

School District of Osceola County, FL

Osceola High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 30 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Osceola High School

420 S THACKER AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Johana Santiago

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 77% |
| 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: C (47%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Osceola High School

420 S THACKER AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">88%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p> |

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.

Osceola High School will provide access to rigorous courses with interventions to support all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Graduate all students career and college ready.

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 |
|----------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OF INSTRUCTION Yanelys Ballard Assessing Administrator</p> <p>Math and Math ESE support (20) (Science (14) ; ELL Specialist (1); School counselors (6); College and Career Counselor (1) ; ELL paras (4); Guidance clerk typist (1); Data entry (2) ; Attendance Interventionist (1) ; Front desk clerk (1) ; Attendance clerk typist (1) ; Math coach (1); Science coach (1) ; Edgenuity (2)</p> <p>Areas of Supervision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back up of principal for payroll • Stocktake • LASSO • Customer service • Main office operations • Mental Health Referrals • Guidance Department Operations • Master Schedule • Student Scheduling • Staff development • Lesson Plan Submission • Substitute Procedures • Open House • Summer Instructional Programs • DOE Data Validation (Instructional) • Grade Submission Processes • Graduation Data & At-Risk • Other Duties as Assigned |
| Walters, Erica | Assistant Principal | |
| | | <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR COLLEGE AND CAREER Dr. Rivera Assessing Administrator</p> <p>Career & Technical Education (13); 3DE (10) ; World Language (9); Testing clerk (1); Testing Coordinator (1)</p> <p>Areas of Supervision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer Service • State Assessment Supervision/ calendar • Advanced Placement Program • Khan Academy • Professional Learning Communities • Multi-Tiered System of Support • Teacher of the Year/Professional Support Staffer of the Year Selection • Record Keeping of Data • Other Duties as Assigned |
| Rivera, Ivett | Assistant Principal | |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Bryant, Bronsky | Assistant Principal | <p>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OF STUDENT SERVICES Bronsky Bryant Assessing Administrator</p> <p>ESE Self Contained (12); ESE paras (11); School deans (4); custodial; (13)campus monitors ; (1) Dean clerk typist (1) ; PE (5); Fine Art (4)); Media Center specialist (1); ROTC Air Force (2) ; Nurse (1)</p> <p>Areas of Supervision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer service • Student Services Operations • Master Calendar • MTSS • Attendance Programs & Interventions • Student Discipline • Expulsion Hearings • Facilities • Positive Behavior Support System • DOE Data Validation (Discipline) • Transportation • Emergency Management Plans and drills • Field Trips • Duty roster • VAM Roster Verifications • Event coverage • Assist with graduation data • Assist with staff development • Other Duties as Assigned |
| Santiago, Johanna | Principal | <p>PRINCIPAL Johana Santiago Assessing Administrator</p> <p>English Language Arts and ESE Language Arts (22); Reading (8) Social Studies (13) AVID (2) Principal Secretary (1); AP (3) Bookkeeper (1) Reading Coach (1) Academic Interventionist (1) ; LRS (1) ; MTSS Coach (1)</p> <p>Areas of Supervision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer service • School wide Operations • Leadership meetings • AVID • Title I Programs • Instructional Technology • School Budget & Internal Accounts • School Advisory Council |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Handbook • Public Relations • Athletics • Unit allocations • All other duties as assigned |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/12/2021, Johana Santiago

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.*

2

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.*

32

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

127

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,346

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

10

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

8

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 609 | 610 | 570 | 557 | 2346 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 78 | 52 | 57 | 288 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 105 | 95 | 69 | 350 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 146 | 107 | 93 | 405 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 22 | 50 | 44 | 159 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 221 | 195 | 154 | 793 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 257 | 125 | 175 | 866 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 351 | 360 | 340 | 275 | 1326 |

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 | 90 | 182 | 130 | 131 | 533 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 23 | 32 | 96 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 13 | 46 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/13/2021

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 345 | 269 | 292 | 1237 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 85 | 86 | 104 | 376 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 76 | 64 | 22 | 181 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 80 | 46 | 37 | 185 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 108 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 92 | 271 |

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 | 9 | 31 | 81 | 54 | 175 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 36 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 345 | 269 | 292 | 1237 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 85 | 86 | 104 | 376 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 76 | 64 | 22 | 181 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 80 | 46 | 37 | 185 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 108 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 92 | 271 |

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 | 9 | 31 | 81 | 54 | 175 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 12 | 24 | 67 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 36 |

