**School District of Osceola County, FL**

# Koa Elementary School

**2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

# Table of Contents

# Koa Elementary School

## 5000 KOA ST, Kissimmee, FL 34758

### www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

## Principal: Adah Schwartz                    Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (46%)<br><br>2017-18: C (49%)<br><br>2016-17: C (43%) |
| **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

# Koa Elementary School

## 5000 KOA ST, Kissimmee, FL 34758

### 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 | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 93% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Koa Elementary School will inspire all students to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive learners and citizens.

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

Koa Elementary School will work in partnership with its families and the community to ensure all learners develop the essential academic, social, and emotional skills needed for college and career readiness.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Terry, Ashton | 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. |
| Sanders, Erica | Assistant Principal | Assists the principal with supervision and evaluation of teachers and support staff. Oversees the student behavior support decision-making process. Participates with principal and leadership team in visiting classrooms to monitor instruction, and provides timely and relevant feedback to teachers and support staff. Handles other school administrative functions as assigned by the principal. |
| Yatsko, Kimberly | Instructional Coach | Supports teachers by facilitating MTSS meetings to plan interventions and ensure students with gaps in learning receive needed additional instruction. Monitors supports to ensure fidelity and reviews student data to determine effectiveness and next steps. Works with groups of low-performing students during intervention time. |
| Rieder, Cynthia | Instructional Coach | Serve as coach, mentor, and conduct on-going classroom visits and coaching cycle with math and science. Facilitate implementation of math and science curriculum by providing curriculum support and side-by-side coaching. Monitor student progress of all tiers and demographic subgroups for Math and Science. Support the work of the school leadership team with other duties as assigned by the principal. |
| Rosaly-Ortiz, Elsamarie | ELL Compliance Specialist | Along with the ELL team of paras, ensure that instructional support is provided to ELL students. Monitor academic progress of ELL students through analysis of data such as WIDA, FSA, NWEA, and other state/district assessments. Meet with parents/guardians of ELLs to keep them informed of academic progress throughout school year. Collaborate with school leadership team to keep rest of team informed of student progress and plan for next steps. |
| Patrick, Bonnie | Staffing Specialist | Support ESE Teachers via scheduling of students. Monitor timelines and completion of evaluations and IEP meetings. Support teachers with academic and behavior strategies to support student growth. Monitor academic data of students with disabilities and gifted students. Support school leadership team through other duties as assigned by the principal. |
| Maharaj, Neroli | Reading Coach | Literacy Coach's name is Neroli Maharaj.<br><br>Serve as coach, mentor, and conduct on-going classroom visits and coaching cycle with English Language Arts. Facilitate implementation of ELA curriculum |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| | | by providing curriculum support and side-by-side coaching. Monitor student progress of all tiers and demographic subgroups for ELA. Support the work of the school leadership team with other duties as assigned by the principal. Monitor progress of 3rd grade students working towards earning ELA Good Cause promotion to grade 4 via completion of portfolios. Plan for and monitor interventions for these students who are at-risk of retention. |
| | Instructional Media | Kristy Price-Media Specialist<br><br>Support students' access to traditional and media sources. Monitor library circulation and provide teachers and students with opportunities to access materials tied to curriculum needs, student levels of proficiency, and student interests. Will serve as testing coordinator to support WIDA , FSA, and FSAA assessments during school year. Train teachers on testing procedures to ensure fidelity. Monitor teacher completion of i-safe lessons and support teachers as needed. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 6/5/2019, Adah Schwartz

**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.*
6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
619

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**
16

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
18

**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 | 90 | 85 | 98 | 90 | 102 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 568 |
| 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 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 6 | 18 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

Tuesday 8/10/2021

## 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 | 98 | 79 | 95 | 102 | 92 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 573 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 33 | 18 | 32 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| One or more suspensions | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 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 | 28 | 28 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 37 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**2020-21 - Updated**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 98 | 79 | 95 | 102 | 92 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 573 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 33 | 18 | 32 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| One or more suspensions | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 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 | 28 | 28 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 37 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 46% | 53% | 57% | 50% | 51% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52% | 56% | 58% | 56% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 51% | 53% | 54% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 45% | 55% | 63% | 47% | 54% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 54% | 59% | 62% | 59% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 45% | 51% | 43% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 42% | 49% | 53% | 36% | 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 | 42% | 51% | -9% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 48% | -6% | 56% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 54% | -19% | 62% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 64% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -35% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 60% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| 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.**

Power BI ST3DI 20-21 Archive

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 50 | 38 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 41 | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42 | 24 | 21 |
| | English Language Learners | 37 | 31 | 22 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 52 | 40 | 32 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 54 | 41 | 34 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45 | 34 | 26 |
| | English Language Learners | 47 | 31 | 24 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 50 | 39 | 45 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46 | 35 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42 | 36 | 36 |
| | English Language Learners | 40 | 32 | 42 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51 | 35 | 36 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 30 | 33 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 38 | 35 | 22 |
| | English Language Learners | 46 | 30 | 35 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 46 | 41 | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 38 | 40 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29 | 18 | 30 |
| | English Language Learners | 37 | 28 | 37 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 38 | 37 | 42 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 37 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 25 | 23 |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 29 | 34 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43 | 37 | 42 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 35 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 27 | 22 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 26 | 22 | 26 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 38 | 32 | 38 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36 | 30 | 34 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 24 | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | 29 | 23 | 27 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 46 | 38 | 38 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48 | 37 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 19 | 21 |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 26 | 24 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 39 | 34 | 34 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 32 | 33 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24 | 22 | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | 24 | 20 | 23 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 49 | 44 | 42 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 43 | 29 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37 | 25 | 65 |
| | English Language Learners | 33 | 32 | 54 |

## 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 | 7 | 15 | | 8 | 7 | | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 37 | | 26 | 15 | | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 11 | | 28 | 22 | | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 40 | | 28 | 16 | 20 | 18 | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | | | 39 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 33 | 30 | 26 | 18 | | 15 | | | | |
| 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 | 9 | 27 | 30 | 13 | 40 | 40 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 49 | 47 | 32 | 48 | 38 | 26 | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 56 | | 43 | 51 | 30 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 53 | 48 | 43 | 54 | 50 | 41 | | | | |

| 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 | 55 | 50 | | 71 | 64 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 52 | 45 | 44 | 51 | 39 | 42 | | | | |
| 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 | 19 | 44 | 43 | 21 | 35 | 40 | | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 48 | 54 | 35 | 52 | 33 | 5 | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 59 | 67 | 46 | 59 | 44 | 34 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 54 | 50 | 44 | 57 | 38 | 34 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 57 | | 67 | 67 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 56 | 51 | 49 | 60 | 48 | 34 | | | | |

## 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 | 31 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 72 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 248 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 17 |
| 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 | 34 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 30 |
| 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 | 33 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 33 |
| 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?**

Math has shown a trend of lower performance across the school than Reading. Same with Math gains.

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

In 2019, ELL students dropped to 10% Proficiency in ELA from 22% in 2018.
Federal index for students with disabilities was 27%.

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

New actions taken were implementation of district resource materials with fidelity, consistent monitoring and feedback of ESE teachers and Support Facilitation environments from the leadership team, and deliberately scheduled and monitored interventions.

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

ESE students improved from 20% proficiency in 2017-18 to 39% proficiency in 2018-19, a 19% increase.

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

New actions taken and continued in 2019-20 were implementation of district resource materials with fidelity, consistent monitoring and feedback of ESE teachers and Support Facilitation environments from the leadership team, and deliberately scheduled and monitored interventions.

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

Utilizing intervention opportunities such as iii and PE waiver "Double Dose". Also monitoring classrooms using observations and "NEST" Tools to provide feedback for teaching and learning that occurs in all classrooms.

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

Teachers will be supported in Professional Learning Communities by a "Personal Trainer" for each grade level, to assist with managing agendas for data analysis, monitoring SMART goals, and following through on plans to help students across all ability levels and intervention opportunities. We are also starting AVID and PBIS which will help teachers train students on WICOR and behavior management skills.

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

We are continuing with 21st Century which was lanched in 2nd semester of 20-21. This provides over 50 students with after school instruction and homework help four days per week. Our school will be continuing with after-school tutoring and "Double Dose" interventions which extend beyond the core instruction and intervention periods that every school offers.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development | |
|---|---|
| **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 a leadership team. Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the adminstration, instructional coaches, lead tecahers, and other stakeholders that can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their priorities.<br><br>It was found through the insight survey that there is a need for growth in instructional leadership.<br><br>The insight survey domain score for Leadership in 2019-20 was 3.4 (3rd lowest domain) and in 2020-21 was 2.9 (4th lowest domain). |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Insight survey domain score for Leadership will be 4.0 or higher by end of 2021-2022 school year. |
| **Monitoring:** | Principal will meet with PLC Leads monthly to assess glows and grows pertaining to leadership within the building. Will carefully analyze feedback and take suggestions from teachers, as took place in spring 2021 after the latest results were available. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Ashton Terry (ashton.terry@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Increase teachers' leadership roles within the school. Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and has taught them to motivate, lead, and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitutde to teaching among leaders. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students and themselves need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school-improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each oether, learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas. This team dynamic-inwhich everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomse. It also boots teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments, transparency of pracitce and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019). |

### Action Steps to Implement

1.) Shifting in PLC's from "planning to prep", emphasizing the importance of using the Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPS) as intended to ensure guaranteed and viable curriculum for all students. Personal PLC trainers will assist with supporting and monitoring grade levels through this process.
2.) When having monthly meetings witih PLC lead teachers, create monthly measurable improvement strategies tied to goals. Will be able to analyze these and determine what strategies and goals are working/being met.
3.) Cultivate a mindset of focus and accountability within every staff member. Have documented meetings with teammates to ensure that everyone is working towards school goals within their individual roles and positions.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Ashton Terry (ashton.terry@osceolaschools.net) |

### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | On the 2021 Statewide Science Assessment, we finished the lowest of all elementary schools in the district for student proficiency. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Improve from 18% proficiency in Science to at least 35% on the 2022 SSA . |
| **Monitoring:** | Admin and Leadership Team will be instituting non-negotiables such as weekly mini-assessments and other research-based interventions in grades 3-5. This will allow us to have constant data points and allow us to monitor and intervene with groups of students who are not making progress, and to help us identify "bubble" students in 5th grade. We will also be monitoring 5th grade PLC's and science lessons to ensure consistency and GVC for all students. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Rieder (cynthia.rieder@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002). |

### Action Steps to Implement

1.) Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly comon planing PLC.
2.) Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content, pacing, and re-teaching of standards.
3.) Teachers will participate in PD that will utilize AVID strategies such as Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes, and interactive notebooks.
4.) Teachers will learn and implement standards-based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.
5.) ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialst and RCS ensuring students are support in science course.
6.) Teachers will provide individual student data chats.
7.) The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises.
8.) Teacher will provide Tier 2 and 3 instruction based on grade level standards, data, student tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Rieder (cynthia.rieder@osceolaschools.net) |

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our 2021 FSA Scores indicate Math Proficiency of 29%. Only 17% of students made learning gains from the 2019 FSA, and only 14% of Lowest 25% students made a learning gain. This indicates issues with instruction and monitoring for learning across all tiers of math. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase proficiency in Math from 29% to 41%, learning gains from 17% to 41%, and Lowest 25% gains from 14 % to 41%. |
| **Monitoring:** | Individual teachers and grade levels have been given a master data tracker and will be expected to monitor progress of students who count for proficiency and learning gains. Admin and Leadership team will be having regular data chats to discuss glows and grows. Intervention opportunities such as Double Dose will be given for students who are not making progress from core instruction or scheduled intervention time. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Rieder (cynthia.rieder@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | By identifying needs within math standards, identifying "bubble" students, and targeting these skills and groups of students with fidelity, we can expect to increase or capacity and the number of students who are adequately prepared for the state assessment in the spring. Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour et. al (2010) |

## Action Steps to Implement

1.) Staff will use vetted test specs to teach problem solving strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of engaging and differentiated math lessons

2.) Staff will assist students monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.

3.) Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in math or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non proficient based on a variety of assessments. In addition, enrichment activities will be offered to students to extend their learning.

4.) Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of learning.

5.) Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of learning.

6.) Formative assessments to monitor learning and provide teacher/student feedback.

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Rieder (cynthia.rieder@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | On the 2021 FSA, 37% of our students were proficient, 32% made learning gains from 2019 FSA, and 25% of Lowest 25% made learning gains. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our goals for ELA on 2022 FSA will be at least 47% of students proficient, 41% learning gains, and 41% Lowest 25% gains. |
| **Monitoring:** | Will monitor progress of students across all tiers of learning, have data chats with teachers regarding their students' ELA progress, implement programs such as Double Dose to provide additional support to struggling ELA students, and ensure teachers are trained in Core Connections and other relevant ELA programs to ensure fidelity and best instructional strategies being used. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achieveable, 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

RAISE Action Steps:
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**   Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

| **#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | ESSA data showed in 2018-19 that ESE was below ESSA level 41. This affected the proficiency and student acheivement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | ESSA data for 2021-22 will be 41% or above for both ELL and ESE subgroups. |
| **Monitoring:** | When visiting classrooms during observations or NEST walkthroughs, team members will identify ESE and ELL students in rooms and track their engagement and ability to complete standards-based tasks and problems assigned by teachers. During Leadership Team meetings and Stocktake sessions, team will use master data tracker and PowerBi to assess progress of ESE and ELL students, and discuss next steps for classrooms, grade levels, and/or schoolwide trends showing need for improvment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kimberly Yatsko (kimberly.yatsko@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically-diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum (Content, Process, Product, Affect). |

## Action Steps to Implement

1.) Grade levels will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
2.) PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjuntion with Leadership Team members.
3.) Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4.) Teachers will participate in Professional Development that focuses on instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies and ESE support strategies.
5.) ELL and ESE Compliance specialists will collaborate to ensure students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE Professional Development and instructional strategies for teachers.
6.) Students will participate in targeted interventions in tiers 1-3.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Yatsko (kimberly.yatsko@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #6. Other specifically relating to Culture & Environment | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared.\ <br><br>A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 2020-21 SEL Climate Survey showed 43% of students answered favorable for Emotion Regulation. Goal is for 2021-22 for this to increase to reach at least 50% of students. |
| **Monitoring:** | School Counselor will work with leadership team to ensure that students idenified as needing behavioral support beyond Tier I, mental health needs, or other SEL factors inhibiting them from reaching academic potentioal, are provided with specific interventiosn to increase their SEL capacity. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess invididual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | 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; identifying and building on students' individual needs and passions.
2.) Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3.) Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4.) Teachers will encourage and facilitate students' shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5.) Teachers will use active learning strategies.
6.) Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into academic curriculum.
7.) Teachers will facilitate collaborative learning among students.
8.) School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunties that support SEL development.
9.) All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plan will be developed.

| **Person Responsible** | Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

**We have a school incident rating of "Very Low" and appear to be in the 80th percentile or higher for lowest rate of school incidents and suspensions across all elementary schools in the district and state. We have worked to shift the cultural mindset of our school from expected discipline to expected to teach and train students to recover from and learn from making unwanted decisions. We have been championing our new PBIS program and are confident Koa will continue to demonstrate low number of incidents and suspensions for 2021-2022.**

## 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.

To promote a positive culture among teachers and staff within the building, there are several activities and awards that are done on a routine basis. This includes, traveling treats for the teachers and staff served by the principal and AP, meals for the staff on special occasions such as Thanksgiving, a Sunshine Committee comprised of staff members that put on breakfasts and other treats for the employees, and awards such as the "Heart & Hustle Award" and "Coaches Award" that recognizes teachers and staff who go above and beyond. To promote a student-first climate within our school, we have several systems in place with reward students for positive choices, and help students who are struggling with issues making it challenging for them to be successful each day. These systems include our "Koala-ty Bucks" which are given to students for making positive choices. Students can spend Koala-ty Bucks in a school store on toys, games, etc. We also have a mentoring system where we assign students with academic, social-emotional, or other behavioral difficulties to a staff member who provides a direct support system to the child. We also have a positive referral system. Students whose teachers write them a positive referral get Koala-ty bucks and a visit from the principal or AP, and have their names shared on the morning announcements. The school also has a "Helping Hand" award given to students who make choices that positively impact safety or well-being in our school. We provide many activities during and after-school to promote parent participation and motivate our students. We have quarterly awards which parents are invited to, recognizing students for grades, behavior, and attendance. We also held a "Climbing Koala Awards" ceremony to recognize student achievement and learning gains on the FSA tests. We also provide students with a variety of after-school activities including running club, cross country, Odyssey of the Mind, Battle of the Books, gardening, basketball, and more. We provide many opportunities for parents and volunteers to engage in supporting our students. One example of this is our "Bookmark Buddies", in which community members volunteer to

work with struggling readers. During 2019-2020, all 33 students who were identified for this program were able to receive reading support each week from an OASIS certified volunteer.

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

Ashton Terry and Erica Sanders IAdministration)
Wanda Moreno (School Counselor)
Randy Anthony (SRO)
Kim Yatsko (MTSS Coach, monitors students on tiered behavior plans)
Bonnie Patrick (ESE Specialist)
Elsamarie Rosaly-Ortiz (ESOL Specialist)
Jonathan Rivera (Behavior Tech)
Andrea Hickey (Volunteer Coordinator)
Kim Jarka (Sunshine Committee Lead)