%	54%		52%	52%
Math Achievement					52%	62%		52%	61%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains					55%	59%		54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	52%		50%	52%
Science Achievement					49%	56%		54%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					75%	78%		71%	77%

**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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA is the progress monitoring tool used by all grade levels to compile the data below.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/69%	31/39%	50/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/67%	10/30%	16/48%
	Students With Disabilities	3/50%	2/40%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	11/73%	2/13%	9/56%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/77%	30/38%	55/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/76%	10/30%	24/73%
	Students With Disabilities	6/67%	1/20%	3/50%
	English Language Learners	11/69%	5/31%	10/63%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44/51%	45/52%	61/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/42%	16/36%	23/58%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	3/75%
	English Language Learners	8/35%	9/38%	11/46%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46/54%	38/44%	69/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/44%	11/28%	27/68%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/25%	2/50%
	English Language Learners	10/43%	7/29%	16/67%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62/67%	60/66%	62/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/71%	31/63%	35/69%
	Students With Disabilities	3/23%	3/23%	6/46%
	English Language Learners	14/64%	13/52%	14/54%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51/55%	45/49%	67/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/49%	22/45%	26/52%
	Students With Disabilities	4/31%	1/8%	3/25%
	English Language Learners	11/50%	9/36%	10/40%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/64%	57/59%	60/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/51%	19/41%	21/45%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/11%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	17/55%	12/40%	14/47%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55/57%	52/54%	59/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/47%	19/41%	23/49%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/11%
	English Language Learners	12/39%	13/43%	10/33%
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/77%	62/77%	66/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/74%	27/69%	29/73%
	Students With Disabilities	3/38%	3/43%	2/29%
	English Language Learners	16/64%	15/58%	18/69%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/49%	54/67%	59/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/42%	24/62%	27/68%
	Students With Disabilities	2/25%	4/57%	2/29%
	English Language Learners	12/48%	16/62%	16/62%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/77%	68/84%	80/93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/76%	32/82%	38/95%
	Students With Disabilities	2/25%	4/57%	6/86%
	English Language Learners	18/72%	20/77%	23/88%



Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/70%	47/53%	55/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/76%	24/53%	27/59%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/8%	1/7%
	English Language Learners	16/70%	11/46%	12/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/42%	43/48%	45/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/43%	21/47%	25/54%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	12/52%	15/63%	15/63%
Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a

## 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	18	63	65	30	47	40					
ELL	56	70	54	59	64	64	67				
BLK	18			20							
HSP	64	72	50	63	57	50	69				
WHT	61	74		68	77		84				
FRL	58	73	55	59	59	47	72				
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
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

**ESSA Data Review**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	19
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	73
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	59
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?

71% of our ESE students did not make proficiency in grades 1-6 on the NWEA ELA Spring Assessment.

79% of our ESE students did not make proficiency in grades 1-6 on the NWEA Math Spring Assessment.

65% of our 6th grade students did not make proficiency on the grade 6 Math FSA.

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

ESE proficiency in grades 1-6 in both ELA and Math are the areas of greatest need for improvement.

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

We are working to close the achievement gap with our ESE subgroup through the co-teaching model, researched-based interventions, and before and after school tutoring.

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

The 2020-2021 school year was the first year as a new school. Therefore there is no data to compare to show improvement.

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

The 2020-2021 school year was the first year as a new school. Therefore there is no data to compare to show improvement.

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

Our elementary students in grades K-5 will participate in ESTEM instruction and project-based learning opportunities to accelerate learning. Our middle school, 6-8 students will be accelerated through course placement and SOAR enrichment groups.

**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.**

Teachers and leaders at the school will participate in Equity/Warm Demand training, BEST standards training and ESTEM/project based learning professional development.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability include, lead team meetings, stocktake meetings, classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback, progress monitoring and data chats and side-by-side coaching.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership team.</p> <p>Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities.</p> <p>It was found that through the Insight Survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2020-2021 Opportunities to pursue leadership roles 18%. We will increase opportunities to pursue leadership roles in by 10%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This area of focus will be monitored through the 2021-2022 insight survey data and qualitative data collection with grade level teams.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Increase teachers leadership roles within the school. Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.</p> <p>Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students-and what they themselves---need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school---improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they can coach each other, learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas. This team dynamic---in which everyone plays a role and is valued---provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019).</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	

**Action Steps to Implement**

Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down---towards conducting experiments (such as small, 30-day projects), using pattern recognition, and execution by the whole.

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day toward goals.

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrators. Both are equally valuable and necessary especially with leadership teams.

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

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

Given the 2020-2021 school data finding that 63% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The outcome for 2021- 2022 is to increase math proficiency by 5%

**Monitoring:**

This Area of Focus will be monitored using common formative assessments and NWEA Map testing throughout the year .

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect o student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010).

**Action Steps to Implement**

Instructional coach will teach high impact mathematical strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons to provide quality tier 1 instruction.

**Person****Responsible**

Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will utilize district created curriculum unit plans for equitable, quality education for all students.

