School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Nathan Deright

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (66%)
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

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

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)
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	89%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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.

Kissimmee Elementary School will provide an enriched and rigorous learning environment within a diverse community where all children succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kissimmee Elementary will unlock the full potential of all students by empowering learners as they journey to academic success.

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
DeRight, Nathan	Principal	Create a safe school culture that is conducive for learning. Carry out the school mission statement. Serve as the lead instructional leader who sets forth procedures and systems that create opportunity and increase student learning.
Terry, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Duties assigned by the principal. Duties may include, school safety, scheduling, Title I, SAC meetings, instructional leadership, mentoring, and more.
Hinson , Katrina	Math Coach	School Math/Science Coach School AVID Coordinator
Wright , Jade	Reading Coach	School literacy Coach PLC facilitator
Kane, David	Instructional Coach	Restorative coach working with students on behavior strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/15/2022, Nathan Deright

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.*
10

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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

870

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

16

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

21

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	102	118	123	141	116	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	771
Attendance below 90 percent	0	32	30	33	25	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	16	8	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	10	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	47	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	48	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	19	18	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	19	18	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	111	128	129	145	164	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	829
Attendance below 90 percent	103	122	137	170	150	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	842
One or more suspensions	4	3	5	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	17	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	64	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	35	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	62	64	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210

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	4	2	5	17	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

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	111	128	129	145	164	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	829
Attendance below 90 percent	103	122	137	170	150	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	842
One or more suspensions	4	3	5	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	17	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	64	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	35	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	62	64	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210

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	4	2	5	17	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

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	39%	48%	56%				52%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						64%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						55%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	44%	50%				69%	55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						71%	59%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						59%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	46%	59%				49%	49%	53%

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	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

				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	60%	54%	6%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	53%	14%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

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	16	30	36	20	34	38	29				
ELL	34	46	39	36	45	54	37				
BLK	42	50		30	50		18				
HSP	37	49	43	38	49	55	39				
WHT	42	53		47	53		27				
FRL	35	49	43	34	47	48	33				

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	16	42		21	47		32				
ELL	31	48	52	35	49	54	36				
BLK	39	46		48	50		43				
HSP	34	52	54	37	51	59	38				
WHT	63			59							
FRL	32	51	54	35	52	50	35				

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	28	50	67	47	64	65	36				
ELL	47	62	54	66	70	59	41				
BLK	36	64		56	91						
HSP	53	62	56	69	70	57	46				
WHT	61	72		81	72		67				
FRL	46	62	59	63	67	58	43				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	45
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	43
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?

ELA students in the lowest quartile dropped a significant amount of percentage points from the previous year as identified by FSA (55% to 42%). The needs of the lowest performing students in ELA are beset helped during Guided Reading. Classroom teachers are must provide specific differentiation when meeting with students in small group for this subcategory.

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

ELA lowest quartile demonstrated the greatest decline (-13%) as identified by the Statewide Reading Assessment. Many students were lacking fundamental literacy skills that were missed due to intermittent schooling, movement and/or COVID-19 schooling issues. We are proactively targeting students in literacy through remediation and acceleration, while providing lessons/mini-lessons that will support student needs.

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

Students enrolling from different countries tended to have very intermittent schools and lacked fundamental skills in all subject areas. Kissimmee Elementary also has a high non-English speaking population, as well as students who are labeled ESOL. Tutoring and remediation services will be available all school year to help close the opportunity gap.

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

Our area showing the most improvement was within the ELA Achievement area (36% to 39%) and Math lowest quartile (48 to 51%). Having targeted this group of students during the 21-22 school year, the results showed that extra tutoring and small group instruction helps. We will be breaking this data down further this academic year, looking deeper into other subgroups, such as race and gender.

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

We offered tutoring and small group instruction all school year. The school leadership team used weekly data to make decisions on learning. Knowing the currently levels of performance for each student gave teachers the ability to meet students' needs in a timely manner. PLC groups will be tracking common trends this school year as well.

