

School District of Osceola County, FL

# St. Cloud Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>27</b> |

# St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Amy Flowers

Start Date for this Principal: 1/21/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 62%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (59%)<br>2016-17: B (58%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>27</b> |

# St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2020-21 Title I School</b> | <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                               | Yes                           | 70%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 60%   |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Education which inspires all to their highest potential.

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

At St. Cloud Elementary we focus on the child and expect success to promote lifelong learners. We lead with vision because education must be a shared responsibility between the home, students, school and community.

### 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  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Flowers, Amy      | Principal           | To administer the programs, facility and personnel of SCES and develop positive school-community relations with parents, students, community members, business partners, and other educational programs.   |
| Crawford, Melanie | Assistant Principal | Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Collaborating with teachers and coaches to ensure curriculum standards are being implemented with fidelity. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. Oversee school safety and school-wide discipline.   |
| Souza, Genevieve  | Reading Coach       | Develop capacity with teachers to deliver curriculum in effective and engaging ways. Model lessons for new or struggling teachers. Support the district curriculum goals and provide professional development to educators.  |
| Farrell, Matthew  | Instructional Coach | Collaborates with the team to plan and deliver quality professional learning and specific feedback aligned to the needs of the school and staff. Supports the development of high-quality, standards-based instruction in the areas of Math and Science; Supports and mentors teachers through the use of the coaching cycle; provides training and support in the use of collecting data, assessment, tracking students' progress, using the data to drive classroom instruction, and providing interventions. Supports the school in using data to plan, implement and track the effectiveness of interventions (iii). |
| Gray, Kelly       | School Counselor    | Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principals of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies. Promote and support a safe school.  |
| Haines, Lacey     | School Counselor    | Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principals of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies. Promote and support a safe school.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 1/21/2020, Amy Flowers

**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.*

17

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

57

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

813

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

7

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

7

**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                              | 97          | 116 | 129 | 138 | 144 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 765   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 19          | 23  | 15  | 16  | 22  | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 108   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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   | 0   | 25  | 35  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 24  | 24  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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     | 3           | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

Thursday 8/26/2021

**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               | 110         | 142 | 141 | 143 | 143 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 817   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 13  | 9   | 2   | 6   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 2   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

**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 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

**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           | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**2020-21 - Updated**

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 110         | 142 | 141 | 143 | 143 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 817   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 13  | 9   | 2   | 6   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 2   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

**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 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

**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           | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 63%    | 53%      | 57%   | 68%    | 51%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 57%    | 56%      | 58%   | 56%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 46%    | 51%      | 53%   | 44%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 72%    | 55%      | 63%   | 71%    | 54%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 60%    | 59%      | 62%   | 56%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 38%    | 45%      | 51%   | 45%    | 42%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 66%    | 49%      | 53%   | 72%    | 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 | 61%    | 51%      | 10%                        | 58%   | 3%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 51%      | 9%                         | 58%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 61%    | 48%      | 13%                        | 56%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 74%    | 54%      | 20%                        | 62%   | 12%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 68%    | 53%      | 15%                        | 64%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -74%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 65%    | 48%      | 17%                        | 60%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -68%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 45%      | 19%                        | 53%   | 11%                     |
| 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 progress monitoring.

| Grade 1               |                            |        |        |         |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 86/62% | 61/46% | 84/60%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 34/57% | 18/31% | 29/45%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/25%  | 0/0%   | 3/19%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 6/35%  | 2/12%  | 5/29%   |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 83/60% | 53/40% | 80/57%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 34/58% | 20/33% | 29/46%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/27%  | 0/0%   | 3/20%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 6/35%  | 2/12%  | 3/18%   |
| Grade 2               |                            |        |        |         |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 86/63% | 90/63% | 109/75% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 30/51% | 36/57% | 46/69%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/22%  | 5/26%  | 8/42%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 4/44%  | 4/36%  | 7/54%   |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 78/58% | 76/54% | 109/75% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 23/40% | 26/41% | 45/67%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 5/29%  | 4/21%  | 9/47%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 3/33%  | 3/27%  | 5/38%   |

| Grade 3               |                            |        |        |         |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 99/72% | 93/67% | 107/77% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 31/62% | 32/62% | 40/74%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 3/18%  | 3/17%  | 6/33%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 9/50%  | 9/43%  | 11/50%  |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 81/59% | 74/54% | 101/71% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 24/47% | 20/38% | 34/63%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/22%  | 4/22%  | 4/21%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 4/21%  | 3/15%  | 13/57%  |
| Grade 4               |                            |        |        |         |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 87/67% | 91/68% | 84/60%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 32/59% | 34/59% | 30/49%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1/9%   | 3/20%  | 4/24%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 13/48% | 15/48% | 12/39%  |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring  |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 90/66% | 80/60% | 88/64%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 32/53% | 28/48% | 30/50%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/29%  | 5/33%  | 3/18%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 14/47% | 12/39% | 15/48%  |