**Person****Responsible**

Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Teachers will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including making connections between concrete, representational, and abstract representations in their work.

**Person****Responsible**

Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional coaches will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non-proficient in mathematics based on a variety of formative and summative assessments. In addition, accelerated courses will be offered to students to extend their learning.

**Person****Responsible**

Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional stakeholders will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of learning.

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques, supported by quality feedback and the ability to self-assess progress related to learning outcomes.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will utilize formative assessments regularly to monitor student learning and provide feedback.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)



**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2020-2021 school data, ELA proficiency was a 61%, which is above the state average of 52%. The district average is 45%, however the goal is to increase the overall proficiency by 5% to 66% while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for the 2020-2021 is increase ELA proficiency by 5%.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored through the use of common formative assessments, NSGRA, and NWEA Map testing throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has great effect on student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented can effectively double the speed of learning (William, 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

**Action Steps to Implement**

All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

**Person Responsible:** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.

**Person Responsible:** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered.

**Person Responsible:** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional will be differentiated with varied, research-based strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of instructional text through classroom experiences and other professional development.

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans.

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Kindergarten, First Grade, and Second Grade Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development.

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 and Tier 2 students engage in 20 minutes on Lexia Core 5 one day per week during station rotation.

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

T3 students engage in 20 minutes on Lexia Core 5 two days per week during station rotation.

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

RISE reading for Tier 2

Pre-Teaching strategies for Tier 2

**Person Responsible** Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ESSA data showed in 2020-2021 had one sub group below the ESSA level of 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	ESSA Data for 2020-2021 ESE in ELA 29%, and in Math 21% will increase in the 2021-2022 to the above 41% in this sub group
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This area of focus will be monitored through the use of common formative assessments, NWEA Map testing, MTSS meetings and data chats throughout the year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will differentiate instruction to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Content - the information and skills that students need to learn Process - how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers, that share common planning will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will work on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses on instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies, and ESE support strategies.

**Person Responsible** Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1, 2, & 3.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring that students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Reid (nicole.reid@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions, mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges, and habits, such as coming to class prepared.

**Measurable Outcome:** 2020-2021 SEL Climate Survey showed 38% answered favorable for school belonging. In 2021-2022 this question will be increased by 10%.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored through the Panorama Survey data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sonia Garcia (sonia.garcia@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and passions.

**Person Responsible** Sonia Garcia (sonia.garcia@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging.

**Person Responsible** Robert Haynes (robert.haynes@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will increase student input and voice through reflection and planning activities.

**Person Responsible** Robert Haynes (robert.haynes@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.

**Person Responsible** Robert Haynes (robert.haynes@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will integrate SEL strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities.

**Person Responsible** Erika Booth (erika.booth@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching-collaborative learning.

**Person Responsible** Erika Booth (erika.booth@osceolaschools.net)

School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.

**Person Responsible** Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and a schoolwide plan will be developed

**Person Responsible** Sonia Garcia (sonia.garcia@osceolaschools.net)

The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.

**Person Responsible** Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Science education cultivates students' scientific habits of mind, develops their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teaches students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs, inquiry lessons and experiments. Science is well-suited to children of all ages. It's highly engaging and interactive. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children. Given the 2020-2021 school data finding that 75% of students were proficient in science, productive actions are necessary to sustain the goal of ensuring higher levels of science achievement for all students.
---	--

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for 2021- 2022 is to increase science proficiency by 2%.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored through the use of common formative assessments and NWEA Map testing throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in context that give facts, meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives and provide opportunities for solving complex inquiry-based questions while utilizing hands-on experimentation and problem-based learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/ minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002).

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs where formative achievement data is analyzed, and instructional decisions are made to either remediate or enrich.

**Person Responsible** Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers utilize district provided curriculum unit plans to guide instruction and ensure equitable tier 1 instruction is occurring and all students have access to high quality instruction.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will participate in professional development that highlights AVID strategies including WICOR, structured notetaking and use of an interactive notebook.

**Person Responsible** Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will engage students using Kagan strategies that emphasize collaboration and accountability for their learning.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional coach will provide learning opportunities for teachers to learn and then implement standards-based stations which include differentiated instruction as well as instructional strategies that will increase classroom engagement and rigor.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying science practices.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional coaches will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in science or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non-proficient in science based on a variety of formative and summative assessments. In addition, accelerated courses will be offered to students to extend their learning.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will provide Tier 2 and 3 instruction based on grade level standards, student data, collaborative planning, and continued data analysis.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Woollet (jennifer.woollet@osceolaschools.net)

### 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.

**Not applicable in 2020-2021**

## 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.

The school will engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for



implementing any changes. CCK8 frequently communicates high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building.

For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data.
- Student work is displayed throughout school.
- All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created.

Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out of-school suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what is working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school is in the process of establishing an infrastructure to support family engagement, and a decision-making SAC council. The school will reach out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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

The stakeholders that are involved in promoting a positive culture and environment are, the administrators, instructional coaches, the dean, guidance counselors, teachers, staff, parents and community members.

## **Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00



3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00