Osceola County School For The Arts

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Osceola County School For The Arts

3151 N ORANGE BLOSSOM TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Dennis Neal

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (85%)
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

Osceola County School For The Arts

3151 N ORANGE BLOSSOM TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34744

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)
High School 6-12	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

It is our Mission to provide a community that nourishes and nurtures the personal integrity and creative expression of our students in their pursuit of artistic and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Osceola County School for the Arts will grow to become an artistic showcase where the community gathers to appreciate the artistic talents and academic achievements of its students.

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
Neal, Dennis	Principal	Principal oversees all team members Stocktake: holds team members accountable for results, asks questions that challenge and support, actively engages in problem solving
Conners, Mark	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction Master Schedule and Curriculum Stocktake: facilitator, prepares Principal for meeting, designs agenda, keeps meeting on track.
Gilford, Lisa Renee	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of College and Career Stocktake: PLC PP
Bell, Tiffany	Dean	Oversees MTSS, academic interventions, MTSS Stocktake PP
Cornwell, Gislene	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, MTSS Interventions, ELA Curriculum Coach, Professional Development, ELA/Reading Stocktake PP
Gonzalez, Ana	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, MTSS Interventions, Math Curriculum Coach, Professional Development, Math Stocktake PP.
Vedder, Jay	Instructional Coach	Testing, Science Stocktake PP

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/22/2020, Dennis Neal

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

967

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

11

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

12

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	139	135	177	152	134	139	967
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	27	42	53	61	39	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	1	2	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	2	3	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	3	0	0	3	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	2	6	2	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	3	8	4	1	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	2	6	2	19

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	3	6	3	3	2	2	19

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	4	0	3	3	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/18/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	155	142	167	152	152	119	1014
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	42	28	48	57	56	262
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	1	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	3	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	7	4	4	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	4	1	1	0	17

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	2	4	1	3	2	0	0	12

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	155	142	167	152	152	119	1014
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	42	28	48	57	56	262
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	1	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	3	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	7	4	4	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	4	1	1	0	17

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	2	4	1	3	2	0	0	12

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				89%	57%	56%	92%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	48%	51%	74%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				74%	43%	42%	83%	47%	44%
Math Achievement				91%	46%	51%	84%	39%	51%
Math Learning Gains				79%	41%	48%	74%	40%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				85%	46%	45%	66%	46%	45%
Science Achievement				87%	69%	68%	88%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				97%	70%	73%	99%	70%	71%

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
06	2021					
	2019	89%	48%	41%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	88%	47%	41%	52%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
08	2021					
	2019	90%	49%	41%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
09	2021					
	2019	89%	47%	42%	55%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
10	2021					
	2019	84%	47%	37%	53%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	92%	45%	47%	55%	37%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
08	2021					
	2019	88%	47%	41%	46%	42%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	78%	42%	36%	48%	30%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	62%	31%	67%	26%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	99%	73%	26%	71%	28%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	89%	62%	27%	70%	19%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	89%	49%	40%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	94%	44%	50%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA Progress Monitoring
Number of Students / Percentage of Students
Civics, Biology, and US History are still being examined

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	86 / 90%	107 / 86%	112 / 90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30 / 94%	42 / 98%	40 / 93%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	18 / 95%	20 / 83%	21 / 88%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	99 / 80%	111 / 89%	109 / 87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35 / 85%	40 / 93%	37 / 86%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	19 / 83%	20 / 83%	20 / 83%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78 / 79%	106 / 79%	106 / 80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32 / 80%	38 / 73%	38 / 75%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	10 / 48%	14 / 56%	16 / 64%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	104 / 70%	103 / 70%	103 / 73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35 / 63%	35 / 59%	`42 / 74%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%
	English Language Learners	15 / 58%	12 / 48%	13 / 54%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69 / 84%	94 / 83%	94 / 80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 84%	29 / 81%	27 / 69%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 100%	2 / 100%	1 / 50%
	English Language Learners	3 / 60%	3 / 43%	3 / 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89 / 66%	94 / 73%	102 / 80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25 / 57%	31 / 76%	33 / 77%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 100%	1 / 50%	2 / 100%
	English Language Learners	5 / 56%	6 / 67%	6 / 67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	19 / 73%	19 / 61%	25 / 71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 67%	8 / 62%	10 / 67%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 100%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%
	English Language Learners	2 / 50%	3 / 50%	4 / 67%

