**School District of Osceola County, FL** 

# **Celebration K 8**



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            | 22 |
| Positive Culture & Environment      | 32 |
| FOSILIVE GUILLITE & ETIVITOTITIETIL | 32 |
| Budget to Support Goals             | 0  |

## **Celebration K 8**

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

## **Demographics**

Principal: Gary Weeden

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | No   |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 39%  |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: A (81%)<br>2017-18: A (77%)<br>2016-17: A (80%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | rmation*   |
| SI Region   | Central  |
| Regional Executive Director   | Lucinda Thompson   |
| 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 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **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       | 22 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

## Celebration K 8

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID I |          | 2020-21 Title I School | l Disadvan | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Combination S<br>KG-8             | School   | No                     |            | 29%  |  |  |  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I     |          | Charter School         | (Reporte   | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |  |  |  |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation | No                     |            | 54%  |  |  |  |
| School Grades Histo               | ory      |                        |            |  |  |  |  |
| Year                              | 2020-21  | 2019-20                | 2018-19    | 2017-18  |  |  |  |
| Grade                             |          | A                      | A          | A  |  |  |  |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

Celebration K-8 School will educate each student to his/her highest potential.

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

Celebration K-8 School will be a nationally recognized, top performing school in the state. (#1)

## 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| McMahon,<br>Rhonda   | Principal              | Instructional leader for the school. Works with the stakeholders through community outreach and several committees including SAC.  |
| Pollzzie,<br>Rose    | Assistant<br>Principal | Assistant principal serving grades 4,5 and selections of Middle School. Member of the schools Stocktake committee that analyzes and evaluates data to drive targeted, research based instructional practices.  |
| Jones,<br>Deborah    | Assistant<br>Principal | Serves as Assistant Principal for grades K-4. Member of the school's Stocktake committee that analyzes and evaluates data to drive targeted, research-based instructional practices. Monitors formative reading structures in the early elementary grades.         |
| Kanner,<br>Denise    | Math<br>Coach          | Ms. Kanner serves as the math Coach for grades K-8. She works with teachers to analyze data to help drive their instruction. She coaches teachers on using best practices and high-yield strategies to engage all learners.  |
| Western ,<br>Brandon | Dean                   | Mr. Western serves as Dean for grades 6-8. He coordinates the school's NWEA testing. Mr. Western also assists with our PBIS program designed to reinforce positive student choices and decision-making.  |
| Howe,<br>Jane        | School<br>Counselor    | Ms. Howe works with students to address SEL concerns as well as plans for post Middle School. She participates in Stocktakes and works with the other guidance counselors to determine the SEL needs and resources for our population.                             |
| Baez,<br>Marie       | School<br>Counselor    | Ms. Baez works with students to address SEL concerns as well as plans for post-Middle School. She participates in Stocktakes and works with the other guidance counselors to determine the SEL needs and resources for our population.                             |
| DeSimone,<br>Anna    | Dean                   | Serves as Dean for grades K-5. Serves as testing coordinator and assists with our PBIS program designed to reinforce positive student choices and decision-making.   |
| Carter,<br>Bridget   | Staffing<br>Specialist | Ms. Carter serves as compliance and staffing specialist for our ESE program. She monitors services and data collection for our students with special needs and ensures communication with parents of ESE students is timely and productive.                        |
| Martino,<br>Jannine  | School<br>Counselor    | Ms. Martino works with students to address SEL concerns as well as serving as PBIS coordinator for the elementary grades. She participates in Stocktakes and works with the other guidance counselors to determine the SEL needs and resources for our population. |

| Name                  | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Croft,<br>Hannah      | School<br>Counselor    | Ms. Croft works with students to address SEL concerns as well as plans for K-2 support. She participates in Stocktakes and works with the other guidance counselors to determine the SEL needs and resources for our population. |
| Connolly,<br>Elisa    | Assistant<br>Principal | Assistant principal serving Middle School. Member of the school's Stocktake committee that analyzes and evaluates data to drive targeted, research-based instructional practices.  |
| Whitbread,<br>Natasha | Dean                   | Serves as Dean for grades 6-8. Coordinates the school's MTSS/RTI process. Assists with our PBIS program designed to reinforce positive student choices and decision-making.  |

## **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Gary Weeden

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.

11

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.

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

95

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,739

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

8

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

**Demographic Data** 

## **Early Warning Systems**

2021-22

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| illuicator   | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 135         | 137 | 134 | 167 | 167 | 181 | 251 | 300 | 267 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1739  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 7   | 11  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 7   | 7   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 16  | 26  | 28  | 46  | 45  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 217   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 26  | 14  | 26  | 44  | 44  | 46  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 200   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 26  | 28  | 46  | 45  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 201   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| illuicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2 | 2           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

## Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| illulcator                                | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 107         | 125 | 152 | 149 | 158 | 168 | 214 | 193 | 180 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1446  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 5           | 16  | 10  | 7   | 6   | 14  | 12  | 9   | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

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

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2 | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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                                 |     |     |     |     | G   | rade | Leve | I   |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | K   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    | 6    | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 107 | 125 | 152 | 149 | 158 | 168  | 214  | 193 | 180 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1446  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 5   | 16  | 10  | 7   | 6   | 14   | 12   | 9   | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0    | 0    | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

## The number of students identified as retainees:

| la dia atau                         |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0   | 0    | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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).

| Sobool Grade Component      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 80%    | 56%      | 61%   | 79%    | 58%      | 60%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 72%    | 57%      | 59%   | 69%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 60%    | 55%      | 54%   | 60%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 86%    | 52%      | 62%   | 81%    | 52%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 82%    | 55%      | 59%   | 73%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 75%    | 49%      | 52%   | 67%    | 50%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 82%    | 49%      | 56%   | 82%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 93%    | 75%      | 78%   | 94%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 77%    | 51%      | 26%                               | 58%   | 19%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 71%    | 51%      | 20%                               | 58%   | 13%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -77%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 80%    | 48%      | 32%                               | 56%   | 24%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -71%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 76%    | 48%      | 28%                               | 54%   | 22%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -80%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 82%    | 47%      | 35%                               | 52%   | 30%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -76%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 76%    | 49%      | 27%                               | 56%   | 20%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -82%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | 1                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 76%    | 54%      | 22%                               | 62%   | 14%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 76%    | 53%      | 23%                               | 64%   | 12%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -76%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 78%    | 48%      | 30%                               | 60%   | 18%                            |

|            |          |        | MATH     | ł                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -76%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 91%    | 45%      | 46%                               | 55%   | 36%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -78%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 70%    | 30%      | 40%                               | 54%   | 16%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -91%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 92%    | 47%      | 45%                               | 46%   | 46%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -70%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIENC   | E                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 78%    | 45%      | 33%                               | 53%   | 25%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 75%    | 42%      | 33%                               | 48%   | 27%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -78%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 100%   | 62%      | 38%                         | 67%   | 33%                      |
|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 94%    | 73%      | 21%                         | 71%   | 23%                      |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGEE    | RA EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 100%   | 49%      | 51%                         | 61%   | 39%                      |

|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 100%   | 44%      | 56%                         | 57%   | 43%                      |

## **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

NWEA Progress Monitoring Tool

|                          |                              | Grade 1 |        |        |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 75%     | 66%    | 75%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 67%     | 50%    | 64%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 40%     | 67%    | 11%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 46%     | 40%    | 56%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 75%     | 64%    | 69%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 69%     | 59%    | 62%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 90%     | 56%    | 33%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 46%     | 47%    | 75%    |

|                          |   | Grade 2                          |   |                            |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                             | Winter                                    | Spring                     |
|                          | All Students  | 66%                              | 66%                                       | 77%                        |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged  | 46%                              | 46%                                       | 63%                        |
|                          | Students With Disabilities  | 27%                              | 25%                                       | 46%                        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 47%                              | 42%                                       | 59%                        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                             | Winter                                    | Spring                     |
|                          | All Students  | 63%                              | 59%                                       | 65%                        |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged  | 53%                              | 44%                                       | 55%                        |
|                          | Students With Disabilities  | 17%                              | 8%  | 15%                        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 36%                              | 43%                                       | 47%                        |
|                          |   | Grade 3                          |   |                            |
|                          |   | Grade 3                          |   |                            |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                             | Winter                                    | Spring                     |
|                          | Proficiency All Students  |                                  | Winter<br>70%                             | Spring<br>70%              |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged   | Fall                             |   |                            |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities   | Fall<br>74%                      | 70%                                       | 70%                        |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With   | Fall<br>74%<br>74%               | 70%<br>67%                                | 70%<br>62%                 |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities  English Language   | Fall<br>74%<br>74%<br>13%        | 70%<br>67%<br>38%                         | 70%<br>62%<br>19%          |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students                           | Fall<br>74%<br>74%<br>13%<br>60% | 70%<br>67%<br>38%<br>58%                  | 70%<br>62%<br>19%<br>63%   |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 74% 74% 13% 60% Fall        | 70%<br>67%<br>38%<br>58%<br>Winter        | 70% 62% 19% 63% Spring     |
| Arts                     | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically              | Fall 74% 74% 13% 60% Fall 64%    | 70%<br>67%<br>38%<br>58%<br>Winter<br>63% | 70% 62% 19% 63% Spring 73% |

