

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Partin Settlement Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Partin Settlement Elementary School

2434 REMINGTON BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Karen Corbett C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2012

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 76%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (50%)<br>2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Partin Settlement Elementary School

2434 REMINGTON BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

[www.osceolaschools.net](http://www.osceolaschools.net)

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 76%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 82%  |

### 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.**

Education which inspires all to their highest potential and develops the whole child.

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

To create a safe, secure and nurturing educational environment in which every student is an active learner.

### 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   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Corbett, Karen           | Principal                 | Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support, documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communication with parents regarding school based MTSS plan and activities. Responsible for school Stocktakes, will monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback.                |
| Ortiz, Melissa           | Assistant Principal       | Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support, Osceola - 0904 - Partin Settlement Elem. School - 2020-21 SIP documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communication with parents regarding school based MTSS plan and activities. Responsible for school Stocktakes, will monitor the SIP |
| Czipulis, Sara           | Reading Coach             | Provide guidance on K-5 reading plan: facilitate and support data collection activities, assist in data analysis, provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning, support the implementation of tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans. Provide data at the school stocktakes.   |
| Jares, Shelby            | Math Coach                | Provide guidance on K-5 Math: facilitate and support data collection activities, assist in data analysis, provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning, support the implementation of tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans. Provide data at the School Stocktakes.   |
| Konieczny, Carolyn       | School Counselor          | Works closely with the school social worker and school psychologist to assist students with behavior and social interventions. Identify and analyze data based behavior interventions and monitor student progress. Provide data at the School Stocktakes. Assist with implementation of Character education in 3-5 and promote Growth Mindset. Participate as a member of the leadership team and the threat assessment team. Provides small group counseling in 3-5 and teaches SEL lessons to 3-5.                           |
| Millian Rivera, Femerlie | ELL Compliance Specialist | Provide guidance on ELL strategies to instructional staff: facilitate and support data collection activities, assist in data analysis, provide professional development on ELL strategies and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning, support the implementation of tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans. Provide data at the school stocktakes.  |



| Name                | Position Title   | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------|------------------|--|
| McCormick, Kathryn  | Other            | MTSS coach-Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs, identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Provide data at the School Stocktake. Train staff on intervention materials, hold tier 2 and 3 parent meetings, hold monthly MTSS staff data chats, creating and monitoring interventions groups. AVID Coach- Train staff on AVID strategies, monitor for implementation, assist and model lessons. |
| Churchill, Margaret | School Counselor | Works closely with the school social worker and school psychologist to assist students with behavior and social interventions. Identify and analyze data based behavior interventions and monitor student progress. Provide data at the School Stocktakes. Assist with implementation of Character education in K-2 and promote Growth Mindset. Participate as a member of the leadership K-2  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/17/2012, Karen Corbett C

**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.*

6

**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.*

7

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

65

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

776

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

9

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

12

#### 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                              | 126         | 132 | 138 | 131 | 156 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 796   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 4           | 39  | 38  | 27  | 30  | 37  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1   | 0   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 6   | 13  | 30  | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 3   | 6   | 15  | 24  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 6   | 32  | 40  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 6   | 33  | 44  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 22          | 35  | 32  | 13  | 34  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 163   |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 3 | 12 | 29 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |

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     | 4           | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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                              | 116         | 115 | 126 | 125 | 149 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 738   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 27          | 37  | 37  | 30  | 30  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 161   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 2   | 18  | 18  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 2   | 17  | 13  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 38  | 23  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 45  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6           | 9   | 21  | 23  | 38  | 33  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 130   |

**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 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |

**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     | 6           | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| 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                              | 116         | 115 | 126 | 125 | 149 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 738   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 27          | 37  | 37  | 30  | 30  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 161   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 2   | 18  | 18  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 2   | 17  | 13  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 38  | 23  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 45  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6           | 9   | 21  | 23  | 38  | 33  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 130   |

**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 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |

#### 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     | 6           | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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             | 51%    | 48%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 60%    |          |       |        |          |       | 54%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 48%    | 44%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 57%    | 55%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 56%    |          |       |        |          |       | 58%    | 59%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 47%    | 46%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 45%    | 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 | 58%    | 51%      | 7%                         | 58%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 51%      | 4%                         | 58%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -58%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 48%      | 3%                         | 56%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -55%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 67%    | 54%      | 13%                        | 62%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 53%      | 5%                         | 64%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -67%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 42%    | 48%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -58%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 45%      | -1%                        | 53%   | -9%                     |
| 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                                       | 14       | 35     | 35          | 18        | 33      | 29           | 7        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 42       | 53     | 41          | 42        | 51      | 32           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 38     |             | 28        | 50      | 50           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 48       | 58     | 48          | 45        | 51      | 37           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 90       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 62       | 72     |             | 59        | 65      |              | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 59     | 50          | 37        | 47      | 35           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 13       | 21     | 20          | 18        | 21      | 10           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 35     | 35          | 31        | 24      | 14           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 46       | 33     |             | 32        | 33      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 39     | 33          | 39        | 33      | 17           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 77       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 62     |             | 48        | 38      |              | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 35     | 28          | 33        | 31      | 19           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 16       | 39     | 46          | 20        | 39      | 32           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 48     | 50          | 43        | 58      | 55           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 58       |        |             | 75        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 51       | 46     |             | 51        | 46      |              | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 57     | 58          | 54        | 57      | 49           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 64       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 45     | 20          | 71        | 62      |              | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 49     | 42          | 49        | 52      | 45           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 50   |
| 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 | 48   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 400  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 24   |
| 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                                      | 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                                | 37  |
| 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  | 48  |
| 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   | 85  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| 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   | 63  |
| 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                                | 45 |
| 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?

Across all grade levels, the students with disabilities scored the lowest. The students with disabilities scored the following proficiency in Reading: 3rd grade-19%, 4th grade-16%, and 5th grade-7%. In Math, our ESE students scored the following proficiency: 3rd grade-19%, 4th grade-26%, 5th grade-7%. In Science, our ESE students scored the following proficiency: 5th grade-7%. In NWEA Reading, the students scored the following proficiency: Kindergarten-66%, First grade-59%, and Second grade-67%. In NWEA Math, the students scored the following proficiency: Kindergarten-66%, First grade-64%, Second grade-70%.

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

PSES greatest need for improvement is our students with disabilities as they scored the lowest in all grade levels for both Reading and Math. The students with disabilities scored the following in Reading: 3rd grade-19%, 4th grade-16%, and 5th grade-7%. In Math, our ESE students scored the following proficiency: 3rd grade-19%, 4th grade-26%, 5th grade-7%. In Science, our ESE students scored the following proficiency: 5th grade-7%.

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

Looking at our students performance on the 2022 FSA and NWEA data, our ESE ELA proficiency was at 14%, our Math FSA proficiency was at 18% and our Science FSA proficiency was 18%. Contributing factors to this were the lack of staff in our ESE department and 2 out of the 6 support teachers were new to their position. Student and staff absences were high as we continued to have struggle with quarantine. Teachers continued to struggled with small group instruction in Math and Reading as they feared the spread of COVID and getting back into a routine. Our teachers struggled with the behavior of the students as they returned from digital learning and quarantine.

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

Overall Science gains from NGSSS was the highest with an overall proficiency at 47%(2022) from a 34% in 2021.

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



In science, our PLC worked together to utilize the Elevate Science Assessment guide to review fair game and fifth grade science standards with students. We also used an NGSSS style science question each day on the morning announcements. Classes would come up with one answer together and compete against each other to answer the question. The Science Coach, as well as district support staff, pulled students identified as near proficiency on NWEA Science Winter during lunch for standards review. Our Tier 1 students created one pagers based on different science standards during Triple I. They would review the standard using videos on Generation Genius and then create a one-pager using a teacher created rubric. Each quarter, fifth-grade students participated in Houses of Science to answer NGSSS test spec style questions in a fun, game-based manner.

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

Teachers will plan and provide more engaging lessons using AVID strategies and the CUPS. Teachers will use CUPS with fidelity. The teachers will use data to plan for small group instruction for both Math and Reading. RISE intervention will be provided to our tier 2 students. Lexia will be used for tier 2 and 3 students. Our ESE students will be using Sonday during intervention time for Reading. Osceola Numeracy will be used with our tier 3 and ESE students.

**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.**

The professional development we will provide is Osceola Numeracy project for our math interventions. Core connections and Open Court will be provided for our new teachers. AVID PD will be provided monthly to all staff. Teachers who are not currently reading endorsed will continue to take the courses that are provided by the district. RISE PD will be provided to all of the teachers who will be assisting with the intervention during iii. Zones of Regulation PD will be provided to new staff. Math coach will provided PD on the new math curriculum.

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

We will be providing:

- RISE intervention during iii.
- ELL intervention using Language Power during iii
- PLC time
- Zones of Regulation
- Osceola Numeracy
- Florida Reviel
- Biweekly MTSS meetings
- Monthly AVID PD
- Monthly MTSS PLC
- Stocktakes
- weekly Classroom walkthroughs
- Frax for 3rd-5th
- Splash Learn for K-2
- Red Bird for Math interventions
- Moby Max
- Elevate Science assessment guide (5th grade)
- Generation Genuis for K-5

### 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 and analyze data from created common assessments to make engaging lessons using high yield and AVID strategies, then student achievement will increase in all academic areas.

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

PLC 7 stages rubric data rating scores will increase by at least one level from the beginning to the end of the school year.  
 ELA, Math, and Science achievement will increase by 3%.

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

1. Each grade level PLC will have a leadership member assigned that will facilitate the process weekly.
2. Leadership member and PLC leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure that time is used efficiently, data is being reviewed, and plans are made to best meet the needs of the students weekly.
3. School stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the principal area of focus.
4. PLC seven stages rubric will be used to measure their progress throughout the school year. The survey will be analyzed and feedback will be provided.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

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

PLCs enable teachers to cope with isolation, strengthening solidarity, camaraderie and teachers' self-confidence as professionals (Mogollon and Solano, 2011).

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 leads will provide next steps to the leadership team.

**Person Responsible**

Karen Corbett (karen.corbett@osceolaschools.net)

PLC leads will meet with leadership team monthly to discuss progress and areas of need.

**Person Responsible**

Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

PLC teams will develop and implement formulated meeting collective commitments (NORMS) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members during the meetings.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will meet a minimum of four times per month on the early release Wednesdays in their designated area.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will receive professional development on using SchoolCity and CANVAS to assist them in reviewing common assessments.

**Person Responsible** Laura Wheeler (laura.wheeler@osceolaschools.net)

Mentoring will be conducted by the new mentor positions to all new staff members and PLCs that have been determined to have specific areas of need.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

AVID coach will work with PLCs to assist with embedding WICOR strategies into their instruction both whole group and small group.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn McCormick (kathryn.mccormick@osceolaschools.net)

Each PLC will begin with a celebration of one next step that was achieved and showed positive student outcomes.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn McCormick (kathryn.mccormick@osceolaschools.net)

Provide teachers an opportunity to take part in an extra hour PLC.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will take part in a half day or full day Wednesday PLC and plan/analyze with the academic coaches. Subs will be provided for the teachers to attend.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

New teachers will be given an overview training on AVID.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn McCormick (kathryn.mccormick@osceolaschools.net)

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>Given the 2021-2022 school data, only 51% of students were proficient in ELA. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring of higher levels of literacy achievement for all students.</p>  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.</b><br><b>This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>      | <p>ELA proficiency and gains will increase to 50% in all grade levels or 3% increase if already at 50% proficient.</p>   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Leadership team will utilize a classroom walkthrough tool to collect data to determine areas of need.</li> <li>2. Leadership team will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.</li> <li>3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on common assessments.</li> <li>4. School stocktake will take place monthly and the Literacy, MTSS coach, and facilitator will report data, progress, and action steps during their area of focus.</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)</p>  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented</b>   | <p>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 high effect rate on student achievement. PSES will be implementing the following researched based curriculum and/or assessment materials: Core Connections, Jan Richardson Guided Reading, Benchmark Advanced, Open Court, Lexia, NSGRA, STAR/FAST, and AVID to help increase our overall proficiency in ELA.</p> |

**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.**

Rather, successful efforts to improve reading achievement emphasize identification and implementation of evidence-based practices that promote high rates of achievement when used in classrooms by teachers with diverse instructional styles with children who have diverse instructional needs and interests (Bond & Dykstra, 1967/1997; National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform, 2001).

For those students who are struggling, teachers try to keep classroom guided reading groups small, and the school also provides additional intervention (Pinnell & Fountas, 2008).

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.

All staff will be trained by the district and literacy coach in ELA and collaborative strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with researched-based strategies to improve literacy proficiency for all students during tiered interventions.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will utilize high-quality ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

K-2 will use Open Court to meet students' phonics and phonological awareness needs.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 and Tier 2 students engage in 20 minutes on Lexia Core 5 - 1 day/week during station rotations.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 3 students engage in 20 minutes on Lexia Core 5 - 2 days/week during station rotations.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

RISE reading for all tier 2 students.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all subjects by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Femerlie Millian Rivera (femerlie.millanrivera@osceolaschools.net)

Students will participate in targeted intervention in tiers 1, 2, and 3.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Monthly meetings with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy support for Tiers 1, 2, and 3.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Kathryn McCormick (kathryn.mccormick@osceolaschools.net)

ELL students will receive Language Power interventions during iii time.

**Person Responsible** Femerlie Millian Rivera (femerlie.millanrivera@osceolaschools.net)

Training by the Literacy Coach on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered throughout the year to struggling teachers.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

LES students will receive preteach lessons during iii time.

**Person Responsible** Femerlie Millian Rivera (femerlie.millanrivera@osceolaschools.net)

NEW students will complete English Lexia lessons during iii time.

**Person Responsible** Femerlie Millian Rivera (femerlie.millanrivera@osceolaschools.net)

VE and DHH push in time will be during small group time to implement targeted interventions and work on their IEP goals.

**Person Responsible** Sara Czipulis (sara.czipulis@osceolaschools.net)

VE and DHH teachers will use research based curriculum during intervention time (Lexia or Sonday).

**Person Responsible** Kathryn McCormick (kathryn.mccormick@osceolaschools.net)

Tutoring will be offered to all students scoring a level 1 on last years FSA and level 1 students on FAST/STAR Reading assessments in K-2.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)



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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>Given the 2021-2022 school data finding that only 48% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students.</p>  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.</b><br><b>This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>      | <p>Math proficiency and gains will increase to 50% in all grade levels or 3% increase if already at 50% proficient.</p>  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Leadership team will utilize a classroom walkthrough tool to collect data to determine areas of need.</li> <li>2. 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.</li> <li>3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on common assessments.</li> <li>4. School stocktake will take place monthly and the Math coach, MTSS coach, and facilitator will report data, progress, and action steps during their area of focus.</li> <li>5. Leadership team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for grade level benchmarks.</li> <li>6. 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).</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)</p>  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-</b>   | <p>Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibility. 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</p>   |

**based  
strategy  
being  
implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a high effect rate on student achievement. PSE will be implementing the following research-based curriculum and/or assessments: FRAX, Florida Reveal Math, Splash Learning, STAR/FAST, Hand to Mind and Osceola Numeracy Project.

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

A student has mastered a math fact if they can produce an answer within 3 seconds, through either recall or a highly efficient strategy application (Kling & Bay-Williams 2015).

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 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.

Teachers will intentionally plan for the appropriate stages of fact fluency as required by the benchmarks for a unit of study.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development fluency across grade levels through mathematical thinking and reasoning standards training.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will implement math centers using the CUPs and Florida Reveal that focus on developing appropriate procedural fluency within the grade level benchmarks through game-based learning.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work collaboratively to share their strategies and refine their thinking in groups.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level fluency benchmarks and provide targeted interventions based on the identified needs of the student using Osceola Numeracy Project and/or Hand2Mind Numbers & Operations Intervention resources (based on student needs).

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will teach problem-solving strategies and higher order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated, small-group mathematics lessons.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students will have the opportunity to use WICOR strategies during math instruction.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration with the ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Femerlie Millian Rivera (femerlie.millanrivera@osceolaschools.net)

Meetings monthly with the MTSS and math coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic math support for tier 1, 2, and 3 students.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students in grades 3-5 will utilize Frax to build fraction understanding.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students in grades K-2 will utilize Splash Learn to build mathematical fluency and understanding.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will create and analyze common formative assessments on School City.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students will complete Moby Max lessons each week during math rotations.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students will complete 1-2 lessons a week on Red Bird during math stations and math iii time.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Each Wednesday, teachers will plan and provide a CIM review for math during their math iii time.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students will complete Moby Max lessons each week during math rotations.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students will complete 1-2 lessons a week on Red Bird during math stations and math iii time.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Each Wednesday, teachers will plan and provide a CIM review for math during their math iii time.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

VE and DHH teachers will push in during Math iii or Math small group time to work on their target intervention.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students who scored a level 1 on last year FSA and/or level 1 on the FAST/STAR Math assessment will be invited to Math tutoring.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#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.

Given the 2021-2022 school data finding that only 47% of students were proficient in Science, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of science achievement for all students. 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 from 47% to 50% in 5th grade.

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

1. Leadership team will utilize a classroom walkthrough tool to collect data to determine areas of need.
2. Leadership team will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on common assessments.
4. School stocktake will take place monthly and the Science coach, MTSS coach, and facilitator will report data, progress, and action steps during their area of focus.
5. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction.
6. Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA, PM, and mock) will be used to measure progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning for teachers based on needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

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

The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in context that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems. PSE will be implementing Generation Genius, Houses of Science: a game based review of standards, and AVID to help increase our overall proficiency in Science. We will also increase hands-on science labs, based on the CUPs. Student will participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures, engage in active learning experiences, and 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.**

Laboratory activities appeal as a way of allowing students to learn with understanding and, at the same time, engage in a process of constructing knowledge by doing science (Tobin, 1990).

Evidence clearly indicates that hands-on activities increase skill proficiency in processes of science, especially laboratory skills and specific science process skills, such as graphing and interpreting data (Mattheis & Nakayama, 1988).

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 (in ideal settings, without judgement and with a clear prompt and structure). 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.

Teachers will utilize the curriculum unit plans with explicit adherence to labs and hands on activities.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Use data from common assessments to discuss student learning and plan for remediation and professional learning and coaching needs.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will participate in professional development that will encourage AVID strategies and interactive notebooks.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Students will utilize Moby Max to receive standards-based remediation.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Science coach will provide a science question of the day on morning announcements. Classes will collaborate on the correct answer.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Science coach will utilize science progress monitoring data to identify students who need extra science support during lunch groups.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

With the support of the science coach, teachers will utilize the assessment guide to provide instruction on how to answer science test questions.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will implement standards-based science stations and differentiate instruction based on student needs.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Science coach will assign a topic on Generation Genius bi-weekly. Fifth-grade students will watch the videos during Triple I and create a one-pager based on the standard.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Science coach will create an optional, incentivized, game-based program for students in fifth-grade. They will utilize this program to review previously taught science standards.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

Spiral review Wednesdays using their Science assessments.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)

ELLs will use Science glossaries during Science instruction.