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	143 / 91%	129 / 80%	75 / 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 34%	21 / 47%	26 / 58%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 75%	2 / 50%	3 / 75%
	English Language Learners	17 / 77%	16 / 76%	16 / 76%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	61 / 50%	73 / 59%	75 / 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 34%	21 / 47%	26 / 58%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 25%	1 / 25%	2 / 50%
	English Language Learners	8 / 42%	10 / 56%	11 / 61%
Biology	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62 / 82%	62 / 81%	61 / 81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 68%	19 / 73%	18 / 67%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 25%	1 / 17%	1 / 14%
	English Language Learners	2 / 25%	4 / 57%	3 / 38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8 / 18%	15 / 34%	17 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 13%	4 / 24%	6 / 38%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 11%	3 / 38%	2 / 25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2 / 50%	1 / 33%	1 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 100%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 12					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities		n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a

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	40	53	45	50	50						
ELL	72	73	69	76	66	70	73	95	91		
ASN	91	70		96	82		89	100	100		
BLK	85	66	50	79	54	50	83	89	88	100	72
HSP	85	66	69	78	57	63	77	92	84	100	75

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
MUL	89	76		80	63		82	100			
WHT	92	73	67	86	55	81	89	100	91	100	91
FRL	83	69	68	77	57	62	70	94	86	100	83

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				60							
ELL	73	73	80	86	76	74	75	100			
ASN	96	73		95	95		100	100			
BLK	88	76	86	84	86	93	65	89		100	95
HSP	86	67	72	90	78	82	87	97	100	99	79
MUL	81	70		88	63						
WHT	97	70	78	96	77	96	94	100	100	100	84
FRL	85	65	70	88	77	86	83	93	100	99	84

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
ELL	57	79		53	69						
ASN	100	87		100	80				100		
BLK	85	75	73	64	59	42	78	92	100		
HSP	91	72	83	84	74	70	86	100	90	99	83
MUL	100	93		77	67						
WHT	93	74	85	87	78	78	95	100	95	100	81
FRL	90	74	80	81	73	60	84	100	91	100	81

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	944
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	76
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	74
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	76
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	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	84
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	77
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?

The trend that emerges across grade levels is a slight change by 2-3 percent increase or decrease of proficiency in our progress monitoring assessment NWEA.
ELA - grade 9 has the largest decrease from fall to spring with a decrease of 11%

The subgroup trend that is emerges in an area of need is SWD (students with disabilities), especially targeting math achievement FSA. Its is the lowest percent showing proficiency at 60%.

Another subgroup that emerges in an area of need is ELL (English Language Learners) targeting ELA FSA and NWEA.
ELL subgroup increased in FSA math achievement from 53% to 86%. Now there needs to be a focus on ELA.

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

Science - grade 8
Math Achievement - SWD - all grades
ELA - ELL - all grades

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

The main contributing factors to this need for improvement has been a lack of training overall. Due to some of the environmental factors that the district and country were facing last year, our schedule had to be modified and it cut into the time for regular professional development. This also was a main factor in our staff climate survey. Teachers felt that more training was needed on a regular basis.

The new action that will place this year is bringing back that time for monthly professional development and using the resources from the district and school personnel to provide best practices and training in the resources for our students. These trainings will target SWD, ELL, MTSS, and PBIS in order to decrease the achievement gap.

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

The areas most improved was with the ELL subgroup - FSA math achievement. The subgroup increased from 53 to 86.

The area most improved based off progress monitoring (NWEA) was grade 9 math increasing from 50%-61%, a different of 11%

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

One of the contributing factors to this improvement was our after school tutoring sessions. Students were able to receive extra help in Reading, Math and Science. However, math is the area where we saw the majority of the participation. Math teachers were able to target on the weaker benchmarks after school 4 days a week. We included incentives for students to come and also gave tangible items (food related) to students that stayed after school.
We have had held tutoring sessions in previous years, but none as successful as this past year.

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

Regular monthly schedule for professional learning for all instructional staff targeting specific needs determined by data.

Instructional coaching from our coaching staff for all teachers in BEST standards, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction, working with ELL students, and SWD

Standards aligned instruction - BEST standards (ELA), along with implementation of new curriculum to meet the needs of all learners.

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

Professional development opportunities will consist of BEST standards, PBIS, strategies for ELL and SWD, technology (1:1 devices), Social Emotional learning, and Tier 2 and 3 Intervention Practices,

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

Additional services that will implemented this year to ensure the sustainability of improvement this school year and beyond is to continue to work in professional learning communities, diving into data and moving students to appropriate tiered instruction, monitor intervention plans twice a month, Stocktake data sessions, and monitor strategies and tier 1 instruction by the use of classroom walkthroughs and NEST.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. School level leadership development, Ensuring that school level instructional leaders are trained on new district implementations such as new standards, non-evaluative tools, best strategies for student in tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction. 2. Data disaggregation and monitoring - Leadership is assigned as a "point person" in a certain area in when coming together in a Stocktake forum. Each member will review their data before each Stocktake meeting in order to determine the status of their area. Stocktake facilitator will meet with the principal prior to review the ratings data before the Stocktake meeting for questions in any of the areas. 3. Teacher targeted feedback - leadership team and coaching team will give teachers specific feedback using tools (New Teacher Center, NESTI, and iObservation) to assist in targeted feedback for teachers. 4. Non-evaluative school trend instrument (NESTI Walkthrough Tool) - Administrators and district resource teachers will use NESTI as a tool to collect data and monitor the progress of Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	1. School level leadership development - all leadership staff will attend school wide professional development sessions (8/10 sessions) 2. Data disaggregation and monitoring - each member to submit their Stocktake ratings along after the disaggregation of the data in their specified areas. 3. Teacher targeted feedback - administrators will hold pre/post conferences documented on iObservation. Coaches will NTC tools for new teacher feedback, leadership (school and district) will use NESTI to gather data. Data will monitored and analyzed during Stocktake. 4. Non-evaluative school trend instrument (NESTI) - will be used by school administrators weekly.
Monitoring:	1. School level leadership development - PD Calendar 2. Data disaggregation and monitoring - Stocktake calendar, minutes and ratings 3. Teacher targeted feedback - notes from online tools 4. NESTI - collection of data from form. Leadership meeting notes and Stocktake minutes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dennis Neal (dennis.neal@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. School level leadership development - Strategy - continued expectation of professional learning for all staff, leadership also is a part of content area PLCs. 2. Data disaggregation and monitoring - Strategy - learning and disaggregating data to make informed data driven decisions. 3. Teacher targeted feedback - strategy: providing specific, and timely feedback is one of the best strategies to change and improve instruction. 4. Non-evaluative school trend instrument (NESTI) - Strategy - understanding the whole picture in relation to tier 1 and 2 instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development "High-quality professional learning can equip principals with the knowledge, mindset, and skills to support effective teaching and to lead across their full range of responsibilities," according to the report. "With this investment, principals are best positioned to foster school environments in which adults and students thrive." - Dr. Denisa Superville https://www.hanoverresearch.com/reports-and-briefs/ Data and Monitoring

Domain 1 Student Achievement - School Leader Evaluation System
Prioritizing feedback: Page 39
Florida Department of Education
https://www.osceolaschools.net/cms/lib/FL50000609/Centricity/Domain/1198/
2019-20%20School%20Leader%20Evaluation%20System%20071918.pdf
Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's
student learning goals and direct energy, influence, and resources toward data analysis for
instructional improvement, development and implementation of quality standards-based
curricula.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration team will meet weekly to discuss upcoming professional development work with coaches to ensure the fidelity of the professional development calendar.

Person Responsible Lisa Renee Gilford (lisarenee.gilford@osceolaschools.net)

Leadership team members are a part of the Stocktake process and will meet monthly to create action steps and evaluate collected data from previous steps.

Person Responsible Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

Administrative team will meet weekly to review walkthrough schedule and to ensure each teacher is receiving specific feedback. Schedule will be created for each member. NESTI data will reviewed monthly.

