

School District of Osceola County, FL

Koa Elementary 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 | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Koa Elementary School

5000 KOA ST, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Adah Schwartz

Start Date for this Principal: 10/25/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 (41%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) |
| 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 | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Koa Elementary School

5000 KOA ST, Kissimmee, FL 34758

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 | 93% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Koa Elementary School will inspire all students to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive learners and citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Koa Elementary School will work in partnership with its families and the community to ensure all learners develop the essential academic, social, and emotional skills needed for college and career readiness.

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 |
|--|---------------------|--|
| Perez, Adah | Principal | To be responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur within a school. To be responsible for all aspects of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership as well as professional ethical behavior. To develop positive school-community relations including contacts with parents, community groups, other educational agencies, school officials and the general public. |
| Sanders, Erica | Assistant Principal | Assists the principal with supervision and evaluation of teachers and support staff. Oversees the student behavior support decision-making process. Participates with principal and leadership team in visiting classrooms to monitor instruction, and provides timely and relevant feedback to teachers and support staff. Handles other school administrative functions as assigned by the principal. |
| Literacy Coach's name is Neroli Maharaj. | | |
| Maharaj, Neroli | Instructional Coach | Serve as coach, mentor, and conduct on-going classroom visits and coaching cycle with English Language Arts. Facilitate implementation of ELA curriculum by providing curriculum support and side-by-side coaching. Monitor student progress of all tiers and demographic subgroups for ELA. Support the work of the school leadership team with other duties as assigned by the principal. Monitor progress of 3rd grade students working towards earning ELA Good Cause promotion to grade 4 via completion of portfolios. Plan for and monitor interventions for these students who are at-risk of retention. |
| Colon Dume, Lianivet | Math Coach | Serve as coach, mentor, and conduct on-going classroom visits and coaching cycle with math and science. Facilitate implementation of math and science curriculum by providing curriculum support and side-by-side coaching. Monitor student progress of all tiers and demographic subgroups for Math and Science. Support the work of the school leadership team with other duties as assigned by the principal. |
| Moreno, Wanda | School Counselor | Support students with their social and emotional needs. Conducts gifted testing. Support the work of the school leadership team with other duties as assigned by the principal. |
| Patrick, Bonnie | Staffing Specialist | Support ESE Teachers via scheduling of students. Monitor timelines and completion of evaluations and IEP meetings. Support teachers with academic and behavior strategies to support student growth. Monitor academic data of students with disabilities and gifted students. Support school leadership team through other duties as assigned by the principal. |
| Heron Williams, Karema | Instructional Media | Support students' access to traditional and media sources. Monitor library circulation and provide teachers and students with opportunities to access materials tied to curriculum needs, student levels of proficiency, and student |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | | interests. Will serve as testing coordinator to support WIDA , FSA, and FSAA assessments during school year. Train teachers on testing procedures to ensure fidelity. Monitor teacher completion of i-safe lessons and support teachers as needed. |
| Melendez Velez, Rosmar | ELL Compliance Specialist | Along with the ELL team of paras, ensure that instructional support is provided to ELL students. Monitor academic progress of ELL students through analysis of data such as WIDA, FSA, NWEA, and other state/district assessments. Meet with parents/guardians of ELLs to keep them informed of academic progress throughout school year. Collaborate with school leadership team to keep rest of team informed of student progress and plan for next steps. |
| Yatsko, Kimberly | Instructional Coach | Supports teachers by facilitating Multi-Tiered Support Systems MTSS meetings to plan interventions and ensure students with gaps in learning receive needed additional instruction. Monitors supports to ensure fidelity and reviews student data to determine effectiveness and next steps. Works with groups of low-performing students during intervention time |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 10/25/2022, Adah Schwartz

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.*

0

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

Total number of students enrolled at the school

656

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

6

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

7

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 | 103 | 96 | 104 | 103 | 107 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 613 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 54 | 34 | 39 | 42 | 37 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 36 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

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 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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 | 90 | 85 | 98 | 90 | 102 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 568 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 6 | 18 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |

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

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

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 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 90 | 85 | 98 | 90 | 102 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 568 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 6 | 18 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 22 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |

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 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 30% | 48% | 56% | | | | 46% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | | | | | | 52% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | | | | | | 43% | 51% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 44% | 50% | | | | 45% | 55% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | | | | | | 54% | 59% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | | | | | | 43% | 45% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 35% | 46% | 59% | | | | 42% | 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 | 42% | 51% | -9% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 42% | 48% | -6% | 56% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |

| 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 | 35% | 54% | -19% | 62% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 64% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -35% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 60% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| 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 | 13 | 44 | 47 | 14 | 37 | 36 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 53 | 48 | 40 | 53 | 54 | 41 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 46 | 33 | 34 | 42 | 42 | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 44 | 47 | 34 | 51 | 47 | 35 | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 80 | | 63 | 60 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 46 | 40 | 31 | 44 | 45 | 31 | | | | |

| 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 | 7 | 15 | | 8 | 7 | | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 37 | | 26 | 15 | | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 11 | | 28 | 22 | | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 40 | | 28 | 16 | 20 | 18 | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | | | 39 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 33 | 30 | 26 | 18 | | 15 | | | | |
| 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 | 9 | 27 | 30 | 13 | 40 | 40 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 49 | 47 | 32 | 48 | 38 | 26 | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 56 | | 43 | 51 | 30 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 53 | 48 | 43 | 54 | 50 | 41 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 50 | | 71 | 64 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 52 | 45 | 44 | 51 | 39 | 42 | | | | |

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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 40 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 324 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

According to ELA FSA [Florida Standards Assessment], the students in third grade demonstrated a regression of 22% proficiency. Fourth grade students' proficiency percentage remained the same. In addition, the students in fifth grade proficiency increased by 5%. Based on Math FSA, the students in third grade demonstrated a regression by 5% proficiency. Also, fourth grade students achieved an increase by 10% proficiency and fifth grade students increased proficiency by 13%. State-wide Science assessment showed an increase of 17% proficiency.

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

The overall proficiency rates in both ELA and Math trends below the 50th percentile. As a result, our Tier 1 instruction will need to become the focus of our shift as a school to provide students with a guaranteed and viable curriculum. In addition, our students with disabilities also consistently perform below their peers based on both the progress monitoring data and the state assessments results.

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

A shift in our Professional Learning Communities [PLCs] will contribute to student success. Teachers will create ongoing, short-term SMART goals to meet the needs of students. A geographical change of PLCs will support teams in having instantaneous access to all leadership members.

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

Science demonstrated the most improvement according to State-wide assessment. There was an increase of 17% proficiency.

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

The increase in science was a result of consistent review of Fair Game standards and tier 1 instruction of fifth grade standards. Data analysis from grade level common formative assessments and district assessments. A focus on student motivation and hands-on science review.

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

To accelerate learning, we will work to ensure that students are engaging in small group lessons with classroom teachers on a regular basis. In addition, students will also be provided with rigorous academic

tasks related to grade level mathematical standards. Teachers will facilitate a classroom learning environment which requires students to explore academic concepts through concrete, operational and abstract tasks. Classroom teachers will implement the reading strategies taught through ELA in their science classes to assist in processing science content.

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.

Koa Elementary will focus on AVID, NSGRA/small group professional development, mathematical tasks (releasing students to problem solving tasks that require students to apply the understanding they have acquired will assist in developing a deeper understanding of content), effective questioning, allowing for processing time/ releasing students to process, and Carnegie Math cycles. Additionally, we will work with PLTs to develop common formative assessments and engage in data digging.

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

Our Varying Exceptionalities teachers have worked with our RCS and our general education teachers to develop a schedule that provides necessary supports for our students with an IEP. General Education teachers and Varying Exceptionalities teachers will partner together to ensure students with disabilities receive appropriate accommodations to support their individual learning needs. In addition, our ELL students will also be provided with foundational support while in the classroom via the inclusion of cognates, sentence frames, visuals, scaffolds, Total Physical Response [TPR] and increased opportunities to process content while focusing on building academic vocabulary.

