

School District of Osceola County, FL

Celebration School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Celebration School

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Gary Weeden

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Celebration School

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Celebration K-8 School will educate each student to his/her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebration K-8 School will be a nationally recognized, top performing school in the state. (#1)

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMahon, Rhonda	Principal	All school!
Connolly, Elisa	Assistant Principal	Responsible for instructional leadership, student achievement and growth. Assist teachers with instructional growth plan. Observe teachers and non-instructional staff. Maintain school safety and procedures.
Jones, Deborah	Assistant Principal	Responsible for instructional leadership, student achievement and growth. Assist teachers with instructional growth plan. Observe teachers and non-instructional staff. Maintain school safety and procedures.
Pollzzie, Rose	Assistant Principal	Responsible for instructional leadership, student achievement and growth. Assist teachers with instructional growth plan. Observe teachers and non-instructional staff. Maintain school safety and procedures.
Kanner, Denise	Math Coach	Denise Kanner serves as a math coach. Her primary responsibility is to improve mathematic pedagogy and improve the collaborative process of math PLC's. She also collaborates with the MTSS coach to identify students with significant gaps in mathematical basic skills and develops intervention plans to decrease gaps.
Carter, Bridget	Instructional Coach	Bridget Carter oversee Multi Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). Her responsibilities include coordinating progress monitoring and testing. Then collecting the data for each grade level. Her responsibilities also include collaboration with literacy coach, math coach and teachers to implement interventions to decrease achievement gaps in students.
Shawna Long, Shawna Long	Instructional Coach	Shawna job duties as a literacy coach include supporting ELA PLCs and increasing effective pedagogical strategies of ELA teachers. Shawna collaborates with the testing coordinator to collect baseline data then develops remediation or acceleration plans for small group and intervention instructions. Shawna tracks progress monitoring and assists teachers with appropriate instructional strategies.
Whitbread, Natasha	Dean	Natasha oversees student safety and discipline. Her primary responsibilities include student supervision and reviewing trends in behavior data. Natasha collaborates with admin and teachers to improve campus culture through initiatives of positive behavior. Her responsibilities include addressing behaviors that warrant attention to the discipline matrix and student code of conduct.
DeSimone, Anna	Dean	Anna oversees student safety and discipline. Her primary responsibilities include student supervision and reviewing trends in behavior data. Anna collaborates with admin and teachers to improve campus culture through initiatives of positive behavior. Her responsibilities include addressing

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		behaviors that warrant attention to the discipline matrix and student code of conduct.
Western , Brandon	Dean	Brandon oversees student safety and discipline. His primary responsibilities include student supervision and reviewing trends in behavior data. Brandon collaborates with admin, counselors and teachers to improve campus culture through initiatives of positive behavior. His responsibilities include addressing behaviors that warrant attention to the discipline matrix and student code of conduct.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Gary Weeden

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

18

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

28

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

121

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,780

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

28

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

37

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	101	152	152	142	170	175	248	273	311	0	0	0	0	1724
Attendance below 90 percent	21	25	16	20	19	25	27	21	37	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	29	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	17	26	52	47	59	0	0	0	0	205
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	26	27	64	60	54	0	0	0	0	235
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	17	16	17	26	52	47	59	0	0	0	0	249
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	15	17	16	10	15	25	30	25	0	0	0	0	153

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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	135	137	134	167	167	181	251	300	267	0	0	0	0	1739
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	26	28	46	45	56	0	0	0	0	217
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	26	14	26	44	44	46	0	0	0	0	200
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	26	28	46	45	56	0	0	0	0	201

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	1	8	12	3	7	10	0	0	0	42

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

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	135	137	134	167	167	181	251	300	267	0	0	0	0	1739
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	26	28	46	45	56	0	0	0	0	217
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	26	14	26	44	44	46	0	0	0	0	200
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	26	28	46	45	56	0	0	0	0	201

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	1	8	12	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	42

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	51%	57%				80%	56%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	53%	55%				72%	57%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	45%	46%				60%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	66%	46%	55%				86%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains	67%	54%	60%				82%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	51%	56%				75%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	71%	48%	51%				82%	49%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	68%	72%				93%	75%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	77%	51%	26%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	51%	20%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	80%	48%	32%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	76%	48%	28%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2022					
	2019	82%	47%	35%	52%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2022					
	2019	76%	49%	27%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	53%	23%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	78%	48%	30%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
06	2022					
	2019	91%	45%	46%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
07	2022					
	2019	70%	30%	40%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
08	2022					
	2019	92%	47%	45%	46%	46%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	78%	45%	33%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	75%	42%	33%	48%	27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	62%	38%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	73%	21%	71%	23%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	49%	51%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	44%	56%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	37	36	25	48	42	26	52			
ELL	51	60	50	54	62	53	50	80	88		
ASN	79	63		83	79		83				
BLK	49	64	50	40	60	56	46	90			
HSP	56	60	51	56	63	57	58	83	90		
MUL	77	65		74	81		82				
WHT	76	65	46	74	68	61	81	93	94		
FRL	55	56	44	53	60	52	61	81	81		
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	27	55	48	36	52	39	23	46			
ELL	64	75	74	67	65	66	60	80	78		
ASN	85	91		83	57		78	100	91		
BLK	44	57		44	52		20				
HSP	67	68	59	64	58	56	64	85	77		
MUL	88	90		74	55		60				
WHT	78	71	62	78	64	56	84	97	89		
FRL	61	65	51	60	53	42	52	75	69		
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	33	37	34	46	62	66	35	53			
ELL	67	69	59	82	81	79	64	78	100		
ASN	87	78		98	86		90	92	100		
BLK	48	58	50	58	65	65	50				
HSP	75	71	58	84	80	77	79	90	100		
MUL	84	70		87	86						
WHT	84	72	65	88	83	76	84	97	97		
FRL	74	69	59	77	79	73	67	83	100		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	675

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based on 21-22 FSA data, ELA proficiency was 74% and gains were 66%. Math proficiency was 70% and gains were 65%. ELA ELL proficiency was 15% and growth was 23%. ESE ELL proficiency was 30% with 30% gains; Math was 50% proficiency with 48% gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the data above, intervention and differentiated academic strategies are necessary to increase growth among ESE and ELL subgroups of students.

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

Contributing factors to this need that indicates it needs improvement is not having consistent ELL resources provided to teachers due to paraprofessional being used to cover classes when there was no substitute.

Additional factors include the turnover of the ECS position in the middle of the year. Implementing a task force to target ELL and ESE subgroups is a new action we will take with teachers and staff to address these concerns.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

While Celebration K8 School consistently scores above the district and state average, we did see a drop across ELA and Math proficiency. Math achievement was at 65.7% comparing to 53.1 at the state level. ELA achievement was 66.6% compared to 53.2%

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

Celebration School tried to remediate learning losses that occurred during the pandemic years by implementing tutoring both before and after school. Teachers made the transition to the new standards in 2021 with new curriculum in ELA. The Middle School received approximately 200 plus students through rezoning. Administration made sure that all students were given access to challenging classes that provided instruction to the depth of the standard. Teachers were also able to meet an additional hour each week for paid PLC time to collaborate and review data to guide instruction. Several teacher teams started to focus on backward planning to ensure students success.

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

New and veteran teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities to increase student engagement and monitor student learning using research based strategies. We are piloting a new foundational reading program in Middle school to target specific skills needed for success. Leadership has also identified a select group of low performing reading students to receive intensive vocabulary and comprehension strategies.

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

Professional development opportunities will include writing training through Core connections. Ongoing BEABLE and Achieve3000 reading PD for instructional staff. Coaches will offer lunch and learn PDs focusing on specific skills related to deepening understanding aligned with the science of reading. New Mentor teachers will work with new teachers throughout the school year offering ongoing development in instructional practices.

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

Many of our initiatives surrounding Professional developments will be conducted by teacher leaders and instructional coaches. This eliminates the need to bring in outside paid consultants. Administration goal is to continue to build teacher leaders.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Every grade level and content area has at least two new team members for the 2022-2023 instructional school year. Additionally the majority of PLCs ranked at a level 3 at the end of the 2021-2022 school year. Therefore, new teachers will need and understanding of the PLC process and purpose.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Measurable outcomes for each PLC should include collective commitments, evidence of collaboration measured by using common assessments, evidence of interventions including MTSS tiered data and an increase in PLC rankings on end of year survey.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Bi-quarterly PLC review meetings with Administration to analyze steps toward desired outcome listed above. Monitor the use of District common assessment data. Mid-year data survey for PLC members to rank themselves on the 7 stages.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

"Common formative assessments are designed to give students specific feedback on the clear target to be achieved, along with suggestions on how to reach that target on subsequent assessments. Students need to understand that this feedback will not be graded but that it will be used by their teachers to design specific instruction to help them improve." (Hattie)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Common assessments leads to a better understanding of what students know and can do. Teachers can use the common assessments during the PLC to plan instruction based on students needs.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Send 3 teachers to the PLC national conference. Upon return they will lead specific training for teachers to help them become better acquainted with the PLC concept.

Person Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Create a PLC guiding Coalition. The coalition will create common commitments and reinforce the concept that when we work collaboratively, everyone is more successful.

Person Responsible

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Initial Professional Development focusing on the PLC process in August. All staff members will participate in a session to clarify the purpose of a PLC and initiate next steps.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Provide Bi-quarterly meeting calendar to teachers during Pre-planning including the topics and measurable elements that will be discussed. Offer follow-up training based on needs of individual PLCS.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

If teachers effectively provide opportunities for students to actively participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures, engage in active learning experiences (such as labs, activities, and investigations), and authentically use their interactive science notebook to process their learning, then student engagement and learning will increase.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Science proficiency will increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction.

2. Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA, PM, and mock) will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning and coaching for teachers based on individual and small group needs.

3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the leadership and/or coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

In all of our middle school and elementary science classes teachers will be utilizing cooperative learning strategies (Hattie) with a .59 effect size over individual student work. Additionally teachers will use problem solving strategies in their science instruction (Hattie effect size .61)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Science curriculum and the Osceola School District curriculum unit plans incorporate both of these strategies into its lessons. The high effect sizes make them impactful for instruction and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will participate in engagement strategy workshops and the effective and impactful use of the science notebook.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Administration and Coaches will monitor to ensure that hands-on learning is planned for and executed effectively in science classrooms.

Person Responsible Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to students**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on 6-8 grade schoolwide survey only 30% of students felt connected to adults at our school. 56% of students grades 6-8 indicated that they feel as though they did not matter to anyone on campus.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

At the end of the year, we will increase our data points in the two identified areas. We will have at least 50% of students feeling connected and fewer than 20% feeling disconnected.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will continue to monitor the data through the Panorama survey. We will also review our PBIS data to see that all students are participating in our Positive support Systems. Additionally, we will monitor excessive absences and skipping class to identify students who may need positive interventions of supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Howe (jane.howe@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will use our PBIS system to track positive interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We will be using the PBIS strategies to monitor students involvement in Positive campus activities.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Purchase the HERO program to monitor PBIS data for individual students.

Person Responsible

Brandon Western (brandon.western@osceolaschools.net)

Share survey data with staff and task them in creating solutions for engaging all students in the school culture.

Person Responsible

Jane Howe (jane.howe@osceolaschools.net)

Create grade level team lead to plan student centered activities to create a fun and welcoming environment for their grade levels.

Person Responsible

Jane Howe (jane.howe@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Overall proficiency for ELA was 67%. Our LY student proficiency was 23% and our ESE population was at 22%.

Measurable**Outcome:****State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Increase overall proficiency to 72%. Increase our LY population's proficiency to 30%, and our ESE populations to 30%.