Person Responsible Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Achievement Students need assistance in using effective ELA strategies.
Measurable Outcome:	NWEA - Middle School - Increase 1% ELA 6th grade - 90% to 91% 7th grade - 80% to 81% 8th grade - 80% to 81% NWEA - High School - Increase 2% ELA 9th grade - 61% to 63% 10th grade - 81% to 83%
Monitoring:	Monthly Stocktake meetings - point person will share highlighted data and action plan with team MTSS meetings - Literacy Coach will share updated data, progress monitoring and formative assessments with MTSS team. Coach will monitor data and list student names for concern about movement from tier 1 to 2 or from tier 2 to 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gislene Cornwell (gislene.cornwell@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: 1. Collaborative Planning / Professional learning communities 2. Professional learning 3. Standards Aligned Instruction 4. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices 5. Tier 2 and 3 Instructional Intervention Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"A criterion for schools that have made great strides in achievement and equity is immediate and decisive intervention...Successful schools do not give a second thought to providing preventative assistance for students in need." (Reeves, 2006, p.87)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be provided Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis.
2. Students will be monitored through Professional Learning Communities, Stocktake, and MTSS frameworks ensuring proper placement is made throughout year and interventions are effective.
3. Data chats with teachers from coaches and admin are conducted three times a year reflecting NWEA data.
4. Continued professional development is conducted monthly for B.E.S.T standards that align with new ELA and reading curriculum.
5. Professional learning and training will occur monthly - updated MTSS process and data, how to support students with disabilities (research based strategies), ELL strategies (using strategies beyond the dictionary and glossaries).
6. Acceleration and Enrichment for students in advanced classes are exceeding expectations within course content or B.E.S.T. standards - after school tutoring and homeroom time

Person Responsible	Tiffany Bell (tiffany.bell@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will meet weekly in professional learning communities.
Progress and stages of PLCs will be monitored through One Note Notebook
Teachers will develop proper placement during homeroom and academic intervention during their PLC time to reflect remediation and acceleration needs and interventions that will take place.
After school tutoring for enrichment or remediation will also be planned during the weekly PLC period.

Person Responsible   Gislene Cornwell (gislene.cornwell@osceolaschools.net)

BEST Standards will be adhered and monitored through lesson plans, walkthroughs, and literacy coach. Ongoing training will continue throughout the year.

Person Responsible   Lisa Renee Gilford (lisarenee.gilford@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Achievement In order to continue the growth in mathematics
Measurable Outcome:	NWEA - Middle School - Increase 1% Math 6th grade - 87% to 88% 7th grade - 73% to 74% 8th grade - 80% to 81% NWEA - High School - Increase 2% Math 9th grade - 61% to 63% 10th grade - 43% to 45%
Monitoring:	Monthly Stocktake meetings - point person will share highlighted data and action plan with team MTSS meetings - Math Coach will share updated data, progress monitoring and formative assessments with MTSS team. Coach will monitor data and list student names for concern about movement from tier 1 to 2 or from tier 2 to 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalezenriquez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: 1. Collaborative Planning / Professional learning communities 2. Professional learning 3. Standards Aligned Instruction 4. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices 5. Tier 2 and 3 Instructional Intervention Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Lowest quartile students continue to struggle in math achievement. The MTSS process has been proven to be successful. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being using in the analyzing and planning for the student achievement. School stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 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. "Teachers in gap-closing schools more frequently use data to understand the skill gaps of low-achieving students...when data points to a weakness in students' academic skills, gap-closing schools are more likely to focus in on that area, making tough choices to ensure that students are immersed in what the need most." (Symonds, 2004, p. 13)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will provide interventions for Enrichment, Tier 2, and Tier3 in math. Math tier 2 interventions will occur within math math instruction by grade level math teachers and tier 3 interventions will occur outside the math block using an interventionist or math coach.
2. Teachers will receive monthly professional development with district support in providing an overview of

course content and upcoming course standards.

3. Teachers will receive monthly professional development in best strategies working with students will disabilities and ELL students.

4. Math teachers will work in professional learning communities designed to reflect in previous data and using the MTSS framework provided by district, ensure that students are receiving proper interventions and placed in proper tiers.

5. Teachers will hold annual math night during the 3rd quarter. This strengthens knowledge of standards and builds working relationships with parents.

6. Acceleration and enrichment during homeroom time

Person Responsible Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalezenriquez@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will meet weekly in professional learning communities, reflecting the MTSS process and providing interventions. Acceleration and remediation placement of students and interventions for proper grouping of students.
Progress and stages of PLCs will be monitored through One Note Notebook
Professional Development notes, agendas, and attendance
Math night plans through PLC notes and attendance

Person Responsible Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalezenriquez@osceolaschools.net)

Math Standards will be adhered and monitored through lesson plans, walkthroughs, and math coach. Ongoing training will continue throughout the year for depth of standard and test specs.

Person Responsible Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement Science Achievement has been consistently declining
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall science achievement. NWEA: Increase by 1% 71% to 72%
Monitoring:	Monthly Stocktake meetings - point person will share highlighted data and action plan with team Science Coach/Testing coordinator will assist in Tier 2 science interventions during intervention time.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jay Vedder (jay.vedder@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: 1. Collaborative Planning / Professional learning communities 2. Professional learning 3. Standards Aligned Instruction 4. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices 5. Tier 2 and 3 Instructional Intervention Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC process is a research-based strategy with proven success. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being using in the analyzing and planning for the student achievement. School stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 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. "Schools committed to improving student learning need information more than ever. They must have process that gathers authentic and relevant information and use it to identify strengths and weaknesses in a way that pushes people toward continuous improvement." (Dolan, 1994).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science tier 2 interventions will occur within intervention scheduled allotted time.
2. Planning for Acceleration and Remediation will occur during PLCs.
3. Tier 2 interventions once an assessment has been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on deficient content. Students will then receive additional resources and support Biology, and 8th grade Science assessment of the standards.
4. Middle school science teachers will meet regularly to ensure that the gap within the 7th and 8th grade course content reflects life science before students are assess with the Florida Standards in 8th grade.
5. Coaches will meet with the science department for quarterly data chats reflecting NWEA data (science and reading), and formative assessments using School City.
6. Professional development will occur for all science teachers, working with students with disabilities and ELL students - research based strategies for specific content.

Person Responsible   Jay Vedder (jay.vedder@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will meet weekly in professional learning communities.
Progress and stages of PLCs will be monitored through One Note Notebook
Teachers will create action plans based upon their formative assessments and NWEA data. Action plans will be documented through One Note PLC minutes.

Person Responsible   Jay Vedder (jay.vedder@osceolaschools.net)

All science teachers will participate in the school wide professional development trainings to gain knowledge on how to best serve ELL and SWD subgroups.
Attendance for all professional development sessions will be taken.
All remediation intervention and enrichment content and strategies will be documented through the PLC One Note Notebook.
PLC Stocktake point person will review all PLC minutes before reporting to Principal during Stocktake meeting.

Person Responsible   Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Subgroups: SWD - Math Achievement Percentage ELL - ELA Learning gains
Measurable Outcome:	Subgroups: SWD - Math Achievement Percentage - Increase by 1%: 60% to 61% ELL - ELA Learning gains - Increase 1%: 73% to 74%
Monitoring:	These two subgroups will monitored through the MTSS and Stocktake process. The point person for each area will disaggregate the data and create actions for each
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: 1. Collaborative Planning / Professional learning communities 2. Professional learning 3. Standards Aligned Instruction 4. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices 5. Tier 2 and 3 Instructional Intervention Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies for Teachers: Using correct terminology when appropriate Confidentiality, Stigma, and Disclosure Teaching Scaffolds Inclusive Design A school is to never look the whole picture of their performance. It is the community that should see the picture. The school should be focused on each subgroup because learning is not a one-size fits all (Duggan, 2014, Targeting Subgroups).

Action Steps to Implement

ESE support facilitation teachers along with our ELL resource teacher will assist teachers within their PLCs to help provide scaffolds and supports to classroom teachers. These support teachers will also use collaborative planning time to ensure that they are prepared for the next day's lesson.

Person Responsible	Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

ESE support facilitation teachers and ELL specialist will continue monthly professional learning. They will also use this platform to facilitate a professional learning opportunities to at least twice a year.

Person Responsible	Gislene Cornwell (gislene.cornwell@osceolaschools.net)

ELL specialist and ESE support team will ensure that each student is being exposed and working with on level text and on level standards each day. Team will also reach out to PLC leads if they would like additional training.

Person Responsible	Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

The MTSS coach will also ensure that each ELL and ESE student are appropriately placed within the multi-tiered system of support. Each month the team will make sure to discuss the progress each student is making. If a student does not make appropriate growth, then interventions will be discussed and determined based upon data.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Bell (tiffany.bell@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Culture and Environment	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social emotional learning is in our everyday lessons at OCSA. Artists tend to look inward to themselves and therefore we encourage teachers and students to build working professional relationships with one another.
Measurable Outcome:	2020 Panorama data showed less than 40% students stated that they do not have a strong connection to an adult at OCSA. Our goal is for 80% of our students to have three trusted adults that they are about to come when dealing with a situation.
Monitoring:	Panorama data Do you have a trusted adult on campus 28% of students stated no - goal will to increase to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Social Emotional Learning 2. Community and Parent Involvment 3. Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support 4. Equity and Diversity 5. Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	OCSA has a strong future orientation that engages all students from 6-12th grades. Students are presented with tools to help them plan for their post secondary decision and supported from parent, community, and school stakeholders. When schools promote student academic and personal development, students will fully gain common those post secondary expectations. Students are monitored and post secondary plans are tracked in Xello. Students are tracked using Xello and Focus their secondary plans. Mrs. Gill meets with each senior multiple times a year to ensure post secondary plans are followed and ensures each student is kept up to date on the latest information. "Providing a positive post-secondary culture is pervasive. Ensuring strong college-going, and vocational culture that many underserved communities face numerous challenges that prevent them from creating these kids of conditions. Providing this type of post-secondary culture will increase the job growth within the community."(Carnevale, 2016,p. 3)

Action Steps to Implement

Xello is the college and career platform available to all high school students. Counselors use the scoping sequence which are delivered by ELA teachers and guidance team to expose students to college and career skills and career demand.

Person Responsible	Mark Conners (mark.conners@osceolaschools.net)

Guidance will work with teachers building SEL lessons into each content area. Teachers took the first week and a half to work on building relationships and embedded lessons regarding social emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Lisa Renee Gilford (lisarenee.gilford@osceolaschools.net)

Implement PBIS
Create school wide expectations for everyone to understand

Person Responsible   Tiffany Bell (tiffany.bell@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.

Very low: violent incidents, property incidents, and drug/public order incidents.
Overall suspensions did increase; however there were additional students during that date.
PBIS will create a solid Tier 1 plan.

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.

Osceola County School for the Arts will continue building positive relationships with families through the use of the school website, Remind, Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) to continue positive communication and updates to students, parents, and community members. Supporting Social Emotional Learning is a large part of our positive culture at OCSA. Daily messages are sent to students via OCSA Announcements that reference positive and encouraging mindset throughout their time at school. Clubs and student led organizations also
assist in a positive atmosphere at OCSA. Clubs such as Positiviti, Interact, and Links promote friendship and solidarity among students. Students are rarely along and find OCSA their home away from home. The school engages students, families, and community in a positive and artistic environment that fosters the creation and celebration of art. OCSA has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as decision-making SAC committee that reaches to families and communities. They assist in the important process of approving funds for students and teacher activities and it acts a forum for develop ideas and assist in the process of ensuring the success of the activities.

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

There is a collaborative culture at OCSA.
OCSA teachers work in professional learning communities each week to design lessons, create

formative and summative assessments, reviews data and reflect on student learning. Each teacher also belongs to a district ePLC that encourages growing and learning in district content areas. Teachers receive professional development, then take what is learned to apply it in their own classrooms. These learning communities have enhanced our "togetherness" here at OCSA and it has become a strong part of our culture. Since our teachers work in teams, and many of them are singletons in grade levels, teachers are also work crosscurricular to develop unit plans that incorporate more than one content area.

Another way we have developed collaboration is through the use of Teams. Each PLC has a team, as well as a school wide faculty teams. This allows teachers to ask questions to one another and bounce ideas off of each other since most teachers are teaching 7 out of 7 periods.

Each leadership team member attends a content area PLC. This shows that there is continuity in learning and allows the leadership to participate like one of the team members.

The leadership team gives feedback to PLC leads and members and also may suggest evidence-based practices and strategies that could enhance student learning.

The OCSA Leadership Team meets each Monday to discuss the week ahead, content agendas, teaching and learning throughout the classrooms, and any issues that may arise. This team is similar to a PLC and data is reviewed bi-weekly to review any opportunities for growth or to create action plans. The team consists of administrators, dean, testing coordinator, guidance director, and instructional coaches. This team implements evidence-based practices to everyday procedures.

The team may also solicit feedback from teachers and staff to review procedures and what is working throughout the school.

Part V: Budget

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

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