School District of Osceola County, FL

Reedy Creek Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Reedy Creek Elementary School

5100 EAGLES TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Katie Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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

Reedy Creek Elementary School

5100 EAGLES TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

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.

Reedy Creek Elementary School, in alliance with family and community, will provide a positive, safe environment where children will be challenged academically to become lifelong learners and respectful, contributing members of an ever changing, diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Reedy Creek we care enough about our students to make sure we meet the individual needs of every student.

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
Adams, Katie	Principal	The principal works with students, parents, and staff to maintain an atmosphere focusing on performance through a culture of shared excellence and reaching college and career goals. the principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP, and receive monthly reports and give feedback. The principal oversees all student data, tier levels and instruction.
Lopez, Angel	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works directly with staff in the area of scheduling students and handles extended learning opportunities. The assistant principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The assistant principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback.
Reid, Jasmine	Reading Coach	The literacy coach provides support for ELA (reading and writing) instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in reading and writing. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.
Beahm, Michael	Instructional Coach	The MTSS and AVID coach supports all tiers of learning through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for all students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. In addition, she models AVID strategies.
Lacey, Jessica	School Counselor	The guidance counselor provides SEL support for all through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the SEL content and curriculum for our students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling, intervention, small group and enrichment strategies.
Moraguez, Amanda	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ESOL compliance specialist provides support for ELL instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESOL students. She works through the MTSS

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.
Singh, Klran	School Counselor	The guidance counselor provides SEL support for all through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the SEL content and curriculum for our students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling, intervention, small group and enrichment strategies.
Cramer, Emily	Staffing Specialist	The ESE compliance specialist provides support for ESE instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESE students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.
Henry, Melissa	Instructional Coach	The math and science coach provides support for math/science instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in math and science. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/14/2021, Katie Adams

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.*

16

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.*

31

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

780

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	111	104	132	127	127	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	727
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	12	18	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	46	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	67	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	46	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	8	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	4	5	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
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	104	137	143	147	138	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	20	59	42	49	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	104	137	143	147	138	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	20	59	42	49	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				54%	53%	57%	51%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	58%	54%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	51%	53%	47%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	55%	63%	56%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	59%	62%	60%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	45%	51%	49%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	49%	53%	37%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	48%	4%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	56%	53%	3%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA is the progress monitoring tool used to gather this data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52/47%	64/51%	53/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/51%	40/49%	34/40%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	4/31%	2/15%
	English Language Learners	7/24%	11/31%	6/16%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61/52%	57/45%	62/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40/57%	36/43%	41/47%
	Students With Disabilities	3/25%	2/15%	4/31%
	English Language Learners	12/40%	12/33%	12/32%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72/59%	60/52%	55/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/55%	38/50%	31/36%
	Students With Disabilities	7/44%	6/33%	4/21%
	English Language Learners	14/48%	8/30%	7/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/58%	53/43%	49/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43/51%	33/41%	31/36%
	Students With Disabilities	8/47%	8/44%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	15/47%	9/29%	8/24%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51/47%	61/45%	59/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/37%	27/36%	23/30%
	Students With Disabilities	3/15%	6/23%	2/7%
	English Language Learners	8/19%	10/20%	8/15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53/43%	41/31%	40/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/36%	18/25%	17/21%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	1/5%	1/3%
	English Language Learners	13/28%	8/17%	9/16%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61/53%	54/44%	53/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/42%	23/30%	26/31%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	0/0%	3/21%
	English Language Learners	17/45%	12/29%	12/27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52/44%	44/36%	61/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/41%	23/30%	34/40%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	0	3/21%
	English Language Learners	13/35%	10/23%	16/36%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/51%	72/50%	84/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/52%	48/50%	52/50%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	2/13%	3/16%
	English Language Learners	13/28%	12/24%	16/29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/49%	51/36%	61/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/53%	33/35%	37/35%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18%	1/6%	1/5%
	English Language Learners	12/26%	7/14%	8/14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	51/52%	76/55%	91/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/52%	52/57%	59/56%
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%	2/13%	6/33%
	English Language Learners	8/22%	17/35%	20/36%

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	23	20		25	40		31				
ELL	22	39	45	23	49	60	17				
BLK	51	40		44	60		33				
HSP	35	48	41	36	49	46	34				
WHT	48	52		43	29		38				
FRL	34	47	41	34	39	39	33				

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	29	50	53	33	59	56	29				
ELL	44	54	49	42	54	41	38				
BLK	53	63		40	43	25	44				
HSP	52	58	53	51	59	44	40				
MUL	64	18		64	45						
WHT	59	62	58	60	56	64	56				
FRL	50	56	51	49	51	38	36				

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	37	53	36	39	68	58	48				
ELL	44	56	51	49	67	65	27				
ASN	60			80							
BLK	40	48		43	43		21				
HSP	48	54	49	54	60	52	33				
MUL	63	45		63	64						
WHT	59	60	42	62	67	53	53				
FRL	47	50	45	53	58	50	33				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
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	41
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	39
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?