|                          |  | Grade 4 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                             | 80%     | 72%    | 70%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged               | 75%     | 65%    | 71%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 27%     | 25%    | 8%     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 71%     | 57%    | 60%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                             | 74%     | 70%    | 75%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged               | 68%     | 61%    | 76%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 14%     | 7%     | 15%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 66%     | 60%    | 60%    |
|                          |  | Grade 5 |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                             | 69%     | 69%    | 72%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged               | 63%     | 53%    | 58%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 38%     | 42%    | 42%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 52%     | 64%    | 57%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                             | 63%     | 54%    | 70%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 46%     | 41%    | 55%    |
|                          | Disabilities                             | 15%     | 17%    | 25%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 60%     | 37%    | 63%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                             | 73%     | 72%    | 78%    |
| Science                  | Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 69%     | 61%    | 73%    |
|                          | Disabilities                             | 54%     | 36%    | 42%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 58%     | 62%    | 69%    |

|                          |  | Grade 6 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 65%     | 67%    | 65%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 69%     | 63%    | 56%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 18%     | 20%    | 31%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 50%     | 56%    | 57%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 61%     | 63%    | 63%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 58%     | 60%    | 57%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 17%     | 13%    | 19%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 54%     | 55%    | 50%    |
|                          |  | Grade 7 |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 68%     | 68%    | 74%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 72%     | 56%    | 67%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 45%     | 8%     | 21%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 53%     | 49%    | 62%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 60%     | 63%    | 66%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 62%     | 52%    | 53%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 14%     | 23%    | 13%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 44%     | 43%    | 45%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Civics                   | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |         |        |        |

|                          |                              | Grade 8 |        |        |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 71%     | 69%    | 68%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 58%     | 53%    | 53%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 0%      | 20%    | 20%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 43%     | 46%    | 45%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 58%     | 73%    | 70%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 47%     | 53%    | 55%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 40%     | 17%    | 20%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 46%     | 58%    | 55%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 79%     | 77%    | 76%    |
| Science                  | Economically Disadvantaged   | 70%     | 52%    | 53%    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 50%     | 33%    | 30%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 70%     | 56%    | 61%    |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 27          | 55        | 48                | 36           | 52         | 39                 | 23          | 46         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 64          | 75        | 74                | 67           | 65         | 66                 | 60          | 80         | 78           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 85          | 91        |                   | 83           | 57         |                    | 78          | 100        | 91           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 44          | 57        |                   | 44           | 52         |                    | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 67          | 68        | 59                | 64           | 58         | 56                 | 64          | 85         | 77           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 88          | 90        |                   | 74           | 55         |                    | 60          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 78          | 71        | 62                | 78           | 64         | 56                 | 84          | 97         | 89           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 61          | 65        | 51                | 60           | 53         | 42                 | 52          | 75         | 69           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 33          | 37        | 34                | 46           | 62         | 66                 | 35          | 53         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 67          | 69        | 59                | 82           | 81         | 79                 | 64          | 78         | 100          |                         |                           |

|                          |                            | 2019                       | SCHO              | OL GRAD                    | E COMF                     | ONENT              | S BY SI                    | JBGRO          | UPS          |                         |                           |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                | ELA<br>Ach.                | ELA<br>LG                  | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach.               | Math<br>LG                 | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach.                | SS<br>Ach.     | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| ASN                      | 87                         | 78                         |                   | 98                         | 86                         |                    | 90                         | 92             | 100          |                         |                           |
| BLK                      | 48                         | 58                         | 50                | 58                         | 65                         | 65                 | 50                         |                |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                      | 75                         | 71                         | 58                | 84                         | 80                         | 77                 | 79                         | 90             | 100          |                         |                           |
| MUL                      | 84                         | 70                         |                   | 87                         | 86                         |                    |                            |                |              |                         |                           |
| WHT                      | 84                         | 72                         | 65                | 88                         | 83                         | 76                 | 84                         | 97             | 97           |                         |                           |
| FRL                      | 74                         | 69                         | 59                | 77                         | 79                         | 73                 | 67                         | 83             | 100          |                         |                           |
|                          |                            | 2018                       | SCHO              | OL GRAD                    | E COMF                     | ONENT              | S BY SI                    | JBGRO          | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                | ELA                        | ELA                        | ELA<br>LG         | Math                       | Math                       | Math<br>LG         | Sci                        | SS             | MS           | Grad                    | C & C<br>Accel            |
|                          | Ach.                       | LG                         | L25%              | Ach.                       | LG                         | L25%               | Ach.                       | Ach.           | Accel.       | Rate 2016-17            | 1                         |
| SWD                      | 33                         | <b>LG</b> 48               | 1                 | <b>Ach.</b> 42             | <b>LG</b> 54               | I                  | <b>Ach.</b> 58             | <b>Ach.</b> 47 | Accel.       |                         | 1                         |
| SWD<br>ELL               |                            |                            | L25%              |                            |                            | L25%               |                            |                | Accel.       |                         | 1                         |
|                          | 33                         | 48                         | <b>L25%</b> 45    | 42                         | 54                         | <b>L25%</b> 53     | 58                         | 47             |              |                         | 1                         |
| ELL                      | 33<br>60                   | 48<br>71                   | <b>L25%</b> 45    | 42<br>64                   | 54<br>70                   | <b>L25%</b> 53     | 58<br>62                   | 47             |              |                         | 1                         |
| ELL<br>ASN               | 33<br>60<br>87             | 48<br>71<br>72             | <b>L25%</b> 45    | 42<br>64<br>91             | 54<br>70<br>86             | <b>L25%</b> 53     | 58<br>62<br>79             | 47             |              |                         | 1                         |
| ELL<br>ASN<br>BLK        | 33<br>60<br>87<br>61       | 48<br>71<br>72<br>61       | <b>L25%</b> 45 64 | 42<br>64<br>91<br>52       | 54<br>70<br>86<br>52       | <b>L25%</b> 53 56  | 58<br>62<br>79<br>60       | 47<br>100      | 80           |                         | 1                         |
| ELL<br>ASN<br>BLK<br>HSP | 33<br>60<br>87<br>61<br>74 | 48<br>71<br>72<br>61<br>71 | 45<br>64<br>69    | 42<br>64<br>91<br>52<br>75 | 54<br>70<br>86<br>52<br>70 | <b>L25%</b> 53 56  | 58<br>62<br>79<br>60<br>73 | 47<br>100      | 80           |                         | 1                         |

## **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  | 71  |
| 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 | 70  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 709 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 97% |

## **Subgroup Data**

| Students With Disabilities  |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 39  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% |     |

| English Language Learners  |          |
|--|----------|
| English Language Learners  Foderal Index - English Language Learners   | 70       |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners  English Language Learners Subgroup Bolow 41% in the Current Year? | 70       |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO       |
| 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   | 84       |
| 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  | 43       |
| 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   | 73       |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | NO       |
| 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%                                     | 1        |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%  White Students                     |          |
|  | 75       |
| White Students   | 75<br>NO |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 58 |
| 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?

Consistently on the progress monitoring tool, students performed lower on the second diagnostic test than the first; however, on the third assessment students improved at a higher rate.

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

Students with disabilities were consistently performing below proficiency in all grade levels.

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

In our self-contained access points classrooms, we had two new teachers. Additionally, 50% of the students were digital learners last year. Teachers did not have the same support with curriculum or instruction last year. Many students with disabilities in the general education classroom were also digital. Accessing the curriculum using a new technology platform with no support at home proved difficult. VE teachers were juggling between providing both online and face-to-face services.

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

In both ELA and Math NWEA progress monitoring, students dropped in proficiency on the winter assessment and improved to their highest proficiency on the Spring and final assessment.

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

The majority of students returned to face-to-face learning and we saw a decreased number of students being quarantined. Celebration K8 offered before school and afterschool tutoring for the second semester. Targeted interventions were occurring in both Triple I and during middle school intervention time targeted all learners but there was a particular focus on Tier 3 students.

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

Teachers will implement AVID strategies school-wide to engage students in writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and rigor. Additionally, Kagan structures will be implemented to increase engagement and collaboration. Teachers will engage in collaborative planning and PLCs where they will participate in data analysis to drive instruction. Ongoing professional development in writing instruction and Open Court phonological awareness.

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.

Ongoing professional development in writing instruction and Open Court phonological awareness. Teachers will receive training on the new Florida BEST standards and how to plan highly effective lessons with an emphasis on strengthening Tier 1 instruction. Ongoing training in how to set up, implement and deliver Guided Reading instruction, small group instruction in mathematics, and differentiation across content areas.

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

To ensure sustainable improvement, the school's leadership team will participate in monthly Stocktake meetings to review progress monitoring data and address areas of concern or areas of success. Coaches will meet with subject areas and provide ongoing support. Administrators will utilize a data collection tool to analyze trends in teaching and learning school-wide.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:** 

#### #1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The leadership team maintains a focus on student achievement and a focus on improving teaching practices. The leadership team consists of the principal, assistant principals, instructional coaches, deans, school counselors, and teacher leaders. Celebration K8's leadership team consists of six new members this year. It is important the team members understand their roles in building teaching capacity and providing support to increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Celebration K8 will see a 50% increase in leadership team members participating in monthly MTSS data meetings. We will increase the number of teachers who feel they were identified to pursue leadership opportunities to 25%.

During the monthly Stocktake meeting, leadership team members will be prepared with data and completed responsibilities. Information will be collected and reviewed in the Celebration Leadership Teams folder.

Person responsible for

monitoring

**Monitoring:** 

Rhonda McMahon (rhonda.mcmahon@osceolaschools.net)

outcome: Evidencebased

Strategy:

Include teacher leaders in observing and participating in different roles throughout the school. Teachers will be able to see a bigger picture of the school as a whole versus their individual classroom. Encourage more teachers to begin their their graduate coursework to attain degrees in Educational Leadership by exposing them to what different roles offer.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

Increase the number of teacher leaders at Celebration K8 to be both mentors and decision-makers. By providing opportunities for interested parties to shadow current leadership team members, teachers will understand the complexities of managing a school while focusing on student achievement.

### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Level Leadership Development - Only 12% of teachers felt that they were identified to pursue leadership opportunities.

Person Responsible

Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

Conduct monthly Stocktake meetings with a review of data and action steps. Invite teacher leaders to observe and participate. Invite aspiring leaders to attend the district's aspiring leader program. Have monthly preparing new leaders meetings beginning in the second semester.

Person
Responsible Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

Data Disaggregation and Monitoring - Review NWEA data and district assessment data through School City to highlight areas of need and success. Work with teacher leaders to build strategies to address targeted strategies to meet student needs. Twenty-six percent of teachers indicated that school leaders regularly review student work from their classes. Administrators will meet regularly with PLCs to participate in data reviews using student work.

Person Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher targeted feedback - According to our 2020-2021 Insight survey, 46% of teachers indicated that they would like to receive more support to make recommended changes 46% and 42% stated they would like more follow-up on recommended feedback. Administration and Coaches will work collaboratively to

provide detailed responses to instruction and follow-up feedback after the new implementation of strategies.

Person Responsible

Rhonda McMahon (rhonda.mcmahon@osceolaschools.net)

NEST - Non-evaluative school trend instrument. Administrators will complete five walkthrough observations per week to track tends in instructions to observe what instructional strategies and practices teachers are using or not using.

Person Responsible

Rhonda McMahon (rhonda.mcmahon@osceolaschools.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of

Focus
Description
and

Continued improvement among students in ELA is essential to maintaining high standards of learning. We saw a drop in proficiency among 4th grade students in this area. The schools overall achievement in ELA dropped seven percentage points from 2019.

Rationale: Measurable

Overall, Celebration K8 should see a 5% increase in proficiency in ELA. Economically

Outcome: disadvantaged students should see an increase of 5% points in proficiency.

Teachers will administer the NWEA three times a year and data will be reviewed by

Monitoring: teachers and the leadership team to track progress toward the goal. Additionally, students

will complete ORF testing and Diebels testing which will provide data to teachers.

Person responsible

for Deborah Jones (deborah.jones@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based
Strategy:

Teachers will focus on standards aligned instruction while implementing AVID strategies including Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Rigor daily in their classroom instruction. WICOR strategies will be implemented in all curriculum areas. Use NWEA data

to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier1 instruction

Rationale

for Evidencebased District-wide teachers will implement WICOR in their classrooms. District official have provided teachers with numerous trainings to prepare them to build these strategies into their instruction develop reteaching plans, lesson Study to identify a problem of practice, plan, execute, and evaluate to refine teaching practice, continue to build PLC capacity to

**Strategy:** move along PLC stages

## **Action Steps to Implement**

Collaborative planning- Professional learning communities- Teachers in each grade level and/ or subject area will have common planning times. Additionally, teachers will have Wednesday afternoons to meet with their professional learning communities where they will create common assessments, review data, and work to implement appropriate teaching strategies to have the highest student achievement.

Person Responsible

Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation- Through the PLC process and review of data, teachers will plan to differentiate their instruction based on student needs. While working collaboratively, teachers will focus on specific subgroups to bring about the greatest change in student achievement including ELL teaching strategies.

Person Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching- The literacy coach will work with each teacher team to ensure the new curriculum is understandable and that the Curriculum Unit Plan is followed with efficacy. The Coach can help teachers with classroom strategies and serve as a mentor when teachers struggle with a particular concept. Coaches also offer support and follow-up information to teachers after professional development training to ensure we have PD to practice.

Person Responsible

Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning - Teachers will continue to participate in professional learning opportunities offered both at the school and through the district. Focused trainings will include AVID strategies training and Kagan structures training. Teachers will also be trained on the new standards and the corresponding curriculum being implemented.

# Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Small group learning - Teachers will utilize the concepts acquired in professional learning to implement effective, differentiated small group lessons to enhance student learning. The collaborative groups will focus on AVID structures.

## Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Standards-aligned instruction- Teachers will utilize the curriculum plans which have been designed to strictly adhere to the Florida Best standards. Teachers will receive professional learning opportunities concentrating on the new standards.

# Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 - Celebration K8 teachers will focus on building rigorous Tier 1 instruction utilizing the AVID strategies. By utilizing the Curriculum Unit Plans which have engagement strategies built in, teachers will keep students engaged in the instruction.

# Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 2 and 3 instruction - all teachers will participate in monthly MTSS meetings focused on the data concerning Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and their leveled instruction. ELA and Math Tier 2 and 3 students will receive specific interventions during the school's PRIDE period. Teachers will maintain a data binder for each student in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

# Person Responsible Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

#### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Celebration will maintain a focus on high achievement in mathematics. Fourth grade math students saw a decrease in performance on the NWEA and the FSA. Additionally, with the addition of more students in middle school, we saw an increase in the number of students taking Pre-Algebra versus Algebra. Math achievement schoolwide dropped 14 percentage points from 2019. Additionally, mathematics learning gains sharply decreased from 82 to 61. Math lowest quartile decreased 21 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

Overall, Celebration K8 expects to see an increase in proficiency of 5%. We expect learning gains to increase by 5% points and our lowest quartile to increase to 60%.

Teachers will administer the NWEA three times a year and data will be reviewed by teachers and the leadership team to track progress toward the goal. Math teachers will a

**Monitoring:** 

teachers and the leadership team to track progress toward the goal. Math teachers will also administer quarterly district formative assessments to track students progress toward mastery of the standards.

Person responsible for

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

Strategy:

based

Teachers will focus on standards aligned instruction while implementing AVID strategies including Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Rigor daily in their classroom instruction. WICOR strategies will be implemented in all curriculum areas. Utilize Marzano high yield, research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction and analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students.

Rationale for Evidencebased

Strategy:

District-wide teachers will implement WICOR in their classrooms. District officials have provided teachers with numerous trainings to prepare them to build these strategies into their instruction. Enhancing our overall Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction to meet the needs of individual students to fill in gaps in learning.

## **Action Steps to Implement**

Collaborative planning - Professional learning communities - Teachers in each grade level and/or subject area will have common planning times. Additionally, teachers will have Wednesday afternoons to meet with their professional learning communities where they will create common assessments, review data, and work to implement appropriate teaching strategies to have the highest student achievement.

Person Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation - Through the PLC process and review of data, teachers will plan to differentiate their instruction based on student needs. While working collaboratively, teachers will focus on specific subgroups to bring about the greatest change in student achievement including ELL teaching strategies.

Person Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching - The math coach will work with each teacher team to ensure the new curriculum is understandable and that the curriculum unit plan is followed with efficacy. Instructional Coaching - help teachers develop a repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction

Person Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning - Teachers will continue to participate in professional learning opportunities offered both at the school and through the district. Focus of trainings will include AVID strategies training and

Kagan structures training. Teachers will also have trainings focused on the new standards and the curriculum being implemented.

Person Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Small group learning - Teachers will utilize the concepts acquired in professional learning to build high functioning small groups to enhance student learning. The collaborative groups will focus on AVID structures.

Person

Responsible Rose Polizz

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

Standards-aligned instruction- Teachers will utilize the curriculum plans which have been designed to strictly adhere to the Florida Best standards. Teachers will receive professional learning opportunities concentrating on the new standards.

Person Responsible

Rhonda McMahon (rhonda.mcmahon@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 - Celebration K8 teachers will focus on building rigorous Tier 1 instruction utilizing the AVID strategies. By utilizing the Curriculum Unit Plans which have engagement strategies built in, teachers will keep students engaged in the instruction.

Person

Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 2 and 3 instruction - all teachers will participate in monthly MTSS meetings and discussions surrounding the data concerning Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and their leveled instruction. ELA and Math Tier 2 and 3 students will receive specific interventions during the school's PRIDE period. Teachers will maintain a data binder for each student in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Person Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

## #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Celebration K8 will focus on increasing science achievement by utilizing standards-aligned instruction in a student-centered classroom especially in 8th grade courses. Last year, all areas of 8th grade science decreased including all subgroups identified by ESSA. Science overall achievement dropped from 82 to 74%.

Measurable Outcome:

Celebration K8 will increase student proficiency on the FSA Science assessment by 5% points. Additionally, each subgroup performance will increase by 5% points. Overall achievement should be 79% in 2022.

Science area of focus will be monitored by district assessments administered quarterly and through the NWEA assessment administered three times a year. Classroom observations and walk-throughs will be conducted by administrators and coaches. Data will be reviewed in Stocktake meetings throughout the year.

Person responsible for

monitoring

**Monitoring:** 

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

outcome: Evidence-

based

Teachers will focus on standards-aligned instruction while implementing AVID strategies including Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Rigor daily in their classroom instruction. WICOR strategies will be implemented in all curriculum areas.

Strategy: Rationale

**for** District-wide teachers will implement WICOR in their classrooms. District official have **Evidence-** provided teachers with numerous trainings to prepare them to build these strategies into their instruction.

based Strategy:

## **Action Steps to Implement**

Collaborative Planning in Professional Learning Communities - Teachers in each grade level and/or subject area will have common planning times. Additionally, teachers will have Wednesday afternoons to meet with their professional learning communities where they will create common assessments, review data, and work to implement appropriate teaching strategies to have the highest student achievement.

Person
Responsible Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation - Through the PLC process and review of data, teachers will plan to differentiate their instruction based on student needs. While working collaboratively, teachers will focus on specific subgroups to bring about the greatest change in student achievement including ELL teaching strategies.

Person
Responsible
Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching - The math/science coach will work with each teacher team to ensure the new curriculum is understandable and that the curriculum unit plan is followed with efficacy. Coaches also offer support and follow-up information to teachers after professional development training to ensure we have PD to practice. The coach will work with teachers to disaggregate data in PLCs and develop a plan to help students who are struggling with specific instructional content.

Person
Responsible
Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning - Teachers will continue to participate in professional learning opportunities offered both at the school and through the district. Focus of trainings will include AVID strategies training and

Last Modified: 5/4/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 29 of 32

Kagan structures training. Teachers will also have trainings focused on the new standards and the curriculum being implemented.

Person Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Small group learning - Teachers will utilize the concepts acquired in professional learning to build high functioning small groups to enhance student learning. The collaborative groups will focus on AVID structures.

Person

Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Standards-aligned instruction - Teachers will utilize the curriculum plans which have been designed to strictly adhere to the Florida Best standards. Teachers will receive professional learning opportunities concentrating on the new standards.

Person

Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 - Celebration K8 teachers will focus on building rigorous Tier 1 instruction utilizing the AVID strategies. By utilizing the Curriculum Unit Plans which have engagement strategies built in, teachers will keep students engaged in the instruction.

Person

Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 2 and 3 instruction- all teachers will participate in monthly MTSS meeting and discussions surrounding the data concerning Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and their leveled instruction. ELA, Math, and Science tier 2 and 3 students will receive specific interventions during the schools PRIDE period. Teachers will maintain a data binder for each student in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Person Responsible

Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of

Focus
Description
and

Based on NWEA data, students in the ESSA subgroups in 4th grade and 7th grade performed lower than all students in ELA. In order to close the achievement gap, instructional strategies need to be implemented to target these specific subgroups.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Students in each subgroup in 4th and 7th grade should improve by 5% points on the final

NWEA assessment.

Monitoring:

Administrators will monitor the progress in each of these identified areas of need by conducting classroom observations. Instructional coaches and MTSS interventionists will review the data collected through district formative assessments and NWEA. PLCs will discuss data in their respective settings and how to use this data to improve instruction.

Person responsible

for

Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Teachers will focus on standards aligned instruction while implementing AVID strategies including Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Rigor daily in their classroom instruction. WICOR strategies will be implemented in all curriculum areas.

Strategy: Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: Increase the number of teacher leaders at Celebration K8 to be both mentors and decision-makers. By providing opportunities for interested parties to shadow current leadership team members, teachers will understand the complexities of managing a school while focusing

on student achievement.

## **Action Steps to Implement**

Social-emotional learning - Students will receive lessons focusing on SEL that is built into the District's curriculum pacing guides. Additionally, in Pride period students will have access to the curriculum provided by school counselors.

Person Responsible

Jane Howe (jane.howe@osceolaschools.net)

Community and Parent involvement - Throughout the years Celebration K8 has always had a vast amount of involvement from the community. Parents, business partners, and community members participate in the Bookmark Buddies reading program, Doughnuts with Dad, science nights, Fun Run, PTA, and SAC. While the global pandemic has stalled the involvement, we anticipate when parents and staff feel safe, involvement will increase.

Person Responsible

Rhonda McMahon (rhonda.mcmahon@osceolaschools.net)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support- Deans and guidance counselors are collaborating to lead the charge to increase PBIS participation at our school. The PBIS committee meets monthly to review data and discuss areas of focus. While there is a reward system in place for positive behavior, the school is attempting to bring more frequent whole campus rewards to the forefront by offering them one time a quarter as a cumulative experience. The other goal of PBIS is to help shape positive interactions with the more than 200 new middle school students who joined our school this year by offering inclusive events.

Person Responsible

Brandon Western (brandon.western@osceolaschools.net)

## **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Based on the data reported on SafeSchoolsforAlex.org Celebration K8 has very few violent, drug or property incidents. Only 1 incident was reported to law enforcement. This year Celebration K8 will add over 200 new students to its middle school campus through redistricting. To ensure that the school culture remains positive and safe, the leadership team will conduct monthly Stocktake meetings to review disciplinary data and address ongoing concerns.

## 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 district has incorporate SEL lessons throughout all subject areas grades K-12. Students will be teaching these routinely during the school year. Many teachers attended training this summer on AVID culturally relevant classrooms. PBIS will continue to be implemented schoolwide to support students. All staff participated in a Warm Demand training that highlighted the importance of relationships and trust while maintaining high expectations for all.

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

Celebration K8 has an active PTA that works to provide support to teachers and students. The PTA provides teachers with grants and funding for supplies and to attend conferences. The School Advisory Council meets monthly to listen to school and community concerns and offers a forward thinking solutions-based approach to making the school a better place for all. Business partners in the community provide financial support for students and teacher events. Teachers participate in the PBIS program and meet regularly to hear feedback from staff and create plans to better engage all in the positive culture of the school.