School District of Osceola County, FL

Cypress Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 31 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 32 |

Cypress Elementary School

2251 LAKESIDE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Libby Raymond

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2016

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Lucinda Thompson</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fe | or 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.

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 | 19 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 32 |

Cypress Elementary School

2251 LAKESIDE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

| School Type and G (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | 1 Economically staged (FRL) Rate rted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servi (per MSID | • • | Charter School | (Report | 9 Minority Rate ed as Non-white n Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 88% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | В | В | С |

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.

A School of Excellence for all Learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Elementary will provide a comprehensive educational experience that results in student gains in all areas, including social and emotional skills.

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Raymond, Libby | Principal | To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards student success. |
| Nicholson, Randa | Assistant Principal | To ensure all students make gains and achieve their highest level of potential. Through building teams who collaborate and work towards student success. To take ownership of the school's stocktake meetings and ensure all stakeholders know: who, what, when, why and how they are meeting the needs of their specified areas. If areas are not making gains or being accountable, an edit of the stocktake plan for that area will need to be adjusted and monitored closely for positive results. |
| Becerra, Helayne | Reading Coach | Will work with all staff to ensure a literature rich culture cross-curricular for all students. The coach will work to co teach, model and give feedback to all instructional personnel to have a laser focus on meeting the needs of students while hitting the depth of knowledge of the standards. |
| Bernardo, Tiffany | Math Coach | Will work with all staff to ensure a problem solving culture cross curricular for all students. The coach will work with teachers in co teaching, modeling, and giving feedback to all instructional personnel to have a laser focus on meeting the needs of the students wile hitting the depth of knowledge of the standards and increasing discourse. |
| Lewis, Stephanie | Other | Assist in motivating PLC teams to gain a laser focus on closing student gaps and creating steps that align to do so. |
| Duran, Maritza | ELL Compliance Specialist | Will work with students and teachers to utilize ELLevation and ELL strategies to meet the needs of our students and help with achieving learning goals. |
| Kaplan, Danielle | Instructional Coach | Will work with all new teachers and new to Cypress teachers to ensure they develop a good foundation to classroom management and all teaching duties to be successful in the classroom. Assist teachers in their classroom roles and ensure teachers are compliant with their certifications. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/13/2016, Libby Raymond

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.

3

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.

38

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

456

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

6

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 77 | 79 | 75 | 69 | 59 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 438 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 30 | 35 | 30 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gra | ade | 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 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | l | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 53% | 53% | 57% | 50% | 51% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 65% | 56% | 58% | 59% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60% | 51% | 53% | 60% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 54% | 55% | 63% | 53% | 54% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 59% | 62% | 51% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 45% | 51% | 47% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 60% | 49% | 53% | 44% | 51% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| | | | ELA | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 51% | -12% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 51% | 3% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -39% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 48% | 8% | 56% | 0% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -54% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 54% | -8% | 62% | -16% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 64% | -9% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -46% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 60% | -7% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -55% | | | • | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 45% | 13% | 53% | 5% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

All grade levels will be measured by NWEA.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 34/52% | 17/25% | 31/42% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 28/60% | 14/26% | 27/47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/33% | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 20/54% | 8/19% | 15/33% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 35/54% | 19/27% | 34/46% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 27/57% | 17/31% | 26/45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/67% | 3/60% | 1/17% |
| | English Language Learners | 22/59% | 8/19% | 21/47% |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 21/30% | Spring 24/32% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 38/58% | 21/30% | 24/32% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 38/58% 24/57% | 21/30% 11/22% | 24/32% 15/29% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | Fall 38/58% 24/57% 7/41% 21/60% Fall | 21/30% 11/22% 2/10% 11/31% Winter | 24/32% 15/29% 5/25% 10/27% Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 38/58% 24/57% 7/41% 21/60% | 21/30% 11/22% 2/10% 11/31% | 24/32% 15/29% 5/25% 10/27% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 38/58% 24/57% 7/41% 21/60% Fall | 21/30% 11/22% 2/10% 11/31% Winter | 24/32% 15/29% 5/25% 10/27% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 38/58% 24/57% 7/41% 21/60% Fall 37/56% | 21/30% 11/22% 2/10% 11/31% Winter 11/15% | 24/32% 15/29% 5/25% 10/27% Spring 17/23% |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33/63% | 26/43% | 23/37% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 24/65% | 17/43% | 14/33% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/33% | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 12/44% | 6/20% | 4/13% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 32/62% | 14/23% | 19/30% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 24/65% | 9/23% | 11/26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/33% | 1/10% | 1/8% |
| | English Language Learners | 16/59% | 5/17% | 6/19% |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | | 0.0.0.0 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 35/41% | Spring 36/42% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 44/59% | 35/41% | 36/42% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With | Fall 44/59% 23/56% | 35/41% 18/36% | 36/42% 20/40% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 44/59% 23/56% 1/6% | 35/41% 18/36% 2/11% | 36/42% 20/40% 2/11% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 44/59% 23/56% 1/6% 15/41% | 35/41% 18/36% 2/11% 9/22% | 36/42% 20/40% 2/11% 10/24% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 44/59% 23/56% 1/6% 15/41% Fall | 35/41% 18/36% 2/11% 9/22% Winter | 36/42% 20/40% 2/11% 10/24% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 44/59% 23/56% 1/6% 15/41% Fall 39/50% | 35/41% 18/36% 2/11% 9/22% Winter 27/32% | 36/42% 20/40% 2/11% 10/24% Spring 37/44% |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42/46% | 46/47% | 35/34% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 24/42% | 20/33% | 15/25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/24% | 6/33% | 3/15% |
| | English Language Learners | 16/40% | 16/39% | 15/33% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 32/35% | 19/19% | 26/25% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 15/25% | 7/11% | 13/21% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/11% | 2/11% | 3/15% |
| | English Language Learners | 11/28% | 7/17% | 9/20% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 35/43% | 42/43% | 53/52% |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/32% | 23/38% | 25/41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/17% | 6/32% | 8/40% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/37% | 18/44% | 19/42% |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 13 | 26 | 36 | 28 | 46 | 36 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 46 | 38 | 29 | 35 | 23 | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 44 | 55 | 31 | 37 | 38 | 31 | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | 56 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 35 | 56 | 29 | 33 | 28 | 18 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 29 | 67 | 63 | 33 | 56 | 41 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 58 | 65 | 43 | 52 | 38 | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 73 | | 53 | 60 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 66 | 62 | 51 | 56 | 43 | 58 | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| WHT | 46 | 50 | | 75 | 69 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 70 | 66 | 49 | 58 | 48 | 67 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 13 | 35 | 52 | 17 | 45 | 56 | 19 | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 58 | 67 | 37 | 52 | 56 | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 57 | | 48 | 43 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 58 | 60 | 51 | 48 | 49 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 69 | | 70 | 69 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 57 | 61 | 49 | 51 | 46 | 39 | | | | |

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 | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 43 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 319 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 | |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 34 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 |
| 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 | 39 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students | N/A N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students | N/A 53 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A 53 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A 53 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students | N/A 53 NO |

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?

SWD scoring well below the 40th percentile, in English and Math. For the 2020-2021 school year 3rd grade scored the lowest among the grade levels.

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

Based off progress monitoring SWD students scored well below their peers with a 15% comparison to 25% of their peers.

From the 2019 FSA data bottom quartile students had a proficiency of 25%.

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

The majority of the ESE students remaining as digital learners for the year. SWD students also counting as Bottom quartile students and the overall denominator being low.

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

Economically disadvantaged students were higher in both ELA and math when comparing subgroups.

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

We identified all students who fell into subgrouping to ensure they received additional interventions and tutoring programs, as well as their attendance in such.

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

Continue with the strategy above, strong foundation for Tier 1 (coach support, mentors, collaborating with peers). Follow all students pathway to ensure they do not dip academically and provide the appropriate interventions.

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.

AVID, Kagan, Cups, PLCs weekly, collaboration among the grade level

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

Ensure all students who are underachieving are invited to participate in 21st century and tutoring programs offered. Making parents aware of their student's tier process and trajectory. Holding family title nights to give parents resources to help their students close gaps. Hold parent meetings with student, teacher and parents.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

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

Area of

teams.