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

SDOC has now implemented AVID learning strategies in all grade levels. AVID (Advancement via individual determination) strategies provide students with a necessary set of tools to advocate for their own learning and understand their strengths and weaknesses. Through AVID, teachers can provide project-bases learning (or accelerated curriculum) when needed with fidelity. Students working within proficiency (levels 3-5) will be monitored and given self-paced 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 AVID coordinator will be offering frequent professional development opportunities to teachers throughout the school year. We will also be meeting regularly with PLC captains and grade level representatives to keep a pulse of the school and continue to work toward our 22-23 academic goals.

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

PLC captain meetings will be held once a month, as well as grade chair meetings to create common language amongst the school, as well as to not lose site of our goals for the school year.

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.	If teachers participate in authentic PLCs in all accountability areas, then engaging lesson plans using high yield strategies and best practices can be planned and common formative assessments can be developed to monitor student achievement. Then student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA, Math, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups. Science proficiency will increase by 3%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and PLC Leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the PLC teams individually and collectively. 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PLC is defined as "…an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (DuFour, 2006).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Set clear objectives that are focused on student learning. The PLC model is grounded in the assumption that building teachers' competencies will lead to improved academic, behavioral, or social outcomes for students. Consequently, student learning is both the foundation and evidence of an effective PLC.

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.

PLC teams will develop and implement formulated meeting Collective Commitments (NORMs) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members during all meetings.

Person Responsible	Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

Schools PLC's teams will meet four times a month during early release and this dedicated PLC time will be spent focused on working together as a team for student success purposes.

Person Responsible	Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes through the PLC facilitator and PLC administrator.

Person Responsible   Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

Current Data will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.

Person Responsible   Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

Mentoring will be conducted by the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team focused on the work.

Person Responsible   Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

Each grade level or content area team will have an embedded leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process.

Person Responsible   Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan together within their PLCs to incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible   Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Well-implemented programs designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to generate, better test scores and higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. These competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop a positive culture they need to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	2021-2022 Panorama Survey showed a 65% of students answered favorably about school belonging. In 2022-2023 this question will be increased by 10%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive culture within the school. 2. The leadership team will review monthly during the Stocktake PBIS, behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop interventions as required.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Terry (elizabeth.terry@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individuals and be focused and flexible to allow for meeting these different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through collaboration during their PLC planning time.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate students' shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum (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 and relationships that support a positive culture for students and staff development.
9. PBIS will be implemented with fidelity throughout the school and and reported out at monthly Stocktake.
10. Create a post-secondary culture around campus, emphasizing choices after high school.

Person Responsible

David Kane (david.kane@osceolaschools.net)

#3. 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.	Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 39% of students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA, proficiency will increase by 5% in all groups.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

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.

1. All staff will be trained by the district and Literacy Coach in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

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

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

4. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text.

5. Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development will take place in grades K-2.

6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2, & 3.

7. Teachers will incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups

Person Responsible   Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

#4. 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 39% of students were proficient in math, 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 will increase by 5% in all groups.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. Administrative team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions should be focused on Costa's higher levels of questions (Inquiry). 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly.
Rationale for Evidence-based	Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts or procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use one procedure for a given situation. Procedural fluency builds on a foundation of conceptual understanding, strategic reasoning, and

Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	problem-solving (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010; NCTM, 2000, 2014). All students need to have a deep and flexible knowledge of a variety of procedures, along with an ability to make critical judgments about which procedures or strategies are appropriate for use, in particular, situations (NRC, 2001, 2005, 2012; Star, 2005). Procedural fluency extends students' computational fluency and applies to all strands of mathematics.

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.

1. Teachers will plan for the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for a unit of study.
2. Students will be presented with a problem of the week focused on the fluency benchmarks.
3. PD will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of fluency across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training.
4. The math coach will co-plan and model lessons with fluency as a focus.
5. Teachers will implement a fluency center that focuses on developing appropriate automaticity within the grade-level benchmarks through game-based learning.
6. Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices.
7. The ELL and ESE teachers and students will receive support from the RCS and EES.
8. Students in Tiers 1-3 will participate in targeted intervention.
9. Teachers will incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible	Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

#5. 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:	Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	• Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures • Engage in active learning experiences • Process learning using interactive science notebooks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	o Academic discourse through collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts. WICOR (AVID) o Active learning experiences: Providing opportunities for students to investigate through inquiry, participate in experiments, develop models, and engage in simulations and activities remember the experience, especially if it is connected and relevant to their lives (which is possible in almost all science content). WICOR (AVID) o Interactive science notebooks: Interactive science notebooks provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence in science as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, and more. WICOR (AVID)

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.

1. Implement needs assessment, planning, learning, and monitoring of science instructional practices.
2. Develop a common understanding for each instructional strategy and expectations for what each looks like in the classroom. (a. Can focus on one strategy at a time, identifying priorities. b. Revisit understanding and expectations of strategy monthly, sharing examples and non-examples. c. Highlight good examples and incorporate into professional learning.)
3. Conduct classroom walkthroughs, focusing on highest priority science instructional strategy. What are students doing?
5. Identify and schedule dates for continuous cycle of learning which includes developing understanding of strategy, monitoring in instructional practice, needs assessment discussion, professional learning.
6. Teachers will participate in PD that will incorporate AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.
7. Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.

Person Responsible   Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@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

FCRR Student Center Activities (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate) This can be used in addition to our Tier 1 foundational skills (Open Court)

Words Their Way (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate) This can be used in addition to our Tier 1 foundational skills (Open Court)

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

Explicit Vocabulary Instruction (Visible Learning effect size - vocabulary
programs: .63 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate) Suggestion would be Anita Archer's model of
explicit vocabulary instruction. This has been addressed district-wide in the past. Additional information
could be obtained from school based literacy coach. This could easily be implemented universally for
grades 3-5.

RISE/RISE UP accelerated intervention (Visible Learning effect size - small group learning: .47 promising)
Easily implemented in grades 3-5 for students who are below grade level.

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)

Open Court Foundational Skills (Open Court does not meet strong, moderate, or promising levels of
evidence;
however, the following IES Practice Guide recommendations support the program: Foundational Skills to
Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade - Develop awareness of the
segments
of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. The district will support and monitor the implementation
of
Open Court through classroom walkthroughs, regular data chats, instructional planning meetings, and
MTSS
progress monitoring meetings.)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

-Differentiated instruction provided in small group in classroom (teacher-led) during the 90-minute block
of
reading. (What Works Clearinghouse Recommend Practice with strong evidence)
- Lexia Core 5 (ESSA Rating: Promising)
-Lexia English (physical learning effect size-comprehensive reading program:.47 promising)

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.

Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted in every grade level. Data and feedback will be
discussed during Stocktake meetings, PLC meetings and grade level meetings. Remediation/Acceleration
will be used once data indicated the needs of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

DeRight, Nathan, nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net

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. §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?

Suggestions listed above contain ESSA ratings and/or effect size. All suggestions listed above are aligned to the district's Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

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?

Through the use of Lexia and Lexia English, students' individual needs are being met. Lexia is used for the general population in grades 2-5, while Lexia English is used to help non-English speaking students become acclimated with the English language.

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
Literacy learning team will conduct weekly focused walkthroughs resulting in the cumulation of school-wide trends. Once trends are established, professional learning opportunities will be made available to teachers.	Wright , Jade, jade.wright@osceolaschools.net

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.

The school engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction. Staff is held accountable for the implementation of any changes. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from various stakeholders such as students, families and school personnel has been created and implemented in support of a well structured learning environment. Teachers meet weekly in PLCs to routinely examine disaggregated data in order to identify areas of strength and growth related to academic success. Discipline referrals, in-and-out of school suspensions, and attendance continue to provide the necessary data essential to understanding the ever evolving needs of our students. Administration ensures that teachers have resources, training and on-going support through timely and actionable feedback in the continued effort to develop all staff in our effort to meet the needs of our students. School staff are also afforded the opportunity to provide administration with feedback on school-wide procedures and policies. In addition, the master schedule ensures that teachers have the opportunity to work collaboratively with regard to standards-based planning. The school's curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diver interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as decision-making SAC council. Parents are also afforded the on-going opportunity to meet with classroom teachers on a regular basis in support of their child's academic success. Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

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

Our school leadership team manages both the instructional and cultural aspects of the school. Our goal is to create a sense of belonging and family-oriented environment. Our PBIS (positive behavior interventions and supports program also teachers out students how to follow schoolwide expectations. They also can achieve rewards and special events by earning cub cash. Our School Advisory Council also meets monthly to discuss all aspects of the school, including academics and culture.