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.

Students demonstrated below 50% proficiency on all 2021-2022 State-Wide Assessments. As a result, Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) need additional support and guidance with analyzing data and determining next steps to promote student achievement. In addition, PLT's need to be more consistent with creating common formative assessments to monitor students' ongoing progress with understanding standards.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

By the end of the school year, all Professional Learning Teams will function at a Stage 5 or higher according to the Seven Stages of Professional Learning Communities. PLTs will begin to shift their collaboration from teaching to learning. PLTs will spend time analyzing student data to make meaningful decisions to provide effective interventions and improve instructional practices to maximize student learning. Also, PLTs will ensure AVID strategies are incorporated in all academic instruction.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and the leadership team will monitor progress through data analysis, classroom visits and data chats with teachers and grade level teams. In addition, administration and leadership teams will conduct classroom visits during scheduled interventions.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Timothy D Kanold stated in the best PLC cultures, vision and values ultimately become the driving force behind the decision-making process that takes place every day. PLCs is the driving force to promote academic learning for students.

Rationale for

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

There is a direct link to successful collaborative teams and student achievement. When teachers have an opportunity to analyze data, collaborate, and strategize a plan to intervene or enrich student's learning, it directly benefits academic achievement.

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. PLC facilitators from each grade level will form a Guiding Coalition. This team will meet twice a month during the school year.

Person Responsible Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

2. Guiding Coalition will meet and design a digital Professional Learning Community (PLC) binder to share with teachers and staff.

Person Responsible Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

3. Assistant principal and Guiding Coalition will provide professional development to instructional staff during pre-planning about implementing productive collaborative teams for this school year.

Person Responsible Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

4. All grade level collaborative teams will meet in the media center during PLC time on Wednesdays. This will provide administration and lead team members an opportunity to support collaborative teams.

Person Responsible Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

#2. 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. | <p>ELA achievement is identified as an area of focus because according to ELA FSA [Florida Standards Assessment], third grade demonstrated a regression of 22% proficiency, fourth grade's proficiency remained the same, and fifth grade proficiency increased by 5%.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | <p>ELA achievement in all grade levels will increase to reach 50% proficiency.</p> |
| Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | <p>Leadership team will analyze data/trends from classroom walks. PLCs will be held in a central location. Leadership team will analyze formative/summative data [School City] to inform next steps. Literacy Coach will attend ELA planning sessions with PLTs. Administration will conduct classroom observations. MTSS data will be collected and analyzed on an ongoing basis to provide necessary interventions and determine next steps based on student performance.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Neroli Maharaj (neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being | <p>Next Steps to Guided Reading provides a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Classroom teachers will implement the various components of this particular guided reading program to ensure they are attending to all aspects of literacy.</p> |

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

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

Corrective Reading, RISE, and LLI provide a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Corrective Reading is a powerful direct instruction remedial reading series that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers. Explicit step-by-step lessons are organized around two major strands to improve decoding and comprehension skills (NIFDI 2019). This program will be implemented to assist in the academic growth of our ELL/ESE students as well as our general education students that scored a Level 1 as identified by the FSA. The RISE program provides a powerful short-term intervention with targeted, daily small-group instruction for reading comprehension, word study, phonics, and guided writing (Scholastic Inc. 2020). The Fountas & Pinell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is a dynamic, short-term intervention that provides intensive, small-group instruction, which supplements classroom literacy teaching (Heinemann 2022).

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. Ongoing professional development [Guided Reading, Intervention, AVID, NSGRA etc.] will be delivered.

Person Responsible Neroli Maharaj (neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net)

2. Data chats regarding the MTSS process with Problem Solving Team will be conducted

Person Responsible Erica Sanders (erica.sanders@osceolaschools.net)

3. Coaching cycles will be implemented with tier 2/3 teachers.

Person Responsible Neroli Maharaj (neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net)

4. Model classrooms will be identified and peer observations will be planned to strengthen tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible Adah Perez (adah.perez@osceolaschools.net)

5. Classroom walks will be conducted weekly and trends will be analyzed and addressed as needed.

Person Responsible Neroli Maharaj (neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net)

6. Teachers will implement AVID strategies in instructional practices.

Person Responsible Neroli Maharaj (neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net)

#3. 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.**

According to the Florida State Assessment, our school scored at 36% proficiency in mathematics.

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

Math achievement in all grade levels will increase to reach 50% proficiency.

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

To ensure the desired outcome is met, the leadership team will analyze data from classroom walks and observations. The leadership team will analyze formative/summative data to inform next steps using SchoolCity. Professional Learning Communities will be held in a central location to support in areas of need. The Mathematics Instructional Coach will attend grade-level planning to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing for student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

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

Engaging students in concrete, representational, and abstract learning opportunities aligned to grade-level benchmarks is critical to the development of student mathematical foundation.

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

Students using the CRA model will allow for deep understanding of number sense and processes.

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. Provide professional development based on classroom trends and data analysis.

Person Responsible Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teachers will engage in learning cycles provided by Carnegie Learning to help teachers grow in content understanding. This will contribute to deeper questioning and engaging students in higher levels of learning.

Person Responsible Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

3. Provide coaching cycles for teachers that need additional guidance with implementation of benchmark-based instruction.

Person Responsible Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

4. Ongoing grade-level data chats with math coach and leadership team to identify next steps based on student performance.

Person Responsible Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

5. Arrange for teachers to visit model classrooms to focus on targeted strategies.

Person Responsible Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

6. Teachers will incorporate AVID strategies in instructional practices.

Person Responsible Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

#4. 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.

According to the 2022 Statewide Science Assessment, Koa Elementary was 35% proficient. This was a 17% increase from the 2021 school year.

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

Koa Elementary will increase the science proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment from 35% to 50% or better for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The science coach will attend planning sessions with teachers to provide additional resources and guidance.
The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthrough to identify trends and areas of need. They will provide feedback to the teachers to improve their practice. The leadership team will analyze data from classroom visits and formative/summative data from School City to inform next steps. PLCs will be held in a central location to have access to resources such as the Science Coach, Literacy Coach, Resource Compliance Specialist, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

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

Teachers will engage students in hands-on inquiry based scientific investigations to enhance their understanding of critical content. A cross-curricular connection of science and literacy will be used to deepen content knowledge of grade level standards and Fair Game Review Standards. There will be an emphasis on systematic review of science vocabulary. Collaboration among peers will be intentional to provide opportunities to process new learning. Students will also participate in an intentional review of Fair Game Standards based on assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific

Students need the opportunity to experience science beyond the text. Hands-on lessons will allow them to test their hypothesis and confirm or disprove their theories. This will result in greater retention of scientific concepts. Connecting literacy and science will help students through deeper comprehension and stronger use of scientific vocabulary. Collaboration among peers allows students process information to confirm their understanding or correct misconceptions. The use of data to determine which

strategy.**Describe the resources/****criteria used for****selecting this****strategy.**

standards for review will allow teachers to focus on the areas of greatest need for review.

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 engage in targeted professional development to increase their science content capacity.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teachers and coaches will participate in grade level data chats to determine next steps.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers will work with academic coaches to plan for and implement the use of cognitively complex informational texts for science concepts.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

4. Model classrooms will be identified to highlight best practice strategies.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

5. Fifth grade teachers will implement intentional review of Fair Game Standards based on data as part of House of Science review and Science Bootcamp lessons.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

6. All teachers will plan for and engage in hands-on science activities based on the Next Generation Science Standards.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

7. Teachers will use academic games and routines to systematically review and strengthen science vocabulary in all grade levels.

Person**Responsible**

Lianivet Colon Dume (lianivet.colondume@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to ELA Social Emotional Learning

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 to foster SEL are associated with positive short term and long term goals ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional 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 being prepared for class on a daily basis. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need to develop the social, emotional and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.

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

2021-2022 SEL Panorama Survey showed 67% of students answered favorably for school belonging in the fall. In 2022-2023 this question will increase by 3%.