**Person Responsible** Femerlie Millian Rivera (femerlie.millanrivera@osceolaschools.net)

Houses of Science for 4th and 5th grade after each unit.

**Person Responsible** Shelby Jares (shelby.jares@osceolaschools.net)



**#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and 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 designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to generate better test scores, higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. These competencies included skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindset, 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 68% of students answered favorably about school belonging. In 2022-2023, this 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 interventions that will support a positive culture within the school.
2. The leadership team will review monthly during Stocktakes; PBiS, behavior and attendance data, and subgroup data to develop interventions as required.

**Person****responsible for****monitoring****outcome:**

Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

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

Students are diverse in their learning style 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.

Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging by utilizing the first week of school to build class rules, expectations and model appropriate behaviors.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students in all subject areas. They will identify and build on students' individual assets and passions.

**Person Responsible** Karen Corbett (karen.corbett@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will increase student input and voice through collaboration within the classroom (WICOR).

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will utilize the first 8 days of intervention time to teach Zones of Regulation. Students will be able to learn how to identify their feeling through the 4 zone colors and utilize strategies to help them cope with their feelings.

**Person Responsible** Laura Wheeler (laura.wheeler@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will encourage and facilitate students' shared decision-making through consensus and action planning.

**Person Responsible** Karen Corbett (karen.corbett@osceolaschools.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their classroom, such as a calming corner, zones student strategy book, and a manipulative to identify their zone.

**Person Responsible** Laura Wheeler (laura.wheeler@osceolaschools.net)

School will develop structure, relationship, and learning opportunities that support a positive culture. Principal will read a spot of feeling book everyday during the morning announcement, recognize student and staff achievements, and remind the students of the Pioneer Three expectations.

**Person Responsible** Karen Corbett (karen.corbett@osceolaschools.net)

PBiS will be implemented with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school and monitored through the PBiS Leadership team and report it out at monthly Stocktake.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

PBiS training will be conducted for students and staff throughout the year. Student orientation to PBiS is to be conducted the first week of school.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Ortiz (melissa.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

Guidance counselors will push into the classrooms and provide SEL lessons with each class targeting emotional regulation.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Koncieczny (carolyn.koncieczny@osceolaschools.net)

Guidance Counselors will target high risk students based on Panorama data to create small groups and plan for interventions.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Koncieczny (carolyn.koncieczny@osceolaschools.net)

Post-Secondary culture-college Wednesdays

**Person Responsible** Kathryn McCormick (kathryn.mccormick@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**

.

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

.

**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)**

.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

.

**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.

.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

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

.

**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?

..

**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**

.

**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.**

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 discussions to guide writing these plans. Teachers, staff, and students are also asked for input as these documents are developed and plans for the school year are developed.

PSES works hard to provide a positive culture and environment through the implementation of PBIS and the Growth Mindset. PBIS and Growth Mindset are promoted during trainings, activities, newsletters, and school wide announcements. This year we are also utilizing Zones of Regulation to promote self-regulation of behaviors for our students.

We work hard to include our community and business partners. They are invited to events throughout the year and help build a positive environment. One partnership with a local church allows us to provide the All Pro dad program at our school. This is geared to get the dads involved on campus.

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

Margaret Churhill-Friend- Guidance Counselor - SEL groups with primary students

Leadership team - Fosters a sense of positive school culture; leads by example

Melissa Ortiz/Laura Wheeler - PBIS training

Classroom teachers - Zones of Regulation; positive classroom culture

Classroom teachers-Growth Mindset implementation

PTO-organize family activities

Academic coaches-family nights. For example, Book Tasting, math nights, STEM night etc.