When looking at the NWEA across grade levels it is evident that our fall data was higher than winter and spring in several areas. This shows that some of our digital students may have had some at home support during the assessment. Our Spring progress monitoring data with NWEA shows a correlation with our FSA scores in 3rd, 4th and 5th Grade ELA, Math and Science. According to the Spring NWEA the 5th Grade ELA students in ELA were above the 50th percentile at 54%. 5th grade students in Science on the Spring NWEA also showed to be above the 50th percentile at 58%. This was also equaled in 5th grade subgroups of economically disadvantaged which perform above the 50th percentile in both ELA and Science at 50% and 56% respectfully. Consistently across 5th, 4th and 3rd grade students with disabilities and English Language learners performed below the 20th percentile in ELA and Math indicating a downward trend across both subgroups.

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

Based off of progress monitoring with NWEA, the areas that show the great need for improvement is our Students with Disabilities (SWD) as all grades levels were below the 30th percentile and students in 3rd, 4th and 5th performed below the 20th percentile. Students in 3rd grade with disabilities percentile in ELA was at the 7% proficient, 4th graders at 21% and in 5th 16%. For Math, SWD students were at 3% proficient in 3rd, 21% in 4th and 5% in 5th. This indicates that substantial learning gains will be needed to improve achievement levels.
English Language Learners (ELL) in grades 3, 4 and 5 also show significant difficulties. In ELA, ELL

students were only 15% proficient, 27% in 4th grade and 29% in 5th Grade. In Math, ELL students in 3rd were 16% proficient, 4th 36% and in 5th only 14%. As a school FSA trend data shows that the overall proficiency of ELA dropped at least 3 percentage points from the 2019 FSA. The overall proficiency in Math also showed a drop of 3 percentage points from 2019 FSA indicating need for improvement in both areas.

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 contributing factors to this need for improvement were changes in Leadership with a new Principal and Assistant Principal for the start of the 2020-2021 school coupled with a second Principal change in January of 2021. The global COVID-19 pandemic has presented many challenges, as students were navigating digital learning, returning to school and inconsistencies in classrooms. Students experienced varying levels of social need responses that all resulted in the drop in overall proficiency in ELA and Math. As an ESE department there were struggles providing support and interventions due to class changes, quarantines and digital learning which all resulted in significant drops in students performance. There were also challenges with the Varying Exceptionality teachers have struggles as one teacher worked remotely from home, and the 2 working face to face with students had limited experience. In order to address these needs we will need to show improvement in the following areas: 1. Need to improvement consistency in Tier 1 instruction across all grade levels. 2. For students with disabilities consistent support and services will need to be provided. 3. Training and support will need to be provided to all faculty and staff to provide consistency in expectations of delivering content and instruction throughout the year. 4. Interventions will need to be purposely developed to help meet needs of students to support their learning. 5. Support in the areas of social emotional learning will need to be increased to help transition students in their return to face to face instruction.

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

Based off of the NWEA progress monitoring we saw improvement or consistency from the Winter and Spring assessments in 1st grade overall Math 45% proficient to 48%, 3rd grade overall Science 45% to 45%, 4th Grade Math 36% to 47% and 4th Grade science 39% to 50%. 5th Grade ELA from 50% to 54%, 5th Grade Math 36% to 39% and Science 55% to 58%. Additionally, SWD subgroup went from 43% to 47% in Math. 3rd Grade Science in ELL learners 17% to 22%. 4th Grade saw SWD improve in ELA 30% to 31%, 0% to 21% in Math and 0% to 14% in Science. Economically Disadvantaged students saw improvement or consistency in 4th Grade ELA 30% to 31%, Math 30% to 40% and Science 31% to 42% as well as in 5th Grade ELA 50% to 50%.

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

Monitoring of classroom instructional content was increased beginning in January of 2021. A focus on academic support and instruction was developed and increased beginning in January. Student data was analyzed by teachers in grades 3rd, 4th and 5th grade and reflections were completed to determine where student need was and academic supports to be put into place. This also helped to ensure that students were receiving Tier 1 instruction with consistency.
Special area teachers also support Science instruction by creating fitness games that focused on science vocabulary.

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

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support process has been analyzed to see where student support is needed and addressed. Teachers will have an increased role in providing tiered interventions and recommendations based on academic and assessment data review.

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.

A comprehensive professional development plan is being developed to focus on providing training and support in areas that teachers have determined need. MTSS structures have been re-vamped and will be shared through PD on how to support students through intervention. NSGRA training and Guided Reading implementation training will be a focus in the early months of the school year. Additionally, continued training in Core Connections Writing and in the areas of math and science will be focused on based on faculty needs.

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

Structures and procedures are being put into place to promote ongoing services that will be designed with a sustainable future. Coaching and training is being conducted to support train the trainer models and to promote teacher leadership.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math Given the 2020-2021 school data findings that only 39% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2020-2021 math achievement was 39% in 2021-2022 math achievement will increase by 5% to 44%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus in Instructional Math will be monitored by formative and summative classroom assessments as well as progress monitoring with NWEA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

Staff will teach problem solving strategies and higher order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.

Person Responsible Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying MTR's for B.E.S.T Standards. Staff will expose student to multiple problem-solving strategies, including concrete and visual representations in their work.
Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non proficient in mathematics based on a variety of assessment. In addition, advanced students will be offered enrichment opportunities to extend their learning.

Person Responsible Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques, support by quality feedback and the ability to self assess progress related to the learning outcome.

Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will utilize formative assessments to monitor student learning and provide feedback.

Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Given the 2020-2021 school data findings that only 40% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of English Language Arts achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2020-2021 ELA achievement was 40% in 2021-2022 ELA achievement will increase by 5% to 45%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus in Instructional ELA will be monitored by formative and summative classroom assessments, NSGRA Running Records as well as progress monitoring with NWEA Map and Fluency Analysis..
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered.

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff will utilized explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of information text through classroom experiences and other professional development.

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

Person Responsible Angel Lopez (angel.lopez@osceolaschools.net)

Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.

Person Responsible Angel Lopez (angel.lopez@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

First Grade Open Court Implementation of letter/book/print awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding phonics and inflectional endings, fluency rate and accuracy, and vocabulary and language development.

Person Responsible Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible [no one identified]

T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation.

Person Responsible Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

RISE reading for T2

Person Responsible Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

Pre-Teaching strategies for T2

Person Responsible Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2020-2021 the school had 1 subgroup below the ESSA level of 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA data for the 2018-2019 ESE was 29% in ELA achievement. For the 2021-2022 school year this data will increase by 5% to 34%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus in Instructional ELA will be monitored by formative and summative classroom assessments, NSGRA Running Records as well as progress monitoring with NWEA Map and Fluency Analysis..
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) described differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achievement by modifying for specific elements related to curriculum. Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process- how students make sense of the content being taught Product- how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect- the feelings and attitudes that affect students learning.

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.	
Person Responsible	Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)
PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with instructional coaches	
Person Responsible	Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students	
Person Responsible	Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies and ESE support strategies.	
Person Responsible	Angel Lopez (angel.lopez@osceolaschools.net)
The ELL and ESE support in classrooms will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teaches.	
Person Responsible	Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)
Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1, 2 & 3.	

Person Responsible	Angel Lopez (angel.lopez@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well-Implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the abilitiy to collaborate and make responsible decisions, mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to hand challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome:	2020-2021 SEL Climate Survey showed 60% students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2021-2022 this question will be increased 5%.
Monitoring:	As evident on the SEL Panorama Climate student survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Lacey (jessica.lacey@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills. (Gardner, 1983)

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and passions.	
Person Responsible	Jessica Lacey (jessica.lacey@osceolaschools.net)
Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.	
Person Responsible	Klran Singh (klran.singh@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.	
Person Responsible	Jessica Lacey (jessica.lacey@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision making through consensus/planning.	
Person Responsible	Klran Singh (klran.singh@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities.	
Person Responsible	Jessica Lacey (jessica.lacey@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will integrated SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.	
Person Responsible	Klran Singh (klran.singh@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching- collaborative learning.

Person Responsible Jessica Lacey (jessica.lacey@osceolaschools.net)

School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.

Person Responsible Jessica Lacey (jessica.lacey@osceolaschools.net)

All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plan will be developed.

Person Responsible Klran Singh (klran.singh@osceolaschools.net)

The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required

Person Responsible Angel Lopez (angel.lopez@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Staff will AVID a schoolwide post-secondary culture	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of post-secondary education for all students - not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goal. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups :low achievers ,middle to low-income levels ,underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college previously in their family.
Measurable Outcome:	By implementing AVID based instructional strategies in grades K-5 and promoting an overall school culture of college and career readiness, there will be an increase on student achievement based on the increase in the WICOR of the content being delivered. As a result of AVID implementation our overall ELA proficiency will increase from 40% by 5%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus in AVID and Schoolwide post-secondary culture will be monitored by formative and summative classroom assessments, NSGRA Running Records as well as progress monitoring with NWEA Map and Fluency Analysis, panorama, and career surveys.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID's proven learning support structure, known as WICOR, incorporates teaching/ learning methodologies in the critical areas of Writing to Learn, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading to Learn. WICOR provides a learning model that educators can use to guide students in comprehending concepts and articulating ideas at increasingly complex levels (scaffolding) within developmental, general education, and discipline-based curricula. Furthermore, the WICOR model reflects and promotes the expertise and attitudes that will serve students well in their academic lives and careers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Drumwright, Pengra, and Potts (2016) suggest that students can successfully achieve when they are held for high expectations and receive appropriate support in a safe environment that empowers them to grow intellectually. Therefore, if teachers implement AVID strategies with fidelity to reach all learners, then students will grow in writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading to promote college and career readiness.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID site team meets on a monthly basis to discuss school-wide AVID implementation and provides professional development for new teachers.

Person Responsible Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

Provide PD opportunities for staff to incorporate WICOR strategies into daily lessons, focusing on designing and implementing sessions on writing to learn through FNT, inquiry, organization of time and materials, and collaboration strategies.

Person Responsible Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

The school will host family involvement nights where teachers model the implementation of AVID in their classrooms with an emphasis on WICOR. Grade levels will take turns showcasing their classrooms at these parent nights. There will be one involvement parent night per semester.

Person Responsible	Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will encourage an atmosphere of college and career readiness (Wednesday college shirt day, classroom decor) and will promote student involvement in College and Career week.

Person Responsible	Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

#6. 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 capability to engage in scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021 science achievement was 36%, in 2021-2022 science achievement will increase by 7%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus in Instructional Science will be monitored by formative and summative classroom assessments, as well as progress monitoring with NWEA Map Analysis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught be teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook. (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning PLC	
Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Science teachers will participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and packing and re-teaching of standards	
Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will participate in PD that will incorporate AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.	
Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Teaches will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.	
Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are support in science courses.	
Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Teachers will provide individual student data chats	

Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises.

Person Responsible	Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level standards, data, student tracking, collaborative planning and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

#7. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams. Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities. It was found through the Insight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership. It was found through the insight Survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in observation and feedback and Instructional Leadership.
Measurable Outcome:	Insight Survey Section Response 2020-2021 Observation and Feedback 3.2 domain score with a goal of 4.2 in 2021-2022 Instructional Leadership 3.7 domain score with a goal of 5.0 in 2021-2022
Monitoring:	As evident by the Insight Survey
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase teachers observation and feedback to teachers within the school and increase instructional leadership and support. Leadership can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and has taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Great teachers understand that teachers know what their students- and they themselves need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school-improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learning from one another, and become experts in specific areas. This team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement. (Gates Foundation 2019)

Action Steps to Implement

Strategic Planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data and executing from the top down- and towards conducting experiments (such as small, 30-day projects) using pattern recognition and execution by the whole.

Person Responsible Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period is intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project is not working.

Person Responsible Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Angel Lopez (angel.lopez@osceolaschools.net)

Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrators. Both are equally valuable and necessary especially with leadership teams.

Person Responsible Katie Adams (katie.adams@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.

According to SafeSchoolsForAlex.org RCES is the top ranked school in the State of FL as it pertains to Discipline and/or violence on campus-with 0.0 incidents per 100 students making us #1 out of 1,395 Elementary schools in the State and #1 of 15 within the District
These rankings include suspension data which was also showing 0.0.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and holds staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students through programs such as AVID program and ambassadors club.

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff.

The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. Leaders demonstrate how these beliefs manifest in the school building by:

1. Engaging in collaborative planning
2. Displaying student work and achievements throughout school
3. Establishing a clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created.
4. Engaging in PLCs meetings to routinely examine data to look for themes/patterns among student groups and better support ALL students for success

Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. Teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result.

Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles.
The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) to promote a positive culture and environment at the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Staff will AVID a schoolwide post-secondary culture	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00