| Grade 5               |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 87/64% | 85/64% | 85/60% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25/52% | 26/55% | 23/44% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1/6%   | 1/6%   | 2/10%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 11/55% | 9/47%  | 7/32%  |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 79/59% | 58/43% | 70/50% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 23/48% | 11/23% | 17/33% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 2/11%  | 1/5%   | 2/10%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 9/45%  | 4/21%  | 5/23%  |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 89/68% | 93/72% | 96/72% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 28/58% | 30/64% | 27/55% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 2/14%  | 4/27%  | 6/38%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 9/45%  | 10/53% | 14/64% |

**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                                       | 43       | 47     | 31          | 47        | 42      | 17           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 39       | 45     |             | 41        |         |              | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 55       | 30     |             | 44        | 20      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 50     | 29          | 52        | 14      | 5            | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 56       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 59     | 38          | 78        | 41      |              | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 43     | 27          | 53        | 13      | 5            | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 42       | 62     | 47          | 56        | 64      | 38           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 48       | 50     | 43          | 59        | 62      | 41           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 56       | 58     |             | 63        | 47      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 50     | 34          | 64        | 56      | 32           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 61       | 77     |             | 78        | 85      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 62     | 60          | 79        | 63      | 42           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 52       | 57     | 46          | 59        | 56      | 35           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 45       | 47     | 29          | 45        | 43      | 31           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 40       | 53     | 67          | 63        | 50      | 38           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 73       |        |             | 91        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 75       | 61     |             | 82        | 72      |              | 82       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 52     | 47          | 64        | 45      | 48           | 61       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       |        |             | 75        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 60     | 50          | 76        | 61      | 43           | 81       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 60       | 54     | 50          | 62        | 51      | 41           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 46  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 71  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 365 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |

| Subgroup Data   |     |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 43  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                 | 38  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | YES |



| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                | 41  |
| 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  | 40  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 63  |
| 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   | 59  |
| 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                                | 37  |
| 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?

ELA Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Lowest Quartile students showed the lowest performance. Lowest quartile students are showing growth in day to day learning and school-wide progress however this is not evident in FSA data. There is a disconnect between the learning observed and application to standardized measures.

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

Math learning gains for students in the lowest quartile dropped 7 points (35 from 48). An overall school-wide decline in literacy proficiency is directly impacting math achievement. Need to strengthen math literacy in all grades.

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

Lack of knowledge of instructional practice related to equity and ability to provide effective differentiation. We also had allocations removed specific to our ESE teachers, which greatly impacted our ability to effectively provide services to students. Additional resources, both financial and human would greatly assist with addressing this need for improvement.

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

Math learning gains for all students increased 4 percentage points (56 to 60). The use of mathematical mindsets and intensive, targeted intervention contributed to the gain.

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

The math team was very strong in pedagogy, instructional delivery, and data analysis. We implemented the use of mathematical mindsets and intensive, targeted intervention contributed to the gain.

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

1-1 device implementation allows for use of quality, research based programs to be utilized by students with high levels of fidelity, which supports accelerated learning.

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

Our Green Shirt Program provides a resource teacher to us -who supports both teachers and leaders in the area of effective use of technology in the classroom. This support is provided through embedded pd, side-by-side teaching, and modeling by the resource teacher.

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

Administration will continue to advocate diligently for resources, both financial and human which will assist the leadership team in providing maximum support to teachers and students for this year, next year and beyond.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on data from 2020-2021 FSA results, school-wide ELA achievement decreased 2 percentage points, from 63% in 2019 to 61% in 2021. The decline in literacy over time will directly impact achievement rates in all subject areas, including math and science. Our focus is to increase student achievement and student learning gains in ELA for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our goals for the 2021-2022 school year is to increase our ELA proficiency school-wide from 61% to 64% and to increase our lowest quartile learning gains from 27% to 47% as measured by the ELA FSA to be administered in the spring of 2022.

**Monitoring:** We will collect data from NWEA and NSGRA assessments to track student progress and monitor student achievement as well as student growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will provide teachers will professional development that focuses on reading strategies, differentiation, and data-driven instructional practices to increase student engagement and learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Providing professional development to support teachers with implementing effective high-yielding reading strategies will have a positive impact on student learning. (Hattie, 2011)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue to implement Balanced Literacy in all K-5 classrooms.
2. Provide professional development on a monthly basis to highlight AVID strategies and help teachers plan for differentiated instruction.
3. Intervention team will support teachers with implementing research-based teaching strategies and materials for students receiving Tier 3 interventions.
4. Open Court reading foundational skills program will be used with fidelity with students in grades K-2.

**Person Responsible** Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We need to increase the percent of students making a learning gain across all areas: school-wide (LQ students, ESE, ESOL, etc.) Based upon data from the 2021 State FSA results, our Math achievement level dropped 9 percentage points (from 72% to 63%), our Learning Gains percent dropped 34% (60% to 26%) and our lowest quartile gains dropped 29% (38% to 9%).

**Measurable Outcome:** Our goals for the 2021-2022 school year is to increase our Math learning gains school-wide from 26% to 50%, increase our lowest quartile learning gains from 9% to 45%, and our SWD learning gains from \_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_.

**Monitoring:** We will collect data from each district unit assessment, allowing us to track student progress of all sub-groups. Using this data, we can identify which sub-groups are on track to make our goals and determine if additional steps are needed for the sub-groups not on track to meet our goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will provide professional development monthly and in-field coaching on planning and implementing effective instructional strategies to boost student engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Student engagement has a strong positive correlation with gains in student achievement. We believe that helping staff learn and implement engaging instructional strategies will increase student mastery of the content.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Meet with PLC's weekly to preview content/co-plan lessons and discuss high-yield instructional strategies for presenting the content.
2. Meet with PLC's monthly to review data from CFA's and create a plan to implement interventions based upon the data.
3. Provide professional development monthly highlighting AVID strategies, previewing the new BEST standards, and planning ways to implement manipulatives to support building a conceptual understanding of Math.
4. Implement the coaching cycle with teachers to help improve the planning, execution, and collection of data from lessons.

**Person Responsible** Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** There are no identified ESSA subgroups below the ESSA level of 41%. The subgroups identified for improvement is the SWD subgroup which includes students present in other ESSA subgroups..

**Measurable Outcome:** 79% of SWD in grades 3 - 5 scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2021 ELA FSA. 79% of SWDs in grades 3 - 5 scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2021 Math FSA. The goal 2021 - 2022 school year goal is to reduce the number of SWDs scoring below proficiency by 20%.

**Monitoring:** NWEA Map Growth for Reading and Math will be used to monitor achievement and progress. District formative assessments will also be used to monitor progress on grade level standards.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Small group differentiated instruction will be utilized to address specific skill deficiencies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Small group differentiated instruction is the selected strategy for its ability to reach the specific needs of our students. Research and evidence based materials including our core adoption will be used during the small group instruction time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

All student and subgroup achievement will be monitored within the Multitiered System of Support. Specific, evidence based interventions will be delivered to students in all ESSA subgroups through tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction.

**Person Responsible** Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will receive training and support with the implementation of the schoolwide PBIS program to ensure students have equitable and culturally responsive learning opportunities of schoolwide expectations, reduce the number of discipline referrals, and decrease time out of class for all ESSA subgroups.

**Person Responsible** Melanie Crawford (melanie.crawford@osceolaschools.net)

A Varying Exceptionalities PLC will be utilized to address the learning needs of our SWDs. Progress monitoring data for both grade level standards as well as IEP goals will be analyzed for required adjustments to instruction.

**Person Responsible** Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)

Grade level PLC's will work with instructional coaches to develop differentiated instruction. Methods and strategies include AVID strategies to increase engagement and tier 2 interventions to support core instruction for all ESSA subgroups.

**Person Responsible** Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Research based programs designed to foster social emotional learning (SEL) are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and improved social behavior. The increased possibility of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) occurring during the pandemic makes SEL an imperative part of the 2021-2022 plan. The five core SEL competencies include, responsible decision making, self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, and relationship skills. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and positive supports for all students. 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 Spring SEL climate Survey response shows 50% of students answered favorable for emotion regulation. It is our goal to increase emotion regulation to 60%.

**Monitoring:** Social Emotional Learning will be monitored through Panorama surveys. Data will also be collected in small group and through observation and discipline incidents.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@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 emotional learning 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 a students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and passions.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities.
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching- collaborative learning.
8. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SEL development.
9. All surveys will be analyzed to identify school interventions that will support SEL and schoolwide plans will be developed.
10. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The percent of students scoring a level 3 on the Science FSSA decreased from a 66% to a 56% (-10%).

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of students scoring a level 3 or above will increase from 56% to 70% (+14%)

**Monitoring:** We will monitor the unit assessments and the Science progress monitoring data (NWEA) to track the estimated proficiency. The data will help identify students who need additional support or if any additional action steps are needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Professional development will be hosted monthly on how to implement small groups/ differentiation within the Science block. The PD sessions will also highlight AVID strategies and inquiry-based activities teachers can implement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Supporting the teachers with implementing small groups and differentiation will result in increased student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1) We will host monthly professional development on AVID strategies on WICOR. The PD will help highlight effective instructional strategies which have been proven to increase student achievement.
- 2) We will conduct walk-throughs to track the implementation of the highlighted strategies monthly.
- 3) We will support the PLCs monthly by previewing the upcoming content, specifically the inquiry-based activities.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]



**#6. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Data shows a consistent trend of achievement gaps between sub-groups which is cause for concern regarding providing access to learning with high equity. We will focus on academic growth of specific sub-groups whose academic performance lags behind what they are capable of achieving.

Specific strategies: Teacher targeted feedback & Non-Evaluative School Trend Instrument (NESTI)

**Measurable Outcome:**

79% of SWD in grades 3 - 5 scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2021 ELA FSA. 79% of SWDs in grades 3 - 5 scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2021 Math FSA. The goal 2021 - 2022 school year goal is to reduce the number of SWDs scoring below proficiency by 20%.

**Monitoring:**

Area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring of NWEA and NSGRA data throughout the year.

NESTI Walkthrough Tool will be utilized and data monitored.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Admin team will prepare instructional faculty to do what is needed to meet the academic improvement needs of the sub-groups. Ongoing professional development, embedded coaching, and professional growth opportunities to strengthen instructional delivery to all students will be provided to faculty.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

This strategy was selected because based on our walkthrough data this was an area which needed improvement. John Hattie's research shows that a learning effect size of 0.40 equates to a year's growth in learning. Implementing teacher clarity correctly results in a effect size of 0.75. This results in almost twice the effect size on one year of formal schooling.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue to implement Balanced Literacy in all K-5 classrooms.
2. Provide professional development on a monthly basis to highlight AVID strategies and help teachers plan for differentiated instruction.
3. Intervention team will support teachers with implementing research-based teaching strategies and materials for students receiving Tier 3 interventions.
4. Open Court reading foundational skills program will be used with fidelity with students in grades K-2

**Person Responsible**

Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

Provide ongoing training on instructional equity in the classroom for teachers.

**Person Responsible**

Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)

Provide ongoing training on instructional equity in the classroom for teachers.

**Person Responsible**

Melanie Crawford (melanie.crawford@osceolaschools.net)

1. Meet with PLC's weekly to preview content/co-plan lessons and discuss high-yield instructional strategies for presenting the content.
2. Meet with PLC's monthly to review data from CFA's and create a plan to implement interventions based upon the data.
3. Provide professional development monthly highlighting AVID strategies, previewing the new BEST standards, and planning ways to implement manipulatives to support building a conceptual understanding

of Math.

4. Implement the coaching cycle with teachers to help improve the planning, execution, and collection of data from lessons.

**Person Responsible** Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will receive training and support with the implementation of the schoolwide PBIS program to ensure students have equitable and culturally responsive learning opportunities of schoolwide expectations, reduce the number of discipline referrals, and decrease time out of class for all ESSA subgroups.

**Person Responsible** Melanie Crawford (melanie.crawford@osceolaschools.net)

A Varying Exceptionalities PLC will be utilized to address the learning needs of our SWDs. Progress monitoring data for both grade level standards as well as IEP goals will be analyzed for required adjustments to instruction.

**Person Responsible** Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@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.

**School discipline data not reported, not a significant number of incidents.**

### 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 engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: •School-wide PBIS •Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data • Student work is displayed throughout school • All students are

enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum through Xello. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension. And attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. 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 schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. 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. The schools, curriculum and 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. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). 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.**

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Literacy Coach
- Math Coach
- School Counselors
- teacher leaders
- PBIS/AVID site teams

**Part V: Budget**

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

|   |          |  |              |                |     |          |
|---|----------|--|--------------|----------------|-----|----------|
| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                      |              |                |     | \$0.00   |
| 2 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                     |              |                |     | \$0.00   |
| 3 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities        |              |                |     | \$0.00   |
| 4 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning |              |                |     | \$0.00   |
| 5 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                  |              |                |     | \$750.00 |
|   | Function | Object   | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22  |

|               |               |  |                                    |                          |     |                   |
|---------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
|               | 0000          | 239-Other  | 0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School | Other                    |     | \$750.00          |
| <b>6</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team</b> |                                    |                          |     | <b>\$2,500.00</b> |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                       | Funding Source           | FTE | 2021-22           |
|               | 0000          | 239-Other  | 0111 - St. Cloud Elementary School | School Improvement Funds |     | \$2,500.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |  |                                    |                          |     | <b>\$3,250.00</b> |