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 | | | | 37% | 57% | 56% | 41% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 43% | 48% | 51% | 50% | 54% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 43% | 42% | 37% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 29% | 46% | 51% | 30% | 39% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 35% | 41% | 48% | 39% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 46% | 45% | 41% | 46% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 48% | 69% | 68% | 56% | 67% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 66% | 70% | 73% | 62% | 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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 47% | -15% | 55% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 47% | -11% | 53% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 67% | -20% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 61% | 62% | -1% | 70% | -9% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 19% | 49% | -30% | 61% | -42% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 37% | 44% | -7% | 57% | -20% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA and SchoolCity common assessment data is utilized for progress monitoring.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 56 | 48 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56 | 46 | 45 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12 | 12 | 10 |
| | English Language Learners | 28 | 18 | 23 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | 18 | 22 | 22 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 | 19 | 22 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 8 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 9 | 14 | 14 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Biology | All Students | 56 | 51 | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56 | 51 | 51 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 52 | 42 | 58 |
| | English Language Learners | 49 | 53 | 49 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| US History | All Students | | 20 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 20 | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48 | 43 | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 42 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 16 | 11 |
| | English Language Learners | 29 | 27 | 29 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12 | 18 | 17 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 14 | 16 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 3 | 9 |
| | English Language Learners | 5 | 16 | 14 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 43 | 41 | 42 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 41 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37 | 36 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 39 | 38 | 39 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47 | 39 | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 39 | 51 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 46 | 36 | 65 |
| | English Language Learners | 23 | 26 | 40 |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | 8 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 38 | 41 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 38 | 41 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 29 | 31 |
| | | 31 | 33 | 34 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 45 | 41 | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 45 | 41 | 51 |
| | English Language Learners | 43 | 37 | 44 |
| | | 36 | 35 | 46 |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | 16 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 5 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | 8 | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 37 | 44 | 38 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 37 | 44 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 46 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 34 | 49 | 34 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 40 | 29 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | | 39 | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 11 | 39 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

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 | 20 | 28 | 29 | 19 | 35 | 52 | 36 | 55 | | 92 | 12 |
| ELL | 13 | 33 | 36 | 19 | 33 | 44 | 33 | 36 | | 94 | 48 |
| ASN | 58 | 45 | | 59 | 46 | | | | | 90 | 50 |
| BLK | 25 | 29 | 33 | 16 | 25 | 31 | 39 | 59 | | 93 | 40 |
| HSP | 32 | 38 | 33 | 25 | 31 | 44 | 51 | 52 | | 94 | 53 |

| 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 | 41 | 44 | | 30 | | | | | | 100 | 64 |
| WHT | 44 | 45 | 29 | 36 | 34 | 57 | 55 | 71 | | 94 | 53 |
| FRL | 31 | 35 | 32 | 20 | 25 | 36 | 45 | 51 | | 91 | 48 |
| 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 | 20 | 31 | 28 | 20 | 37 | 37 | 31 | 33 | | 83 | 7 |
| ELL | 19 | 39 | 33 | 23 | 36 | 42 | 33 | 40 | | 73 | 49 |
| ASN | 60 | 53 | | 64 | 45 | | | 75 | | 95 | 85 |
| BLK | 30 | 42 | 27 | 24 | 28 | 28 | 39 | 59 | | 95 | 35 |
| HSP | 35 | 43 | 35 | 28 | 37 | 39 | 48 | 64 | | 86 | 47 |
| MUL | 53 | 33 | | | | | | 77 | | 100 | 60 |
| WHT | 48 | 50 | 33 | 39 | 32 | 21 | 59 | 77 | | 92 | 51 |
| FRL | 33 | 43 | 32 | 25 | 32 | 34 | 46 | 63 | | 91 | 48 |
| 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 | 27 | 47 | 29 | 24 | 31 | 29 | 27 | 36 | | 61 | 20 |
| ELL | 17 | 43 | 39 | 21 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 36 | | 71 | 61 |
| ASN | 45 | 47 | | 61 | 67 | | 74 | 82 | | 93 | 64 |
| BLK | 32 | 49 | 46 | 18 | 35 | 38 | 41 | 56 | | 88 | 33 |
| HSP | 39 | 49 | 36 | 29 | 38 | 41 | 56 | 59 | | 85 | 53 |
| MUL | 60 | 65 | | 35 | 37 | | 75 | 75 | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 57 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 44 | 71 | 82 | | 92 | 62 |
| FRL | 39 | 49 | 37 | 28 | 38 | 41 | 55 | 57 | | 86 | 50 |

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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 35 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 489 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 40 |
| 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?

School trends indicate a decrease in proficiency in all areas with the exception of Biology and lowest quartile in math.

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

Our ESE and ELL subgroup population indicate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Based on our SIP Team meeting, the continues change of learning platform (going from face to face to digital and vice versa) paired with chronic absenteeism due to the global pandemic, was a contributing factor to our decline in state scores. New actions include a robust intervention pan and providing additional paid time for teachers to work collaboratively to plan intervention strategies during instruction.

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

The most improvement occurred in our lowest quartile in mathematics.

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

We hypothesize the improvement was attributed to teacher experience and continual follow up.

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

We will implement a comprehensive intervention period every Wednesday. Our LASSO time will provide opportunities for remediation and acceleration in every period for our students.

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

Teachers have been provided training on how to deliver interventions during LASSO time. Instructional coaches will continue to provide support and resources to our staff.

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

Osceola High School has included two key roles to our personnel, a Graduation Coach and an Academic Interventionist. These individuals will offer another layer of support to our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The leadership team is a key component of school cohesion. Improvement in this area will be a main priority of the school. The team consists of school administrators, instructional coaches and deans. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Based on our Insight survey from 2021, we will focus on providing feedback to teachers and staff and their professional growth; increase from a 4.4 to a 4.6. |
| Monitoring: | Through classroom walkthroughs, NEST data capturing and stakeholder surveys. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teacher leadership opportunities will be provided to encourage and foster school initiatives. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | When school leaders and teachers are actively involved in examining data and making appropriate changes for student success, academic growth will follow. (Gates, 2019) |

Action Steps to Implement

1. First week of school tailored to ensure SEL and team building activities are prioritized.

Person Responsible Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teachers and administrators will receive Warm Demand training during preplanning

Person Responsible Ivet Rivera (ivet.rivera@osceolaschools.net)

3. Stocktake meetings to continuously meet to discuss data and improvement opportunities.

Person Responsible Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data indicates a need in our ELA instruction. For the 2020-2021 ELA achievement percentage is 33% a drop of 4%, ELA learning gains is 38%, a decrease of 5%, and our Lowest Quartile gains is 33%, a drop of 1%.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 for ELA is an increase in proficiency by 5%.

Monitoring: Use of NWEA progress monitoring in fall, winter and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The analysis of student progress monitoring data is a critical role of student success. Using our MTSS structures and use of our intervention period (LASSO) will be structures to desegregate data and identify use of resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show analysis of student data is a critical role in decision making. Collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment data to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour et al (2010).

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in the implementation of the BEST Standards.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet individual needs of all students.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers will utilize LASSO for intervention and remediation for students not mastering standards.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

4. SIOP teachers will implement the first four stages of the SIOP protocol one per quarter.

Person Responsible Bethzaida Morales-Rivera (bethzaida.moralesrivera@osceolaschools.net)

5. Teacher schedules support common planning to provide additional time for PLCs. Teachers will actively participate in PLC process to analyze data and address intervention strategies.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

6. Academic Intervention Coaches will progress monitor through Intensive Reading classes grades 9-11 using Beable data.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

7. Academic Intervention Coach will progress monitor and intervene based on student performance through Intensive Reading classes grade 12 using SAT/ACT practice tests.

Person Responsible Sussy Jimenez (sussy.jimenez@osceolaschools.net)

8. Teachers will use common board configuration that aligns to the benchmarks to guide students on daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

9. Teachers will create lesson plans using AVID WICOR strategies and monitor as students apply writing, inquiry, collaboration, organizing and reading.

Person Responsible Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

10. Professional Development will be provided during planning periods on Thursdays in order for teachers to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

Literacy will incorporate the monthly school wide reading strategies to all content area texts as outlined by the Literacy Coach. Literacy Coach will provide monthly PDs on each respective reading strategy.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

12. ELA will progress monitor mastery of the BEST standards using Study Sync and Study Sync Reteach.

Person Responsible Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data indicates a need in our math instruction. For the 2020-2021 Math achievement percentage is 26% a drop of 3%, Math learning gains is 31%, a decrease of 4%, and our Lowest Quartile gains is 42%, an increase of 6%.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome for math is an increase of proficiency of 5%.

Monitoring: NWEA data will be analyzed to indicate areas of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The analysis of student progress monitoring data is a critical role of student success. Using our MTSS structures and use of our intervention period (LASSO) will be structures to desegregate data and identify use of resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show analysis of student data is a critical role in decision making. Collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment data to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour et al (2010).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will incorporate real life problems into instruction through differentiated mathematics lesson.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

2. Math teachers will incorporate multiple problem solving strategies in instruction.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

3. The use of LASSO will be implemented with fidelity to provide interventions for students struggling in mastering the standards.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

SIOF teachers will implement the first four stages of the SIOF protocol, one per quarter.

