

School District of Osceola County, FL

Flora Ridge 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	33
Budget to Support Goals	33

Flora Ridge Elementary School

2900 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Dustin Sassic

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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 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	33

Flora Ridge Elementary School

2900 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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.

Inspiring all students to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create an environment of high expectations where all learners achieve their full potential.

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
Sassic, Dustin	Principal	To be responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To be responsible for all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To develop positive school community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public
Merritt, Tracey	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To assist the principal in all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To serve as a liaison between and among the principal to create positive school-community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public.
Archambeau, Gidget	Reading Coach	This position focuses on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementations of research based reading programs and scientifically-based reading strategies/practices at all elementary levels.
Barbour, Emily	Math Coach	This position focuses on student achievement by working with teachers to ensure high-fidelity implementations of research based math programs and scientifically-based reading strategies/practices at all elementary levels.
Chaverez, Carmen	Instructional Coach	Teach efficiently and faithfully, using books and material required, following the prescribed courses of study, and employing approved methods of instruction.
Wolferd, Joanne	ELL Compliance Specialist	Assist principal with all ESOL program and ELL student matters, provide teacher support and inservice on ESOL strategies and Best Practices. Perform all program compliance duties and implement procedures, at the school , as required by the Florida Consent Decree, State Board Rules and District Policy.
Morales, Rosani	School Counselor	To assist in the needs of the student in growth and development- social, academic, physical, emotional and behavioral, serves as a consultant to the student, teacher and parents, and provides leadership and organization to all guidance activities within the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Dustin Sassic

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

6

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

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

970

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

3

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	134	146	144	170	180	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	925
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	48	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	54	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	32	44	63	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	6	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/15/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	118	115	144	169	155	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	854
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	14	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	118	115	144	169	155	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	854
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	14	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	53%	57%	41%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	58%	40%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	51%	53%	33%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	55%	63%	45%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	59%	62%	42%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	45%	51%	36%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				33%	49%	53%	43%	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	36%	51%	-15%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	28%	45%	-17%	53%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA, Math & Science NWEA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	37	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	33	34
	Students With Disabilities	33	20	0
	English Language Learners	26	18	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	33	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	30	37
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	0
	English Language Learners	44	11	28
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	40	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	39	36
	Students With Disabilities	25	17	33
	English Language Learners	24	24	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	36	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	34	26
	Students With Disabilities	33	17	0
	English Language Learners	26	28	15

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	45	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	34	28
	Students With Disabilities	21	7	5
	English Language Learners	47	36	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37	30	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	20	36
	Students With Disabilities	13	7	11
	English Language Learners	35	26	36
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	41	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	42	45
	Students With Disabilities	8	19	17
	English Language Learners	35	29	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	31	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	30	41
	Students With Disabilities	9	19	14
	English Language Learners	32	22	32

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	45	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	42	37
	Students With Disabilities	6	9	8
	English Language Learners	35	39	31
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	32	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	27	26
	Students With Disabilities	12	8	13
	English Language Learners	36	30	31
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	47	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	43	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	27
	English Language Learners	39	43	49

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	26		21	11		22				
ELL	37	53	48	33	32	27	35				
ASN	50			71							
BLK	36	42		27	25		8				
HSP	41	53	43	35	32	27	39				
MUL	43			21							
WHT	45			43							
FRL	31	47	43	29	25	25	31				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	45	36	23	48	38	15				
ELL	35	56	52	41	55	48	28				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	52	71		59	76		40				
BLK	30	38		22	23						
HSP	39	54	51	43	52	44	29				
WHT	65	59		60	51		58				
FRL	38	52	47	41	49	36	30				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	35	27	25	26	23	20				
ELL	30	37	34	35	36	27	12				
ASN	39	44		57	44						
BLK	37			25							
HSP	38	40	34	43	41	38	37				
WHT	55	44		60	50	45	67				
FRL	31	38	35	36	34	27	41				

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	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	61
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	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
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	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Our school's area of concern is the core instruction. Proficiency in ELA, math and Science needs to increase to meet the district and state percentages. In 2019 our school's ELA achievement was at 42% (53% district, 57% state), our school's math achievement was at 45% (55% district, 63% state) and our school's science achievement was at 33% (49% district, 53% state) The ESSA data in 2018-2019 indicated the school had two sub groups below the ESSA level 41%, The two sub groups falling below 41% were Students with Disabilities (36%) and Black/African American Students (28%). Our school's goal is to strengthen tier 1 instruction by improving collaborative teachers practices through the PLC process.

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

Science Achievement was the single area the school declined in from the previous year. Several factors contributed to this decline. The district adopted a new Science curriculum and teachers had little training to use the materials. Nature of Science was the weakest performing area by students on the assessment. Nature of Science is embedded into other content areas and often skipped or not called out or highlighted during instruction.

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

Grades K-4 do not focus on the urgency of teaching Science standards and often let math or reading standards take precedence over Science, therefore students are not prepared by having a deep understanding of "fair game" science standards taught previous to 5th grade. A greater focus on Science needs to be given to grades K-4. The Science block rotation will be monitored to address weak standards evidenced in progress monitoring.

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

The learning gains in ELA showed significant improvement in 2019. Overall, ELA learning gains increased by 15%. In particular, ELA learning gains of ELL students increased by 20%, Asian students by 19%, and students with disabilities by 18%. Furthermore, ELA students in the lowest quartile increased performance by 19% (52%), outperforming the district average by 1% (51%) approaching the state average of 53%.

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

New actions taken by the school included a restructuring of the MTSS process, remediation and enrichment in ELA offered each day of the week, the introduction of Corrective Reading as a tier 3 intervention and a position of interventionists to work with low performing students.

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

Schools must convey the expectation that all students can prepare for the opportunity to attend and be successful in post-secondary education. School culture and climate directly effect student learning and engagement as well as college aspirations and preparation. When high expectations are set, a growth mindset is developed and academic preparations and tools are present, students will meet or exceed expected academic results.in turn, implementing the AVID College Readiness System will accelerate and scaffold learning for students.

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

Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.

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

Two teacher mentors, two interventionist and a AVID Coordinator will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices. A member of the Leadership team will be assigned to each grade level PLC to monitor improvement of all students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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 teams. Effective leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities. It was found through the Insight Survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in the area of feedback by the leadership team on instructional practices.
Measurable Outcome:	Insight Survey Response 2020-21 The data shows 49% of responses are favorable for instructional leader provides feedback about teaching. The 2021-22 survey response to this question will show 59% favorable, an increase of 10%.
Monitoring:	A weekly calendar will be developed to schedule classroom visits to provide feedback to teachers. The Non Evaluative Walkthrough Instrument will be used to monitor instructional practices, as well as, individual feedback will be given to teachers. The School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress to the principal. Dustin Sassic, principal, will update Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Dr. Belinda Reyes, During their monthly check ins. Dustin Sassic, will update the Chief of staff, Dr. Scott Flowers, once a quarter on progress of the Areas of Focus
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase in teacher instructional feedback can improve teacher instructional practices across the campus and provide confidence i their own abilities. It will encourage instructional risk-taking to try innovative teaching strategies with the support of the leadership team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Great leaders understand that teachers know their students and examine their instructional practices. When teachers are involved in examining data, reflect on instructional strategies and making important decisions based on data and research that inform them how they continually improve their schools. School leadership teams can can support teachers in improving student learning outcomes. Instructional leaders have greater effects on student outcomes than transformational leaders (Hattie, 2009)

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher Targeted Feedback-Protected time for classroom walkthroughs and PLC meeting with teams to give feedback on instruction by the Leadership Team. A member of the leadership team has been assigned to each grade level. Admin will walk and give feedback on instruction weekly.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Non-Evaluative School Trend Instrument- Utilize the Non-Evaluative School Trend Instrument by each administrator a minimum of 5 times per week to gather classroom walk through data.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Data Disaggregation & Monitoring- The School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress to the principal.

Person Responsible Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

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

Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy. According to ELA Achievement data from 2018-19, our school (42%) falls 11 percentage points behind the district (53%) and 15 percentage points behind the state (57%). However, for learning gains in ELA our school (55%) is 1 percentage point behind the district (56%) and 3 percentage points behind the state (58%). For ELA lowest quartile our school (52%) is 1 percentage point above the district (51%) and matches the state (52%) average. A strategic focus needs to be placed on literacy core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to enhance tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Highly trained literacy personnel needs to serve students in the lowest quartile and areas of ESSA to continue to make gains in the ELA area.

Measurable Outcome:

The outcome for 2021-22 is to increase ELA proficiency by 5%.

Monitoring:

At the beginning of the school year, an intervention plan was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum will be selected based on the targeted needs of students as evidenced by multiple assessments. This plan will be referenced at each monthly MTSS meeting with grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Foundational Skills will be supported through Open Court, Words their Way and Phonemic Awareness Supplemental Curriculum. Running records will be conducted and analyzed to inform decision making by PLCs. Intervention opportunities will be offered by highly qualified instructional staff using Corrective Reading, Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) and other research based materials from Benchmark. All Literacy decision making made by teachers and PLCs will be discussed with the Literacy Coach and Leadership team to ensure constant support for teachers and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Providing quality classroom reading instruction with researched validated characteristics make a measurable, positive impact on all students. Teachers must be clear about the content and language objectives for the lesson and unit. Learning outcomes should be based on standards with appropriate differentiation to address the needs of all students. Appropriate and varied core and supplemental materials should be available to support different learning styles and needs. Students' reading ability should be screened often and progress should be tracked using a valid measurement tool. Knowledgeable instructional coaches and mentors are available to assist teachers with instructional decision making based on data. Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaching- High quality instructional coaching will be offered by the content instructional resource teacher at the school through modeled lessons, observations, instructional feedback and targeted Professional Development through a coaching cycle model.

Person Responsible

Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Interventions (tier 2 & 3) At the beginning of the school year, an intervention plan was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum will be selected based on the targeted needs of students as evidenced by multiple assessments. This plan will be referenced at each monthly MTSS meeting with grade levels.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

PLC- Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Literacy Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school Literacy plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions. Three teacher mentors, two interventionist and a Literacy Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning- Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned instruction- Instructional strategies will be aligned to Florida BEST standards using Curriculum Unit Plans using district adopted research based high quality curriculum.

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

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

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. Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ work analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody, and vocabulary and language development.

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Lexia- T1 and T2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 1 day/week during station rotation. T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation.

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

Students needing tier 2 interventions- RISE reading for T2
Pre-Teaching strategies for T2

Person Responsible Gidget Archambeau (gidget.archambeau@osceolaschools.net)

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

Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students. According to Mathematics Achievement data from 2018-19, our school (45%) falls 10 percentage points behind the district (55%) and 18 percentage points behind the state (63%). For learning gains in Math our school (52%) is 7 percentage points behind the district (59%) and 10 percentage points behind the state (62%). For Mathematics lowest quartile our school (44%) is 1 percentage point behind the district (45%) and 7 percentage points behind the state (51%) average. A strategic focus needs to be placed on mathematics core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to enhance tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Highly trained mathematics personnel needs to serve students in the lowest quartile and areas of ESSA to continue to make gains in the Mathematics area.

Measurable Outcome:

The outcome for 2021-22 is to increase math proficiency by 5%.

Monitoring:

At the beginning of the school year, a mathematics intervention plan was developed to include instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum choices and instructional decisions will be guided by the school's Math Coach. Teachers will provide interventions for Enrichment, Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 in math. Math tier 2 interventions will occur within the 60 mins of math instruction by grade level math teachers and tier 3 interventions will occur outside the math block using an interventionist or math coach during PE waiver time. Interventions may be designed for the grade level through a Math Bootcamp, with teachers selecting a skill to for reteaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Powerful classroom instruction on grade level begins with researched based curriculum, effective teaching strategies and an effective collaborative Professional Learning Community. Classroom teachers will use district created Curriculum Unit Plans for tier one instruction. District and PLC developed formative assessments will be used to frequently assess student progress and uploaded into School City for PLCs to easily access to analyze for grade level intervention decision making. Intervention opportunities will be offered by highly qualified instructional staff using Pearson adopted math curriculum. All Mathematics decision making made by teachers and PLCs will be discussed with the Math Coach and Leadership team to ensure constant support for teachers and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Providing quality classroom mathematics instruction with researched validated characteristics make a measurable, positive impact on all students. Teachers must be clear about the content and foundational skills objectives for the lesson and unit. Learning outcomes should be based on standards with appropriate differentiation to address the needs of all students. Appropriate and varied core and supplemental materials should be available to support different learning styles and needs. Students' mathematics ability should be screened often and progress should be tracked using a valid measurement tool. Knowledgeable instructional coaches and mentors are available to assist teachers with instructional decision making based on data. Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well

implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaching- High quality instructional coaching will be offered by the content instructional resource teacher at the school through modeled lessons, observations, instructional feedback and targeted Professional Development through a coaching cycle model.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Interventions (tier 2 & 3) At the beginning of the school year, an intervention plan was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum will be selected based on the targeted needs of students as evidenced by multiple assessments. This plan will be referenced at each monthly MTSS meeting with grade levels.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

PLC- Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Math Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school math plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions. Two teacher mentors, two interventionist and a math Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning- Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned instruction- Instructional strategies will be aligned to Florida BEST standards using Curriculum Unit Plans using district adopted research based high quality curriculum.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

PD to develop use of the CUPS to differentiate with in their Tier 1 math block to meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Half Day planning once per quarter to model use of planning time.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Ensure high Levels of science achievement for all students Science proficiency scores declined in 2019. Science proficiency fell from 36.2% in 2018 to 33% in 2019. According to Science Achievement data, our school (33%) falls 16 percentage points behind the district (49%) and 20 percentage points behind the state (53%). A strategic focus needs to be placed on science core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to science interventions. The area of Nature of Science was the lowest scoring area on FCAT. Science instruction must be a targeted focus for grades K-5 to build to proficiency with the 5th grade Science FCAT Assessment. Highly trained personnel needs to serve students in grades K-5, particularly in the areas of ESSA to continue to increase science proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

The outcome for 2021-22 is to increase Science proficiency by 5%.

Monitoring:

Science formative assessments will be on-going throughout the school year. Students will be assessed through PLC and district created assessments and checklists (Success Criteria) through teacher verification of learning. Assessments will be analyzed by PLCs and Math/ Science Coach to monitor effectiveness of instruction. Coaching support will be offered by the Math/Science Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Powerful classroom instruction on grade level begins with researched based curriculum, effective teaching strategies and an effective collaborative Professional Learning Community. Classroom teachers will use district created Curriculum Unit Plans for tier one instruction. District and PLC developed formative assessments will be used to frequently assess student progress and uploaded into School City for PLCs to easily access to analyze for grade level intervention decision making. Intervention opportunities will be offered by highly qualified instructional staff using district adopted Science curriculum. All Science decision making made by teachers and PLCs will be discussed with the Math/Science Coach and Leadership team to ensure constant support for teachers and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Providing quality classroom Science instruction with researched validated characteristics make a measurable, positive impact on all students. Teachers must be clear about the content objectives for the lesson and unit. Learning outcomes should be based on standards with appropriate differentiation to address the needs of all students. Appropriate and varied core and supplemental materials should be available to support different learning styles and needs. Students' scientific ability/understandings should be screened often and progress should be tracked using a valid measurement tool. Knowledgeable instructional coaches and mentors are available to assist teachers with instructional decision making based on data. Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/ minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)_

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaching- High quality instructional coaching will be offered by the content instructional resource teacher at the school through modeled lessons, observations, instructional feedback and targeted Professional Development through a coaching cycle model.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Interventions (tier 2 & 3) At the beginning of the school year, an intervention plan was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum will be selected based on the targeted needs of students as evidenced by multiple assessments. This plan will be referenced at each monthly MTSS meeting with grade levels.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

PLC- Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Science Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school Literacy plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions. Two teacher mentors, two interventionist and a Math/ Science Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning- Professional Development will be offered to enhance AVID strategies and LSI techniques to support tier 1 instruction throughout writing to process learning, leveled questioning, engagement through collaboration, organizing materials, time and thoughts and critical reading strategies during monthly faculty PLCs. AVID professional development will be provided by the AVID Site Team at the school during class release time and training offered by AVID Center in the local area. The strategies will continue to be monitored and strengthened through walkthroughs with feedback, modeling by coaches and teachers, and schoolwide decision making by the AVID Site Team based on data collected.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned instruction- Instructional strategies will be aligned to Florida Science standards using Curriculum Unit Plans using district adopted research based high quality curriculum.

Person Responsible Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA data in 2018-2019 indicated the school had two sub groups below the ESSA level 41%, The two sub groups falling below 41% were Students with Disabilities (36%) and Black/African American Students (28%). These scores affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA data for 2018-2019 ESE- 36% and Black/African American- 28% will increase in 2021-2022 to exceed 41% in both sub groups.
Monitoring:	Teachers will share common planning (Professional Learning Communities) on a weekly basis that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students. ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the RCS/VE teachers/ classroom teacher. Professional development focusing on meeting the needs/goals indicated on the IEP and best practices ESE teaching models will be conducted by the ESE specialists on campus and from the district office.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Each student will have a unique path to success. Forcing all students to learn the same way means some will always struggle, a few will be very successful and the majority will just get by. Teachers will be prepared with various teaching styles for the same material to give each student the opportunity to learn with the class. Even on separate paths, students can reach their learning goals. Teachers will individualize instruction, engage students through multiple learning modalities, be flexible and diagnostic, and attend to ESE student's IEP goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools spend precious time creating the foundations of inclusive programs for students with disabilities. Careful thought goes into scheduling co-taught classes, creating balanced classroom rosters, training co-teaching partners, developing collaborative relationships, and providing appropriate supports for students with disabilities (Walther-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin, & Williams, 2000). Differentiate instruction using flexible grouping, providing activities that appeal to various learning-style preferences, giving students choices, and creating alternative activities and assessments (Tomlinson, 2001). Provide opportunities for students to work in small groups and in pairs. If cooperative learning strategies are used, five conditions must be present: (a) The task must be authentic, worthwhile, and appropriate for students working in groups; (b) Small-group learning must be the goal; (c) Cooperative behavior should be taught to and used by students; (d) Group work should be structured so that students depend on one another to complete a task successfully; (e) Students should be held individually accountable (Putnam, 1998)

Action Steps to Implement

Data Disaggregation & Monitoring- The School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress to the principal.

Person Responsible Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Practices- At the beginning of the school year, an plan to ensure rigor, engagement and differentiation was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The district Curriculum Unit Plan is the basis of Tier 1 instruction using a viable curriculum.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

PLC- Weekly meetings with individual teachers and PLCs will provide the evidence needed by the Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school instructional plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions. Two teacher mentors, two interventionist and a math Coach will be utilized to model for teachers, conference with teachers concerning lesson development and support teachers with resource choices and instructional best practices.

Person Responsible Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

MTSS instructional Intervention Practices- At the beginning of the school year, an intervention plan was developed to include specific and clear instructions on the placement of students into intervention groups. The intervention plan consists of resources for each tier, directions for using the resource, and guidelines on student placement. Curriculum will be selected based on the targeted needs of students as evidenced by multiple assessments. This plan will be referenced at each monthly MTSS meeting with grade levels.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

Equity & Diversity- Promote policies, practices, and procedures that are inclusive and sensitive to the various cultures using inclusionary language and curriculum resources. Selection of instructional materials will be monitored and ongoing Professional Development will be offered to staff.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development on the use of Pre teaching and AVID strategies.

Person Responsible Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Culture & Environment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well implemented programs designed to foster Social Emotional Learning (SEL) are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social- emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. 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:	Panorama Survey Response 2020-21 The data shows 42% of responses are favorable from students for- when things go wrong for you, how calm are you able to stay?. The 2021-22 survey response to this question will show 50% favorable, an increase of 8%.
Monitoring:	Social and Emotional Learning data will be monitored using Panorama school data collected throughout the school year. Surveys will be analyzed and interventions adjusted to support schoolwide SEL implementation by the Leadership/MTSS Team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Building a safe learning environment through inclusion and acceptance of all students. Modeling and teaching positive, effective communications skills. Providing opportunities for flexible groupings. Positive Behavior Support (PBIS) will be implemented and monitored for fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Relational capacity is the degree of trust and level of safety among members of a group. In an educational context, this specifically refers to the established level of trust and safety between teachers and students, as well as directly between students. Classes that are low in relational capacity are often teacher-centered, with little dialogue or collaboration among students. Alternatively, classes that are high in relational capacity are characterized by energy and comfort, where students feel mutual ownership in the expectations and learning within the classroom. Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered,. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

Social Emotional Learning- Teachers will integrate SEL strategies into curriculum such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness through Sanford Harmony curriculum and AVID strategies.

Person Responsible Rosani Morales (rosani.morales@osceolaschools.net)

Community and Parent Involvement-The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision making SAC council (monthly) . We reach out to families and the community early and often. Multiple parent nights are offered to families such as, Math/Science Nights & Literacy Nights.

Person Responsible Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

Positive Behavior Intervention & Support-Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely disaggregate data to look for patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, ISS and OSS, and attendance also forms the basis for discussion and problem solving for particular group in school. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing discipline referrals. Positive Behavior Support System is in place and monitored through a committee monthly.

Person Responsible Carmen Chaverez (carmen.chaverez@osceolaschools.net)

Equity & Diversity- Promote policies, practices, and procedures that are inclusive and sensitive to the various cultures using inclusionary language and curriculum resources. Selection of instructional materials will be monitored and ongoing Professional Development will be offered to staff.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students- AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) will be implemented with fidelity schoolwide. Our school will embed AVID strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading) into all content areas to engage students in learning, develop student success skills and develop a growth mindset in teachers, parents and students. A college going culture on campus encourages students to think about their college and career plans. AVID impacts Leadership, Systems, Instruction and Culture within the school.

Person Responsible Tracey Merritt (tracey.merritt@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Flora Ridge Elem Data 2020-21

15% of total population is ESE, but 33% of referrals went to ESE students.

31% of the population is ELL, but 50% of referrals went to ELL students

6 major referrals, 8 days ISS, 19 days OSS, 1 Sesir

Flora Ridge- .2 incidents per 100 students

Osceola County- .9 incidents per 100 students

Florida- 1.0 incidents per 100 students

Although overall our incidents of referrals was low compared to the state & district, our number of suspensions ranked in the high range. Our school will focus on lowering the number of suspensions given to students and balance the ESE and ELL referral rate by looking at equity issues and break down barriers for ESE & ELL students by providing more supports. Our primary focus will be a focus on PBIS tier 1 interventions and the secondary focus will be tier 2 behavior interventions. An Are of Focus of school culture and environment is added to our SIP and will be monitored through the stocktake process.

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.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

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

The school engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high quality instruction, and holds staff responsible for implementing any changes. We frequently communicate high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: Collaborative planning is solution orientated and based on disaggregated data, student work is displayed throughout the building and student are being prepared to be success in college/ career using AVID strategies. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from stakeholders has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely disaggregate data to look for patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, ISS and OSS, and attendance also forms the basis for discussion and problem solving for particular group in school. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing discipline referrals. Implementing evidence based alternatives to exclusionary discipline and provide training and feedback to teachers on implementing best practices approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training and ongoing support and provide frequent, constructive feedback and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. Leadership actively solicits feedback on school procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. The master schedule includes collaborative planning and ensures it is rooted in data on student progress. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support form 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 with teacher modeling. The schools, curriculum and teacher's 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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Culture & Environment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00