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

School counselor and administration will review Panorama Survey results and analyze discipline data to determine a course of action to provide students with the appropriate emotional and behavioral support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@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 individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting their different needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-

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

centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

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

Person Responsible Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teachers will implement the various tools and strategies provided by Panorama Education to facilitate a greater use of self-regulating strategies.

Person Responsible Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging through the implementation of PBIS strategies.

Person Responsible Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)

4. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.

Person Responsible Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)

5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experimental, and project-based activities.

Person Responsible Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Wanda Moreno (wanda.moreno@osceolaschools.net)

7. Teachers and staff will incorporate Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) strategies to help prepare students for post secondary education.

Person Responsible Neroli Maharaj (neroli.maharaj@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

According to the 2021-2022 End of the Year Next Steps to Guided Reading Assessment, 44 students in grades K-2nd performed below grade level. During TIER 1 instruction, Open Court will be used to strengthened students decoding skills. In addition, students will utilize Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) center activities to foster their reading skills.

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

147 students in grades 3- 5 performed below grade level on the 2021-2022 Florida State Standards Assessment. During TIER I instruction, Florida Benchmark Advance curriculum will be utilized to promote comprehension and vocabulary skills. Also, the RISE intervention program will be implemented to support struggling readers read on 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)

ELA achievement in all grade levels will increase to reach 50% proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA achievement in all grade levels will increase to reach 50% proficiency.

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.

Leadership team will analyze data/trends from classroom walks. PLCs will be held in a central location. Leadership team will analyze formative/summative data [School City] to inform next steps. Literacy Coach will attend ELA planning sessions with PLTs. Administration will conduct classroom observations. MTSS data will be collected and analyzed on an ongoing basis to provide necessary interventions and determine next steps based on student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Davis, Beth, beth.davis@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. 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?

Next Steps to Guided Reading provides a research-based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity for students in grades K-5. Classroom teachers will implement the various components of this guided reading program to ensure they are attending all aspects of literacy. In addition, intervention programs such as RISE, Corrective Reading, and LLI are research based programs to improve student deficiencies reading.

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?

Next Steps to Guided Reading, RISE, Corrective Reading and LLI provide a research based approach to literacy with proven success when implemented with fidelity. Corrective Reading is a powerful direct instruction

remedial reading series that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers, even if they have failed with other approaches. Explicit, step-by-step lessons are organized around two major strands, decoding and comprehension, which may be used separately or together to customize instruction for particular student needs (NIFDI 2019). This particular program will be implemented to assist in the academic growth of our students reading below grade level .

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 |
|--|---|
| 100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans | Maharaj, Neroli, neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net |
| Kindergarten-Second Grade teachers will implement and utilize Open Court curriculum during their 90 minute reading block. Students will learn print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development. | Maharaj, Neroli, neroli.maharaj@osceolaschools.net |
| T1 and T2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 1 day/week during station rotation. | Yatsko, Kimberly, kimberly.yatsko@osceolaschools.net |
| T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation. | Yatsko, Kimberly, kimberly.yatsko@osceolaschools.net |
| T 3 students will use LLI and Corrective Reading during intervention time. | Yatsko, Kimberly, kimberly.yatsko@osceolaschools.net |
| RISE intervention will be used for students close to proficiency. | Yatsko, Kimberly, kimberly.yatsko@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.

There are key stakeholders to help promote a positive school culture and environment. First, the principal maintains open communication and involving teachers and staff in academic planning and empowers them to be more confident in their instructional practices. In addition, the principal ensures Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) are in place throughout the school. Also, the principal engages parents and seek community input to establish invaluable partnerships in their mission to build a strong culture and environment. Furthermore, the assistant Principal supports the principal's endeavors to build positive school culture and environment. The school counselor, social worker, teachers, and staff meet the social and emotional needs of our students to promote a safe learning environment. Additionally, parents partner with the Koa Elementary administration, teachers, and staff to meet the academic needs of their child. Lastly, the community leaders build strong partnerships with the school to foster positive school culture and environment conducive for learning.