

St. Johns County School District

Osceola Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Osceola Elementary School

1605 OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY RD, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-oes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Jessley Hathaway

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2021

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Osceola Elementary School

1605 OSCEOLA ELEMENTARY RD, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-oes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Osceola Elementary will be a family of learners working to become successful in academic and social settings. By nurturing determination, grit, and a growth mindset in all students, we will create life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Better Never Quits

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
Keffer, Rebecca	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/25/2021, Jessley Hathaway

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

674

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

3

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

4

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	104	93	102	82	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	17	15	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	1	7	4	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	5	5	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	5	15	12	14	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
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 8/25/2021

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	97	107	98	85	98	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609
Attendance below 90 percent	14	20	16	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	4	4	6	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	8	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	8	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	107	98	85	98	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609
Attendance below 90 percent	14	20	16	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	4	4	6	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	8	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	8	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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				64%	75%	57%	51%	72%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	67%	58%	35%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	59%	53%	26%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	77%	63%	60%	77%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	69%	62%	40%	67%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74%	59%	51%	17%	58%	47%
Science Achievement				58%	72%	53%	48%	68%	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	57%	78%	-21%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	77%	-6%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	76%	-18%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	82%	-20%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	76%	82%	-6%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	80%	-13%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	73%	-17%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready data.

Fall = percent of students Early on Grade Level or above.

Winter = percent of students Mid On Grade Level or above.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	23	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10	4	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	21	
English Language Learners	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7	4	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9	10	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	18	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	18	10	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	13	10	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	20	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10	13	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	30	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	11	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	15	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	17	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8	3	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	15	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5	3	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	26	43	43	65	64	24				
ELL	40			40							
BLK	33	50	46	42	68	58	14				
HSP	59	60		69	80		70				
WHT	70	63		75	76		60				
FRL	49	52	56	56	80	79	37				
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	38	56	51	44	67	68	33				
BLK	50	69	64	59	74	56	44				
HSP	73	59		67	80						
WHT	66	67	54	75	74	76	69				
FRL	52	65	53	63	74	73	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	23	19	37	28	11	17				
BLK	27	30	25	42	28	9	16				
HSP	63	40		63	47						
MUL	57	30		64	50						
WHT	61	38	23	67	44	19	60				
FRL	43	30	26	51	36	15	36				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	40
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	44
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	68
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
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	69
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

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

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

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

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

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate 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.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the 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:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

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.

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