Monitoring:**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will be using the new F.A.S.T testing system to monitor student proficiency. Additionally we will review lexile data collected through BEAble and Achieve 3000, HD word, and NSGRA. In grades K-2 STAR testing will be conducted 3 times and the data will be reviewed by teachers and leadership to identify areas of strength and weakness. Fluency will be monitored in Middle School using DIEBELS and in elementary using NWEA map fluency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shawna Long Shawna Long (shawna.long@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:****Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Evidence-Based Strategy-Building academic vocabulary. According to Marzano's research when teachers take a systemic approach to helping students identify and master essential vocabulary, student comprehension and achievement rises.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:****Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

We are using the research based strategy listed above because data has shown that we did not make the appropriate gains with our ELL students . This strategy will be implemented across tier 1 instruction to foster growth in al students.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Incorporate guiding reading and small group instruction to reach the needs of all learners. Small group instruction will target specifics skills within the benchmark.

Person Responsible Shawna Long Shawna Long (shawna.long@osceolaschools.net)

Incorporate Beable and Achieve 3000 in grades 6-8 to target level 1 readers. Beable will be completed multiple times a week as an interventions. Achieve 3000 will help accelerate proficient readers and students will complete a minimum of two articles a week.

Person Responsible Shawna Long Shawna Long (shawna.long@osceolaschools.net)

Continue the use of AVID and Kagan structures Campus wide.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Incorporated the new teacher mentoring program to work with new educators.

Person Responsible Bridget Carter (bridget.carter@osceolaschools.net)

ELL literacy strategies incorporated across curriculum. Building LY Prides to focus on utilizing the Lexia program to build capacity with our emerging language learners. Creating a mentoring program during Pride in which middle school students will work with elementary students on foundational reading skills.

Person Responsible Shawna Long Shawna Long (shawna.long@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 65% of students demonstrated growth on the math assessment. 32% of ELL students scored proficient on the math assessment. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administration and instructional leaders will monitor district assessments to see trend data and use as an instructional tool for reteaching certain standards. Additionally FAST tests will be used to monitor student growth toward mastery of the standards. Teachers will use common assessments and meet to discuss data and reteaching instructional strategies. The ELL task force will review math data for this specific subgroup and target instruction by providing systematic paraprofessional support.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

"Increase student engagement through rich and challenging tasks that allows students time and opportunities to make decisions and use a variety of forms or representation" (NSW DOE) Teachers will chunk material, provide cognitively complex tasks and provide students opportunities to work in collaborative groups. (Hattie and Marzano)

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers having students problem solve deeply through cognitively complex task has an effect size of .87 according to John Hattie. Additionally, building student/ teacher relationships is an area of focus through all grade levels and curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will plan in their PLCS using the vetted curriculum maps provided by district resource specialist.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

The math coach will co-plan and model lessons with fluency as a focus.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will implement a fluency center that focuses on developing appropriate automaticity within the grade-level benchmarks through game-based learning.

Person Responsible Denise Kanner (denise.kanner@osceolaschools.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Not a Raise school

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Not a Raise school

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Not a Raise school

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Not a Raise school

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Not a Raise school

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Not a Raise school

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Not a Raise school

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

Not a Raise school

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Celebration K8 has adopted and implement Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports. Our school has adopted pillars of positive culture and behavioral expectation. Preparation, Respect, Integrity, Dedication and Effort. Students are recognized when exhibiting PRIDE expectations through a token economy with a currency of PRIDE dollars. Furthermore, our School Advisory Committee (SAC) meets monthly to collaborate with parents and community members in executing school improvement strategies. Community members include local business partners who collaborate on providing school supplies or teacher supplies. Collaboration with local churches is included in this positive school culture through campus beautification initiatives. University collaboration is sought for teacher preparedness programs and by developing university student mentors for middle school students. All stakeholders collaborate to mitigate obstacles in a student's success in reaching their greatest potential. We also include retired teachers in the community to

volunteer to strengthen student's reading fluency. In conclusion, we establish PRIDE expectations for behavior, ensure student's physical and mental health needs are met, and include community stakeholders in the school's student centered mission and vision.

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

Parents (volunteer in positive behavior initiatives), Business partners (provide incentives to students), local churches (provide incentives to teachers), universities (university students provide mentorships of motivation to students that struggle), school administrators (initiate programs), counselors, deans, social workers and school faculty.