Focus

Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools.

Description

These teams

and

typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders,.

Rationale:

and other school

leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important

priorities.

It was found through the I n sight survey submitted by teachers that the re was a need for

growth in instructional leadership.

Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2019-2020

Measurable

Opportunities to pursue leadership roles 15% 2020-2021 20%

Outcome: In 2020 20% were able to meet the goal to pursue leadership roles. Our goal for 2021-2022

would be to increase an additional 2%.

Mrs. Raymond will monitor the process through leadership team meetings, encouraging

Monitoring: promoting from within, ensuring teachers are given opportunities to grow and take

leadership roles. Meet with teachers to ensure a pathway for success through the pipeline.

Person responsible

for

Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Increase teachers leadership roles within the school Leadership roles can improve teacher

motivation and

Evidencebased Strategy:

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_

Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students-and what they themselves-need to succeed. If teachers use data to make decisions on improving

Rationale

instruction, leadership teams can ensure that all teachers are focused on the standards and improving learning. Working together, teachers can coach each other and learn from

Evidencebased

Strategy:

for

each other. This will boost morale and make it more likely that teachers become stronger and stay in the profession. The team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice

and data are

expected to help with improvement (Gates Foundation 2019)

Action Steps to Implement

1 Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making

predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down-and towards conducting experiments (such as

small, 30-day projects), using pattern recognition, and execution by the whole.

2 The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period is

intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project

Last Modified: 5/2/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 20 of 32

is

not working.

- 3. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day toward goals_
- 4. Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrator's . Both are equally valuable and necessary, especially with leadership teams.

Person

Responsible

Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Given the 2020-2021 school data finding that only 34% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students. | | | | | | |
| The outcome for 2021-2022 will be to raise the math proficiency by 5%. | | | | | | |
| Tiffany Bernardo (coach) will ensure all Tier 1 instruction for math is following the CUPS and teachers are following the pace guide for instruction. Through co-teach, modeling, and feedback to help teachers close the proficiency gap. | | | | | | |
| Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net) | | | | | | |
| 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 on student achievement. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Rationale for Strategy:

Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and

Evidence-based meeting the diverse needs of individual students. According to Hattie's research, Meta cognitive mathematics instruction which involves multi stepped problem solving, has a

desired effect of 0.69. (Hattie-2009)

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.
- Staff will assist students monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.
- 3. Staff 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

assessments. In addition, advanced students will be offered to students to extend their learning.

- 4. Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that connect to a sequence of learning.
- 5.Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques,

supported be feedback and the ability to self assess progress related to the outcome.

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

Person Responsible

Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Based on the 2020-2021, ELA proficiency 37%. The district average is 47%, however, the goal is to increase to by 15% points, to 52% while focusing on ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, arid FRL students.

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

By the end of the 2021-2022 school year literacy scores on the ELA FSA in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades will increase by five percent (5%) from the 2021-2022 data collected.

Becerra will ensure all Tier 1 instruction for math is following the CUPS and teachers

are following the pace guide for instruction. Through co-teach, modeling, and

feedback to help teachers close the proficiency gap.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Helayne Becerra (helayne.becerra@osceolaschools.net)

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and I meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and

collaborative analysis of formative and

Evidence-based Strategy:

summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all

students, including

those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating

appropriately has a great effect on student achievement

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development

of an achievable,

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

- 1. 100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans.
- 2. Kindergarten Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development.
- 3. First Grade Open Court Implementation of letter/book/print awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding phonics and inflectional endings, fluency rate and accuracy, and vocabulary and language development.
- 4. Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ work analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody, and vocabulary and language development.
- 5. T1 and T2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 1 day/week during station rotation.
- 6. T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation.
- 7. RISE reading for T2
- 8. Pre-Teaching strategies for T2

Person Responsible

Helayne Becerra (helayne.becerra@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

Strengthen collaborative process to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met through the active use of Professional Learning Communities

According Hattie's research, Professional Learning Communities have an effect size of

0.93, that positively impacts student achievement. (Hattie 2009)

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the of 2021-2022 school year Cypress Elementary will increase learning

gains in ELA and Math by 5% through collaborative processes and PLC.

Dedicating time weekly for teams to have guided questions, following the PLC placemats to

ensure to remain on target and focused on student data and action plans. Each team will

be supported with a leadership PLC lead.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Lewis (stephanie.lewis@osceolaschools.net)

Research states PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and

Evidencebased Strategy: doesn't work to enhance student achievement. 1.Administration, PLC Lead, and PLC Guide Coalition will meet to discuss all accountability area collaborative teams, to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. PLC Seven stages rubric will be used to measure Pre-Mid-End of school year progress of the PLC teams by the Principal. With the addition of formative assessment scores for Math, ELA and Science PLCs. 3. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal of the Area of Focus

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

If teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction student achievement will increase. Resources from district MTSS administrators will guide implementation. The effect size for PLC learning communities is .93 (Hattie,2009)

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. PLC's will meet monthly during early release days and on two (2) planning periods a month in order to assess, analyze, reflect and revise plans on course progression of individual student needs as a collaborative team.
- 2. PLC professional development will be provided monthly throughout the school year to the school PLC lead via the school district, who will in turn disseminate to Cypress faculty.
- 3. Each grade level team will have an embedded Cypress leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process. Any teams that are struggling will receive mentoring through the school PLC lead and leadership team.
- 4. Each grade level team will utilize district supplied formative assessments and NWEA assessment software.
- 5. Monthly Stocktake meetings will discuss data analysis of the PLC stages and provide feedback to the PLC school lead.

Person Responsible

Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of

Focus
Description

ESSA data showed in 2020-2021 showed no sub groups below the ESSA level 41 %. Of all subgroups, ELL and ESE subgroups were in the lower range.

and

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

ELL and ESE subgroups will increase to 43% in 2021-2022.

During PLCs teams will look at grade level sub grouping to ensure equity and

opportunities for all. They will monitor if students are receiving the right services and if

students are making growth. If students are not we will look at their interventions and Tier

1 instructional strategies.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

responsible for

Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy:

Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately 7 challenging learning experiences for all their students.

Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between

academic content and

Rationale for Evidence-

students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four

specific elements related to curriculum:

based Content the inferr

Strategy: 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

- 1. 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.
- 2.PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
- 3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
- 4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies, and ESE support strategies.
- 5. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
- 6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2,& 3.

Person Responsible

Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

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

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

Area of Focus
Description

skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as

thinking positively

and about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff

relationships, and supports for

learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional,

and academic

competencies they need to succeed in life.

Measurable Outcome:

2020-2021 SEL Climate Survey showed a 56% of students answered favorable for school

belonging. In 2021-2022 this question will be increased 10%.

Ensuring the maximum number of students possible, take the Panorama survey. Analyze

Monitoring: the data in Winter to see where the data is at that point and were it is projected. Daily

Social and Emotional activities for students to learn to self regulate and monitor their

feelings, as well as express their feelings in an appropriate manner.

Person responsible

for Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy:

Students have different learning styles and needs. We must assess individual learning styles and be flexible in allowing students to succeed by meeting their individual needs.

Rationale

Social and Emotional leaning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an

approach that reflects

Evidencebased

for

a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered,. They use teaching

techniques that build

Strategy: on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on

students' individual assets and passions.

- Teacher will build an environment of belonging, through daily activities and relationship building.
- 3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities and the PBIS platform.
- 4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
- 5. Teachers will use active strategies like hands-on, experiential and project-based activities
- 6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence, self

efficacy, and social awareness.

- 7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching collaborative learning.
- 8. School will develop structures, relationships, learning opportunities that support students' SE development.
- 9. Surveys will be analyzed to identify interventions that will support SEL and plan developed.
- 10. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop inventions

Person Responsible

Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

#7. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide post secondary culture for all students

A college-going culture builds the expectation of postsecondary education for all students-

not just the best

students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their

Area of

goals. Students who

Focus

have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after

Description

high school see

and Rationale: college as the norm However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may

seem unrealistic for

those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low income levels, underrepresented minorities, and families where there are no college

Measurable Outcome:

Our school wide goal/objective is for 75% of students to be aware of possible college/ career pathways for future endeavors. Our classroom goal is for classroom evidence of AVID in 70% of classrooms. These will be measured through walkthroughs. Student

evidence will be monitored with a student survey at the end of the year.

Schoolwide adoption of AVID will increase students college and career awareness and **Monitoring:** readiness. Students will explore and develop an understanding of career and college

pathways.

Person responsible

for

Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Schools with a strong future plan, that engages all students in planning for life after

graduation. With

Evidencebased

effective school-based teams that are strong in implementing postsecondary work, Which

shape a culture of

Strategy:

success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school In theses schools, students

will fully

participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of ways meet

their needs.

Rationale for

Students should be supported ill their efforts to reflect on their future and should have

multiple opportunities to

Evidencebased

do so. A school culture committed to promoting students aspirations for continuing their

education must expand

Strategy: beyond just lessons students alone. (Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college

and career readiness for success in school and in life.

2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequence<I activities that focus on personal

development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a postsecondary plan.

3. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time

management, planning.

- 4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities ttiat will practice 21st-century life skills.
- 5. Administration alld the Guidalice department will plan activities that will allow all studelits to have a greater

voice in school life and develop and strengttien ttieir capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.

6. The school will create a plan that creates all environmellt that develops greater bonds witll peers, usually

cutting across the exclusionary social groups.

Person

Libby Raymond (libby.raymond@osceolaschools.net)

Responsible

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of **Focus**

Description and Rationale:

Science education is well suited to active young children because it creates habits of mind, develops their capacity to engage in scientific inquiry and teach them how to reason through the content. It also allows them to explore the world and discover new things. It is an important part of the foundation for education for all.

Measurable Outcome:

The 2020-2021 Science achievement was 29%. In 2021 we will increase that score by

21%.

Through PLC process of analyzing student data, verifying assessments align with the

Monitoring:

standards to ensure gaps are addressed and closed. The Science coach will monitor,

coteach, and model for teachers. For 5th grade house of science.

Person responsible

for

Tiffany Bernardo (tiffany.bernardo@osceolaschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts

that give facts

based

meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving Strategy:

complex problem

Rationale

for EvidenceStudents who manipulate scientific ideas using hands on, minds on strategies and activities are more successful that peers who are taught to rely on primarily lectures and textbooks

based (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

- 1 Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning PLC.
- 2 Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards
- 3 Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, 2 column notes notes and interactive notebooks.
- 4 Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as

instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery

5 ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL. compliance specialist

and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses

6 Teachers will provide individual student data chats

7 The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and if the need arises.

8. Teachers will provide Tier instructional support based on grade level standards.

Person

Responsible

Randa Nicholson (randa.nicholson@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.

In the 2019-2020 school year there were 23 out of school suspensions and 10 in school. Our goal since 2020 has been to work with students in a restorative practice and addressing the root of the issue to not be repeat offender. This will be monitored through FOCUS (referrals, infraction) as well as Panorama with student responses, to decrease multiple referrals.

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 engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible and for implementing any changes. Frequently communicate 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 * 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 PLC's weekly to routinely examine dis aggregated data to look for themes/patters 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's 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 provide frequent, constructive feedback and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide 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 has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches 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 for historically underserved 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.

Libby Raymond (principal)- Monitor all pieces below for maximum success rate in creating and maintaining a positive culture.

Randa Nicholson (assistant principal)-Ensuring all stakeholders are aware of meetings, offerings, and resources available.

Arthur Mitchell (SAC chair)- Ensure all stakeholders are represented and aware of all meetings.

Camille Perez (PBIS sponsor)- Ensuring all stakeholders are aware of their impact in the success of a positive school culture and support system within the community.

Maritza Duran (ELL specialist)- Ensuring translation is available and support given to our ELL families.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | \$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: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide post secondary culture for all students | \$0.00 |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |