

School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Nathan Deright

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 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 (60%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, 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 PK-5	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<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.

Kissimmee Elementary School will provide an enriched and rigorous learning environment within a diverse community where all children succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kissimmee Elementary will unlock the full potential of all students by empowering learners as they journey to academic success.

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
Colon, Vivian	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coach
Kane, David	Instructional Coach	Interventionist
Hinson , Katrina	Math Coach	School Math/Science Coach School AVID Coordinator
Wright , Jade	Reading Coach	School literacy Coach PLC facilitator
Terry, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Duties assigned by the principal. Duties may include, school safety, scheduling, Title I, SAC meetings, instructional leadership, mentoring, and more.
Mcdonald, sasha	Instructional Coach	Interventionist/Testing Coordinator
DeRight, Nathan	Principal	Create a safe school culture that is conducive for learning. Carry out the school mission statement. Serve as the lead instructional leader who sets forth procedures and systems that create opportunity and increase student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Nathan Deright

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

959

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

25

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

26

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	111	128	129	145	164	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	829
Attendance below 90 percent	103	122	137	170	150	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	842
One or more suspensions	4	3	5	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	17	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	64	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	35	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	62	64	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210

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	4	2	5	17	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	142	144	196	183	177	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1024
Attendance below 90 percent	0	116	113	141	132	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	0	2	10	35	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

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	142	144	196	183	177	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1024
Attendance below 90 percent	0	116	113	141	132	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	0	2	10	35	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	53%	57%	51%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	56%	58%	62%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	51%	53%	60%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	55%	63%	74%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	59%	62%	80%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	45%	51%	65%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	49%	53%	67%	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	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	53%	14%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

FSA, NWEA, NSGRA, Dibels

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	37	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	36	36
	Students With Disabilities	25	13	22
	English Language Learners	27	24	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	37	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	32	28
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	0
	English Language Learners	36	29	26
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	39	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	30	35
	Students With Disabilities	43	38	27
	English Language Learners	40	32	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	28	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	26	22
	Students With Disabilities	50	38	18
	English Language Learners	39	23	22

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51	48	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	53	41
	Students With Disabilities	25	10	0
	English Language Learners	45	39	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39	33	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	30	33
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	18
	English Language Learners	32	26	34
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	29	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	27	26
	Students With Disabilities	14	21	10
	English Language Learners	36	21	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	30	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	24	34
	Students With Disabilities	20	11	21
	English Language Learners	38	26	33

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	43	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	42	41
	Students With Disabilities	16	21	22
	English Language Learners	26	30	36
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	30	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	30	37
	Students With Disabilities	12	5	9
	English Language Learners	34	18	29
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	42	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	38	44
	Students With Disabilities	13	15	26
	English Language Learners	31	29	41

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	16	42		21	47		32				
ELL	31	48	52	35	49	54	36				
BLK	39	46		48	50		43				
HSP	34	52	54	37	51	59	38				
WHT	63			59							
FRL	32	51	54	35	52	50	35				
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	28	50	67	47	64	65	36				
ELL	47	62	54	66	70	59	41				
BLK	36	64		56	91						
HSP	53	62	56	69	70	57	46				

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
WHT	61	72		81	72		67				
FRL	46	62	59	63	67	58	43				
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	41	66	61	58	73	65	38				
ELL	37	58	61	62	75	69	51				
BLK	43	38		74	75						
HSP	51	63	58	73	80	67	67				
WHT	56	64		86	84		75				
FRL	49	58	53	72	78	63	62				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

ELA students in the lowest quartile maintained the same amount of percentage points from the previous year as identified by FSA (55% to 55%). The needs of the lowest performing students in ELA are not being met during Guided Reading. Classroom teachers are not providing specific differentiation when meeting with students in small group for this subcategory

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

Math achievement levels demonstrated the greatest decline (-29%) as identified by the Statewide mathematics Assessment. Many students were lacking highly important fundamental skills that were missed due COVID-19 schooling issues. We are proactively targeting students in mathematics through remediation and acceleration, while providing lessons/mini-lessons that will support student needs.

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

Math learning gains was a contributing factor, falling from 71% to 50% in gains. Students did not make adequate gains to push them into proficiency. Tutoring and remediation services will be available all school year to help close the opportunity gap.

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

Our area showing the most improvement was the lowest quartile in ELA. Having targeted this group of students during the 20-21 school year, the results showed that extra tutoring and small group instruction helps. We will be breaking this data down further this academic year, looking deeper into other subgroups, such as race and gender.

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

We offered tutoring and small group instruction all school year. The school leadership team used weekly data to make decisions on learning. Knowing the currently levels of performance for each student gave teachers the ability to meet students' needs in a timely manner. PLC groups will be tracking common trends this school year as well.

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

SDOC has now implemented AVID learning strategies in all grade levels. AVID (Advancement via individual determination) strategies provide students with a necessary set of tools to advocate for their own learning and understand their strengths and weaknesses. Through AVID, teachers can provide project-bases learning (or accelerated curriculum) when needed with fidelity.

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.

Our AVID coordinator will be offering frequent professional development opportunities to teachers throughout the school year. We will also be meeting regularly with PLC captains and grade level representatives to keep a pulse of the school and continue to work toward our 21-22 academic goals.

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

PLC captain meetings will be held once a month, as well as grade chair meetings to create common language amongst the school, as well as to not lose site of our goals for the school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in ELA (ESE/ELL Proficiency)
Description and Rationale:	Based on 2018-2019 FSA results, 36% of students were proficient in ELA. Our goal is to increase this by 4% points.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase in all subcategories in this area by 5% by the end of the 2020-2021 academic year.
Monitoring:	School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Next Steps to Guided Reading provides a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Classroom teachers will implement the various components of this particular guided reading program to ensure they are attending all aspects of literacy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Corrective Reading and LLI provide a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Corrective Reading is a powerful direct instruction remedial reading series that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers, even if they have failed with other approaches. Explicit, step-by-step lessons are organized around two major strands, decoding and comprehension, which may be used separately or together to customize instruction for particular student needs (NIFDI 2019). This particular program will be implemented to assist in the academic growth of our ELL/ESE students as well as our general education students that scored a Level 1 as identified by the FSA.

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 Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on 2020-2021 FSA mathematics results, 40% of students were proficient on the state assessment. It is our goal to increase the overall proficiency level of students in 3rd to 5th grade by 5% points.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency will increase from 40% to 45% by the end of the 2021-2022 academic school year.

Monitoring: School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

Engaging students in cognitively complex mathematical tasks aligned to the grade level standard(s) is essential to the development of a solid foundation for more complex mathematics. By implementing mathematical tasks that support complexity of the standard and build autonomy in students, student achievement will increase.

Evidence-based Strategy: Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If classroom teachers appropriately plan for rigorous standard based mathematical tasks and allow students to productively struggle toward standard attainment through appropriate scaffolding of content, then student understanding of mathematical concepts will increase thus increasing student achievement. Doing math requires students' to comprehend and understand mathematical connections. These tasks require students to monitor their own process of thinking, while using applicable knowledge to work through the task. In order to complete the task students must analyze the task, which requires considerable cognitive effort. These tasks may ensue apprehension for students, because there is no certain process to solve for the solution. (Smith & Stein 1998).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify classroom trends with regard to task-standard alignment and levels of engagement in mathematics
2. Provide professional development in support of the adopted mathematics text
3. Provide coach support for teachers that need additional guidance with the implementation of standards-based instruction
4. Utilization of district and school based mathematical assessment results to drive instruction
5. Monitor and provide teachers with timely actionable feedback on a consistent basis in order to shift academic instruction as necessary

Person Responsible Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-21 statewide science assessment results, 41% of students were determined to be proficient on this assessment. This is a decrease of 8% points from the previous school year. It is our goal to increase the overall proficiency level of students in 5th grade by 5% points.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency will increase from 41% to 46% by the end of the 2021-2022 academic school year.
Monitoring:	Leadership team will meet weekly to address the goal and school Stocktake will take place monthly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging students in cognitively complex, inquiry based tasks aligned to the grade level standard(s) is essential to the development of a solid foundation for scientific understanding. By implementing cross-curricular inquiry based scientific tasks that support the complexity of the standard and build autonomy and problem solving in students, student achievement will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>If classroom teachers appropriately plan for rigorous and inquiry based tasks, and allow students to productively struggle toward standard attainment through appropriate scaffolding and cross-curricular connections of the content, then student understanding of scientific concepts will increase thus increasing student achievement. Inquiry-based science challenges students' thinking by engaging them in investigating scientifically orientated questions where they learn to give priority to evidence, evaluate explanations in the light of alternative explanations and learn to communicate and justify their decisions (Gillies 2020).</p> <p>Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.</p> <p>Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop small group instruction focused on specific reading strategies that can be implemented during science class to ensure understanding of the informational text
2. Ensure that students are engaged in hands-on exploration of the content when appropriate
3. Engage students in science wars as a means of review/preparation on a consistent basis
4. Collect walk through data/trends with regard to science instruction in order to provide timely actionable feedback consistently

Person Responsible Elizabeth Terry (elizabeth.terry@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA learning gains, ELA learning gains dropped from 64% to 51% and math learning gains 71% to 50%. We plan to target various accountability systems within the school including, MTSS, tutoring/remediation and Tier 1 instruction. By targeting these areas, we hope to close the opportunity gap in every grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the ELA and Math learning gains from 51% to 55% (ELA) and from 50% to 55% (math).
Monitoring:	Leadership meetings will be held weekly to check the progress of the goal. Walkthrough trends and classroom data will drive the discussion and action steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging students in cognitively appropriate tasks aligned to the grade level standard(s) is essential to the development of a solid foundation for understanding. By implementing effective Tier 1 strategies for instruction, students will reach proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Looking at past data, proficiency and learning gains have slightly declined. The emphasis this year is on Tier 1 instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop small group instruction focused on specific strategies that can be implemented during ELA, math and science classes to ensure understanding of the presented material.
2. Ensure that students are engaged in hands-on, collaborative structures.
3. Engage students in accelerated curriculum (when necessary)
4. Collect walk through data/trends in order to provide timely actionable feedback consistently

Person Responsible Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2020-2021 FSA results, 7% of ESE students demonstrated a proficiency in ELA. Our support facilitation students were a large group and our VE teachers were spread thin, causing gaps in learning. Based on 2020-2021 FSA ELA results, 10% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency in ELA. Classroom teachers worked with students in small groups, however the activities and work were not always fully aligned to standards. In addition, we did not appropriately identify students in this subcategory on an ongoing basis.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase proficiency in ELA for ESE students by 2% by the end of the 2021-2022 academic year. Regarding ELL students, the goal is to increase performance from 10% proficiency to 14% proficiency through targeted weekly interventions and through the implementation of specific ELLevation strategies.
Monitoring:	Leadership meetings will be held weekly to review data, walkthrough trends and progress toward our goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vivian Colon (vivian.colon@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Next Steps to Guided Reading provides a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Classroom teachers will implement the various components of this particular guided reading program to ensure they are attending all aspects of literacy. Corrective Reading and LLI provide a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. This particular program will be implemented to assist in the academic growth of our ESE students as well as our general education students that scored a Level 1 as identified by the FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The appropriate implementation of ELLevation strategies build the capacity of teachers to serve multilingual learners, and empower students with the academic language necessary for success in school. Small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn next to move forward. Ongoing observation of your students, combined with systematic assessment enables you to draw together groups of students who fit a particular instructional profile (Fountas & Pinnell). If classroom teachers and VE support teachers appropriately plan for differentiated ELA instruction utilizing the Next Steps to Guided Reading and targeted interventions are implemented and monitored with fidelity, then student achievement increases. If teachers appropriately plan and implement ELLevation strategies in support of ELL students, then student achievement increases.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative planning meetings between VE support teachers and general education classroom teachers.
2. Guidance with the collaborative teaching model in support of a strengthened approach to differentiated instruction specific to the IEP of every student
3. Strategic approach to small group reading instruction provided by VE teachers
4. Appropriate scheduling for VE teachers (case loads)
5. Develop and provide appropriate support with regard to ELLevation implementation in the classroom

6. Identify trends through weekly walk through data collection and appropriate next steps specific to the data collected

Person Responsible Vivian Colon (vivian.colon@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Social-Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well implemented programs to foster SEL are associated with positive short term and long term goals 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 being prepared for class on a daily basis. 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:	2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed 68% of students answered favorably for school belonging. In 2021-2022 this question will increase by 5%.
Monitoring:	Leadership team will meet weekly to focus on the progress of the goal. School counselors will give an update on the progress as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	sasha Mcdonald (sasha.mcdonald@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting their different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Teachers will implement the various tools and strategies provided by Panorama Education in order to facilitate a greater use of self regulating strategies.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging through the implementation of PBIS strategies.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experimental, and project-based activities.
5. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.

Person Responsible sasha Mcdonald (sasha.mcdonald@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.

KMES is a second year PBIS school. School/student discipline is a primary area of focus under the PBIS umbrella. KMES will be monitoring discipline data through monthly PBIS meetings. Teacher/parent meetings may be a result of the findings and action plans will be created on a case by case basis.

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. Staff is held accountable for the implementation of any changes. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from various stakeholders such as students, families and school personnel has been created and implemented in support of a well structured learning environment. Teachers meet weekly in PLCs to routinely examine disaggregated data in order to identify areas of strength and growth related to academic success. Discipline referrals, in-and-out of school suspensions, and attendance continue to provide the necessary data essential to understanding the ever evolving needs of our students. Administration ensures that teachers have resources, training and on-going support through timely and actionable feedback in the continued effort to develop all staff in our effort to meet the needs of our students. School staff are also afforded the opportunity to provide administration with feedback on school-wide procedures and policies. In addition, the master schedule ensures that teachers have the opportunity to work collaboratively with regard to standards-based planning. The school's curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diver interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as decision-making SAC council. Parents are also afforded the on-going opportunity to meet with classroom teachers on a regular basis in support of their child's academic success. 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 meetings 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.

Our school leadership team manages both the instructional and cultural aspects of the school. Our goal is to create a sense of belonging and family-oriented environment. Our PBIS (positive behavior interventions and supports) program also teaches our students how to follow schoolwide expectations. They also can achieve rewards and special events by earning cub cash. Our School Advisory Council also meets monthly to discuss all aspects of the school, including academics and culture.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Social-Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00