Person Responsible Bethzaida Morales-Rivera (bethzaida.moralesrivera@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher schedule supports common planning to provide additional time for PLC. Teachers will actively participate in PLC process to analyze data and address intervention strategies.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

Academic Interventionist coaches will progress monitor and intervene based on the respective student data: common formatives (Math College Readiness) and district assessments (Liberal Arts Math)

Person Responsible Sussy Jimenez (sussy.jimenez@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use board configuration that aligns to the benchmarks to guide student on daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will create lesson plan using AVID WICOR strategies. They will monitor students as they write, inquire, collaborate, organize and read.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development opportunities will be provided during planning on Thursdays to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

Math teachers will apply monthly school-wide reading strategies to all text as outlined by the Literacy Coach, Dana Schmidt. Ms. Schmidt will provide monthly PDs on each respective reading strategy.

Person Responsible Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capabilities to engage in scientific inquiry and teach students how to reason context.

Measurable Outcome: An increase of 5% in our Biology EOC, from 49% to 54%.

Monitoring: The use of common assessment and district progress monitoring through SchoolCity will be used to monitor during the fall, winter and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in context 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 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 desegregate achievement data from common assessments and district progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teacher will actively participate in PLC process to review data and address intervention strategies.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

3. Essential laboratories will be provided to all biology teachers.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use LASSO for intervention and remediation for students not mastering standards.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use common board configurations that align to the benchmarks, to guide students on daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will create lesson plans using AVID WICOR strategies and monitor students as they write, inquire, collaborate, organize and read.

Person Responsible Yanelys Ballard (yanelys.ballard@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development will be provided on Thursdays for teachers to assist teachers on meeting the needs of the students.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

Science teachers will incorporate the school wide reading strategies in all text, as outlined by the Literacy coach. The Literacy coach will provide monthly PD for teachers on reading strategies.

Person Responsible Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Pending ESSA data.

Measurable Outcome: Measurable outcome data will increase by 5% for all our subgroups.

Monitoring: Continuous review of subgroup data will occur throughout the year utilizing our NWEA data and SchoolCity data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common planning will be incorporated into the master schedule to ensure teachers teaching the same subject have the opportunity for additional PLC time. Teachers will actively participate in the PLC process analyzing data and address intervention strategies.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

2. Learning goals and targets will be displayed in each classroom and teachers will use board configuration that aligns to the benchmarks to guide students on daily learning goals.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

3. The use of the LASSO Intervention period will assist with continual differentiation for students needing additional support.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

MTSS Coach will support Teachers and PLCs through data chats to assure effective interventions are being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development opportunities will be provided during planning on Thursdays in order for teachers to meet the needs of all students in all subgroups.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

MTSS Coach will monitor and analyze progress monitor student data by subgroup to support student learning.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The incorporation of SEL strategies is essential for student success. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships which support learning.

Measurable Outcome: An increase of 5% for our SEL survey will be used to monitor outcome.

Monitoring: SEL Climate surveys will be monitored for desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sussy Jimenez (sussy.jimenez@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students; current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will be part of the Character Strong Professional Development during preplanning.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teachers will focus on relationship building during the first week of school.

Person Responsible Patricia Blakeney (patricia.blakeney@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers will continually revisit activities to build strong student rapport and ensure Wellness Wednesday lessons once a month.

Person Responsible Ivet Rivera (ivet.rivera@osceolaschools.net)

OHS is pursuing the pathway to be an AVID National Demonstration School by implementing teaching strategies that align with WICOR. School counselors will go into ELA classes and implement Xello, post-secondary planning lessons and the College and Career Counselor will work with all grade levels to determine a post secondary plan.

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

Building positive relationships is a priority at Osceola High School. OHS prides itself in effective communication between many avenues of Social Media, Remind and newsletters/columns which appear regularly to maintain our stakeholders informed on important school related issues. Additionally, we have many parent opportunities on an ongoing basis to ensure positive relationships are built and maintained throughout a student's four years. We offer several events to maintain open communication with our stakeholders; such as College Information Nights, FAFSA Nights, Dual Enrollment Sessions and more to keep parents engaged and involved throughout a child's education.

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

All stakeholders will be tasked to maintain a positive school culture. Teachers will be integrating Character Strong lessons, Deans will be mentors for our neediest students. Our College and Career Specialist, along with our School Counselors will deliver Xello lessons to all our students. Our leadership team will monitor discipline data and conduct surveys to keep a pulse on school climate.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |