**School District of Osceola County, FL** 

# Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts



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  |

## **Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts**

4201 RHODODENDRON AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

#### **Demographics**

**Principal: Kimberley Dos Santos** 

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2018

|   | •  |
|---|--|
| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(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* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: C (44%)<br>2018-19: C (44%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| SI Region   | Central  |
| Regional Executive Director   | <u>Lucinda Thompson</u>  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |
| ESSA Status   | ATSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F   | or more information, <u>click here</u> .   |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### 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  |

#### **Poinciana Academy Of Fine Arts**

4201 RHODODENDRON AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2021-22 Title I School | Disadvan | 2 Economically<br>staged (FRL) Rate<br>rted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5            | School   | Yes                    |          | 100%   |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   | • •      | Charter School         | (Report  | 9 Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>n Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                     |          | 94%  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                        |          |  |
| Year                            | 2021-22  | 2020-21                | 2019-20  | 2018-19  |
| Grade                           | С        |                        | С        | С  |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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.

Poinciana Academy of Fine Arts will inspire all learners to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive citizens.

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

Poinciana Academy of Fine Arts will work collaboratively as a staff and within the community to ensure ALL of our students develop necessary skills to be successful lifelong learners.

#### 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<br>Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Dos<br>Santos,<br>Kimberley  | Principal                       | Lead implementation of plan, follow-up on plan throughout the school year, problem-solve in areas of need, ensure resources outlined in plan are available, and provide assistance to team members when needed (facilitate stocktake process monthly).  |
| Kalloo<br>Molina,<br>Annette | Assistant<br>Principal          | Lead implementation of plan, follow-up on plan throughout the school year, problem-solve in areas of need, ensure resources outlined in plan are available, and provide assistance to team members when needed (lead stocktake process monthly).  |
| Martin,<br>Jamie             | Instructional<br>Coach          | Lead MTSS on campus, monitor students in all tiers, update MTSS database throughout school year, schedule MTSS meetings, coach/mentor teachers, monitor school-wide PLC process, monitor PLCs and PLC progress, monitor ESSA Subgroup progress, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus area 1 at monthly stocktake).  |
| Booker,<br>Rafael            | Instructional<br>Coach          | Lead Math and Science on campus, monitor student learning/achievement in math and science, coach/mentor teachers, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus areas 4 and 5 at monthly stocktake).   |
| Murphy,<br>Dennise           | Instructional<br>Coach          | Lead Literacy on campus, monitor student learning/achievement in literacy, coach/mentor teachers, and problem-solve areas of need (report on focus area 3 at monthly stocktake).  |
| Martin,<br>Heather           | Instructional<br>Media          | Heather Martin-Media Specialist Supports school-wide Literacy. Leads PBIS initiative on campus and monitors school culture. Supports teachers and problem-solves on issues related to Literacy and School Culture. (Responsible for reporting on Area of Focus 2 at monthly stocktake meetings)   |
| Weeks,<br>Michelle           | Other                           | Lead core character education on campus, assist with behavior interventions campus-wide, monitor students receiving behavior interventions, communicate with MTSS coach in reference to students receiving behavior interventions, mentor/coach teacher in utilizing behavior interventions and collecting data on students receiving behavior interventions, track student attendance, schedule meetings on students with high absenteeism, promote college and career readiness, and problem-solve areas of need. |
| Perez,<br>Michelle           | ELL<br>Compliance<br>Specialist | Michelle Perez- EES ESOL Educational Specialist Lead ELL learning and best practices on campus, monitor students in ESSA subgroups, coach/mentor teachers, monitor PLCs and PLC progress, and problem-solve areas of need.  |

| Name               | Position<br>Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|
| Soltis,<br>Melissa | Other             | RCS Melissa Soltis<br>Lead differentiation on campus, monitor students in ESSA subgroups, coach/<br>mentor teachers, monitor PLCs and PLC progress, and problem-solve areas<br>of need. |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/4/2018, Kimberley Dos Santos

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.

1

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.

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

570

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

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

**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:

| Grade Level Indicator                                    |    |    |     |    |     |     |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| mulcator   | K  | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 90 | 87 | 106 | 93 | 106 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 586   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 39 | 32 | 44  | 27 | 32  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 201   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 1  | 3   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0  | 1   | 4  | 7   | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 0  | 1   | 2  | 4   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0   | 2  | 35  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 64    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0   | 2  | 52  | 48  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 102   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0  | 0  | 0   | 2  | 35  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 64    |

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                            |   |   |   |   |    | Gra | de l | Lev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5   | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 19  | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |

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

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2 | 0           | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 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  |       |  |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |    |     |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator   | K           | 1   | 2  | 3   | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 87          | 102 | 94 | 101 | 98 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 566   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 22          | 30  | 31 | 19  | 26 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 146   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 3           | 5   | 1  | 5   | 4  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 1   | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0  | 43  | 33 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0  | 63  | 59 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 191   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0  | 43  | 33 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                            | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 4           | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |  |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| 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  |    |     |    |     | Gra | de L | _ev | el |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K  | 1   | 2  | 3   | 4   | 5    | 6   | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 87 | 102 | 94 | 101 | 98  | 84   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 566   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 22 | 30  | 31 | 19  | 26  | 18   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 146   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 3  | 5   | 1  | 5   | 4   | 4    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0   | 0  | 1   | 0   | 1    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0   | 0  | 43  | 33  | 48   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0   | 0  | 63  | 59  | 69   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 191   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0  | 0   | 0  | 43  | 33  | 48   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7  | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5  | 0   | 0  | 0    | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                           |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7     |
| 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).

| Sahaal Grada Component      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       | 2019   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 43%    | 48%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 42%    | 53%      | 57%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 57%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 56%      | 58%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 44%    | 51%      | 53%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 33%    | 44%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 40%    | 55%      | 63%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 49%    |          |       |        |          |       | 47%    | 59%      | 62%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49%    |          |       |        |          |       | 44%    | 45%      | 51%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 33%    | 46%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 41%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 32%    | 51%      | -19%                              | 58%   | -26%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 48%    | 51%      | -3%                               | 58%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -32%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|                   | ELA  |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                   | 2019 | 36%    | 48%      | -12%                              | 56%   | -20%                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -48%   |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|            |                   |        | MATH     | ł                                 |          |                                |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year              | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison          |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 02         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Con | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019              | 32%    | 54%      | -22%                              | 62%      | -30%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison          | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 04         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019              | 44%    | 53%      | -9%                               | 64%      | -20%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison          | -32%   |          |                                   | <u>'</u> |                                |
| 05         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019              | 33%    | 48%      | -15%                              | 60%      | -27%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison          | -44%   |          |                                   |          |                                |

|            | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade      | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05         | 2022    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            | 2019    | 35%    | 45%      | -10%                              | 53%   | -18%                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Com | parison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Subgroup Data Review

|           | 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |  |
| SWD       | 15  | 49        | 53                | 20           | 57         | 64                 | 26          |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| ELL       | 32  | 52        | 29                | 25           | 43         | 50                 | 35          |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| BLK       | 37  | 59        | 60                | 26           | 40         | 33                 | 25          |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| HSP       | 43  | 53        | 28                | 34           | 50         | 50                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| WHT       | 67  |           |                   | 36           | 60         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| FRL       | 40  | 56        | 41                | 28           | 47         | 47                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |  |

|           |             | 2021      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 23          | 38        | 40                | 13           | 19         | 18                 | 10          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 24          | 37        | 40                | 15           | 15         | 23                 | 3           |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 32          | 50        |                   | 18           | 19         |                    | 22          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 34          | 37        | 50                | 19           | 17         | 24                 | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 45          |           |                   | 38           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 29          | 44        | 75                | 18           | 16         | 29                 | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 12          | 24        | 27                | 23           | 47         | 50                 | 31          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 27          | 38        | 29                | 23           | 37         | 25                 | 22          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 34          | 54        | 42                | 44           | 43         | 30                 | 21          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 42          | 47        | 42                | 38           | 48         | 50                 | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 44          |           |                   | 33           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 42          | 52        | 43                | 38           | 45         | 45                 | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |

#### **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  | 45   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 55   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 362  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |

# Students With Disabilities Federal Index - Students With Disabilities 40 Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% 0

| English Language Learners   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                         | 40  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| 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                                | 40  |
| 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  | 43  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 54  |
| 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                                | 44 |  |
| 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?

All grade levels increased proficiency in ELA and Math. 5th grade increased proficiency in science. All subgroups increased in proficiency except the SWD subgroup. Math LQ subgroup increased significantly. ELA LQ subgroup decreased.

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

Greatest need for improvement overall is proficiency in all content areas. We are below 50% proficiency in all content areas (ELA, Math, and Science)

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

Closing learning gaps are the biggest contributing factors to this need for improvement. While the actions we took last year did result in increases in all content areas, it did not get us at or above 50% proficiency in all content areas. A new action to take this year would be to focus in on students close to proficiency and include them in more during and after school interventions to push them to proficiency (while still offering intervention for our lowest subgroups as well).

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

Math proficiency, Math Learning Gains, and ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement.

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

We implemented several initiatives in mathematics including ONP to close skill gaps and dream box learning. We also conducted math intervention groups such as math lab for LQ 4th grade students, during school math tutoring for selected students, and after school math tutoring. We held RISE reading intervention groups to increase reading proficiency. We also held during school and after school reading tutoring.

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

Strategies to be implemented to accelerate learning will consist of intervention groups happening through in-school tutoring and after school tutoring. Meeting all student needs during triple i intervention time for reading and math during the school day.

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.

Teachers will continue to receive PD on ONP to close skill gaps in mathematics. We will continue best teaching practices PD in ELA and Math standards. We will also focus on AVID strategies and Thinking Maps tools to support student learning--teachers will receive PD on these throughout the school year.

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

Trained coaches on campus to sustain long-term implementation of Best Practices is necessary. Our instructional coaches must be our experts and trained trainers to support our teachers on campus.

#### **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.

District and state assessments show low proficiency in content areas (reading, math, science) and not all PLCs are functioning at a Level 5 or higher in the Seven Stages Rubric.

## Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see all grade level PLCs performing at a Stage 5 or higher on the Seven Stages Rubric. We also expect to see an 8% growth in ELA proficiency, 12% growth in Math proficiency, and 15% growth in Science proficiency.

## Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the

Leadership team members along with PLC Leads will monitor PLC teams to ensure schedule time is being used effectively. They will evaluate their PLC team weekly to determine which stage the PLC is performing at. The rubric will be used at the beginning, middle, and end of year to monitor the progress of teams towards the desired stage. PLC facilitator will report progress during the monthly Stocktake meetings.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

desired outcome.

Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

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

An effective PLC must collaborate well to excel student learning. "We assert that if you want to impact learning, you have to make high-impact decisions about what AND how to teach" (Almarode, J., Fisher, D., Flories, K., Frey, N., and Nagel, D. (2020). Introduction/So What is a PLC? In PLC+ Better Decisions and Greater Impact by Design (p. 5), Corwin . PLCs will focus on the four questions to guide their educational decisions.

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

If teachers are deliberate in their decision making processes about what and how they teach, then students will receive rigorous instruction centered around their individual learning needs. During PLCs teachers will use the four questions to guide their thinking on exactly what they need the students to learn and how they will teach those skills/standards.

#### **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 teams will establish Collective Commitments as a collective group and will abide by those commitments.

**Person Responsible** Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

2. School PLC teams will meet each Wednesday following dismissal and will focus on meeting the needs of all students.

Person Responsible Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

3. PLC teams will utilize all current data to make informed decisions by answering the four important questions (What they need to learn, how do we know they learned it, what do we do if they didn't and what do we do if they did).

**Person Responsible** Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

4. Support will be provided to any PLC team that is not progressing toward stage 5.

Person Responsible Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

5. Leadership team members will join grade level PLCs to assist with the PLC process.

**Person Responsible** Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will ensure they are planning with AVID strategies embedded to promote optimal learning.

Person Responsible Jamie Martin (jamie.martin@osceolaschools.net)

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Post Secondary Culture for All Students

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:
Include a rationale
that explains how it
was identified as a
critical need from the
data reviewed.

The data collected from our school and district assessments show that many of our students struggle in feeling connected to the educational experience (sense of belonging). This impacts overall student achievement, when our students are struggling with belonging they cannot acquire content knowledge because they do not have a safe circle of people with whom they can connect.

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

We expect to increase all our categories in the Panorama assessment by 4%. Additionally, we expect to see an 8% growth in ELA proficiency, 12% growth in Math proficiency, and 15% growth in Science proficiency.

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

Principal and leadership team will work directly with staff to ensure they have strategies and the tools needed to achieve success with social emotional learning. School Stocktakes will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. We will monitor progress by reviewing discipline data each month and meeting agendas/notes from grade level PLCs and PBIS Committee meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Martin (heather.martin@osceolaschools.net)

Research shows that when students increase their social emotional skills, they are able to focus on academic work. This results in an increase of student achievement. There is a positive impact on student achievement when students are able to focus on academics (Weissberg, 2016).

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. The school will continue implementing PBIS school-wide. The PBIS Committee will meet monthly to discuss discipline data trends and ways to proactively address behaviors. Teachers will work on creating inviting and inclusive classroom environments that make all children feel welcome.

Additionally, teachers will promote college and career throughout the school year by participating in various college and career initiatives including but not limited to College Week and Xello lessons. Teachers will utilize AVID strategies and best practices to support student learning and prepare students for life after elementary school.

School stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

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

Principal will share and update Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

If students are taught more social emotional strategies and a strong classroom

Describe the

resources/criteria culture is built, then student confidence will increase resulting in an increase in used for selecting this student achievement. strategy.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Counselor and Leadership Team will provide PD on Life Skills strategies such as hosting morning meetings, zones of regulation, school-wide PBIS expectations, equity and diversity, etc. to help create positive classroom cultures school-wide. Counselor and LT will monitor implementation through classroom walks and provide feedback to teachers weekly.

#### **Person Responsible** Heather Martin (heather.martin@osceolaschools.net)

2. PBIS-Media Specialist will monitor PBIS implementation and support PBIS in the classroom (with assistance from the counselor). She will meet monthly with the PBIS Committee to also monitor implementation of school-wide PBIS and to make decisions about PBIS needs.

#### **Person Responsible** Heather Martin (heather.martin@osceolaschools.net)

3. PBIS continued- PBIS Lead and MTSS Coach will meet monthly to review discipline data trends discussed at PBIS Committee meetings. They will review students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior supports to monitor changes in behaviors and adjust behavior interventions for those students as needed. These items will also be reviewed at monthly MTSS meetings.

#### Person Responsible Heather Martin (heather.martin@osceolaschools.net)

4. Postsecondary culture- Counselor will hold monthly activities for each grade level to participate in to enhance their learning of the 4 E's (enroll, enlist, employ, explore). Teachers will conduct lessons on the 4Es as described in the CUPs. Data from the Xello lessons will be reviewed twice a year to ensure students are receiving exposure to college and career options. College and career will be promoted through AVID and we will expose our students to all opportunities that will be available to them after high school. Media Specialist will share out college and career facts each week on the morning news and visit classrooms to support teachers in promoting college and career.

Person Responsible Heather Martin (heather.martin@osceolaschools.net)

Last Modified: 4/23/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 21 of 32

#### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description

and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from

the data reviewed.

District and state assessment data shows that students are performing below grade level. Increased gaps in learning cause proficiency to decrease and adversely affect student achievement.

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

We expect to see an 8% increase in our ELA proficiency. Increasing overall proficiency from 43% to 51%.

Monitoring: Describe

objective outcome.

how this

Area of Focus will be

monitored for the

desired outcome.

Person responsible for

monitoring outcome:

Literacy leadership team and administration will conduct routine walkthroughs of classrooms. Leadership members will also participate with every grade level PLC team to

ensure correct processes are being used in

order to made data driven decisions when planning for student achievement. School Stocktake team will meet monthly to report progress and plan next steps on their Area of Focus.

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Describe the evidencebased strategy being

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices- is where we will prioritize the bulk of our instruction. Tier 1 instruction offers access to grade level standards for all students. PLCs/Collaborative Planning- data driven collaboration to modify instruction based on student needs improves student achievement. BEST Standards- we will focus school instruction based on our new state standards. Each content-area teacher will follow the district-created curriculum unit plans with fidelity. Differentiation- students in every grade level have unique areas that need support and require a wide range of instructional strategies. Differentiated instruction designed to meet students' needs will provide students with

implemented instruction that is equitable and effective in achieving student growth. Interventionsfor this Area focused instruction designed to narrow student learning gaps by improving

of Focus. their reading ability.

Rationale for Evidence-

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

this strategy.

Ensuring that teacher capacity to work effectively and meaningfully during PLC will have a direct effect on the choices for instruction and interventions provided to students. Improving the quality of instruction and the timeliness of interventions will improve student outcomes school-wide. Equity in our education can be achieved if teachers are able to collaborate and decide on the best course of action that ensures all students can access the information outlined in our state's Best Standards through appropriate scaffolding and Describe the interventions. Creating consensus and commitment to becoming a learning-focused school or district is an essential prerequisite to successful RTI implementation (Buffum et al., 2018)

#### **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. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices- 100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans. Literacy Coach will work with teachers through coaching cycles to ensure that tier 1 instruction is rigorous and appropriate to grade level by following district curriculum lesson plans with fidelity. LC and LT will observe implementation of Tier 1 Instructional Practices through classroom walks and provide feedback to teachers as well.

#### Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

2. PLCs/Collaborative Planning- LT will work closely with grade levels to implement district-approved PLC plans and ensure teams are having data-driven conversations. LT members will attend weekly PLC meetings to support planning and ensure that conversations are around data.

#### Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

BEST Standards- Literacy coach will provide PD on BEST standards, AVID, Thinking Maps, Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPS), and Intervention programs (Core5, Benchmark, and FCRR) throughout the school year. LT will monitor through walkthroughs and participation of PLCs to ensure planned tasks and interventions are aligned to standards.

#### Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

4. Differentiation- LT will work closely with teachers to embed differentiated instruction that best meets the needs of students in small group instruction at different instructional levels. Teachers will plan and present weekly plan for differentiation in their lesson plans. There will be a focus on our subgroups who are below state expectation and LT will support with strategies on how to support these groups (Black/African American students, ESE, and ELL). LT will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that differentiation of instruction is being provided in small groups accordingly.

#### Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

5. Interventions like RISE reading, Open Court, Core5, and Corrective Reading will be provided to specific subgroups of students based on data during and after school.

Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

6. Kindergarten Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development.

Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

7. First Grade Open Court Implementation of letter/book/print awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding phonics and inflectional endings, fluency rate and accuracy, and vocabulary and language development.

Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

8. Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ work analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody, and vocabulary and language development.

Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

9. T1, T2, and T3 students engage in Lexia Core5 during station rotation based on individual student needs to meet proficiency by the end of the school year. Teachers provide individual or small group focused lessons to students needing remediation in specific areas as defined by the program.

Person Responsible

Dennise Murphy (dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:
Include a
rationale that
explains how it
was identified as
a critical need
from the data
reviewed.

Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students. According to Mathematics Achievement data from 2021-22, our school (33%) falls behind the district. For learning gains in Math our school (49%). For Mathematics lowest quartile our school (49%) is below the district average. A deliberate focus needs to be placed on mathematics core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to enhance tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Highly trained mathematics personnel need to serve students in the lowest quartile and areas of ESSA to continue to make gains in the Mathematics area.

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

We expect to see an increase of 12% in our Math proficiency increasing our proficiency from 33% to 45%.

**Monitoring:** 

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. The principal and leadership team will conduct frequent walkthroughs to access fidelity of math instruction in all areas. Leadership team members will participate in grade level PLC weekly. Monthly Stocktake meetings will be held monthly to review progress towards goals. Curriculum choices and instructional decisions will be guided by the school's Math Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

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

High-quality instruction on grade level begins with research-based curriculum emphasizing effective implementation of curriculum unit plans. Our curriculum unit plans are designed to provide access to grade level standards to all students.

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

When Tier 1 instruction is successful and meets the needs of a higher percentage of students, fewer require services at the Tier 2 or Tier 3 level. In this way, it is critically important that Tier 1 instruction is as efficacious as possible Swanson, E., Stevens, E. A., Scammacca, N. K., Capin, P., Stewart, A. A., & Austin, C. R. (2017).

To cultivate effective instruction in every classroom, school leaders first need to establish a common language or instructional practice model. In essence, a school

#### resources/

criteria used for selecting this

needs to have a clear playbook for what will occur to help students learn in the classroom (Marzano, R., Warrick, P., Rains, C., & Dufour, R.).

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.

High-quality instruction on grade level begins with research-based curriculum emphasizing effective implementation of curriculum unit plans. Our curriculum unit plans are designed to provide access to grade level standards to all students. Our Tier I instruction will consist of teaching using our curriculum unit plans (CUPS) daily. Leadership team members will ensure that classroom instruction is in alignment with scope and sequence

#### Person

Responsible

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

Interventions- specialized instruction designed to target specific groups of students in the areas of reading, math, and science. There will be a focus on our subgroups who are below state expectation and LT will support with strategies on how to support these groups (Black/African American students, ESE, and ELL).

#### Person

Responsible

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

AVID Professional development- professional learning focus on improving AVID strategies identified by the leadership to improve teaching practices and support tier 1 instruction. Weekly walkthroughs with immediate feedback following observations.

#### Person

Responsible

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

PLC- Weekly meetings with PLCs and individual teachers will provide the evidence needed by the Math Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school math plan and provide feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions.

#### Person

Responsible

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

Mini-PDs will focus on specific trends in instruction that are identified by leadership team. Mini-PDs will be offered twice a month on different components of math and science. An action plan will be required after completion of mini-pd by teachers and math point person.

#### Person

Responsible

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

#### **#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

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

Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students. According to Science Achievement data from 2021-22, our school (33%) falls behind the district (48%). A deliberate focus needs to be placed on science core instruction (tier 1) while continuing to enhance tier 2 and tier 3 interventions in science and reading.

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

We expect to see a 15% increase in our Science Proficiency increasing from 33% to 48%.

Monitoring:

outcome.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. The principal and leadership team will conduct frequent walkthroughs to access fidelity of math instruction in all areas. Leadership team members will participate in grade level PLC weekly. Monthly Stocktake meetings will be held monthly to review progress towards goals. Curriculum choices and instructional decisions will be guided by the school's Science Coach.

Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

High-quality instruction on grade level begins with research-based curriculum emphasizing effective implementation of curriculum unit plans. Our curriculum unit plans are designed to provide access to grade level standards to all students.

When Tier 1 instruction is successful and meets the needs of a higher percentage of students, fewer require services at the Tier 2 or Tier 3 level. In this way, it is critically important that Tier 1 instruction is as efficacious as possible Swanson, E., Stevens, E. A., Scammacca, N. K., Capin, P., Stewart, A.

A., & Austin, C. R. (2017).

To cultivate effective instruction in every classroom, school leaders first need to establish a common language or instructional practice model. In essence, a school needs to have a clear playbook for what will occur to help students learn in the classroom (Marzano, R., Warrick, P., Rains, C., & Dufour, R.).

#### **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.

High-quality instruction on grade level begins with a research-based curriculum emphasizing the effective implementation of curriculum unit plans. Our curriculum unit plans are designed to provide all students with grade-level standards.

Person Responsible Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

Interventions are specialized instruction designed to target specific groups of students in reading, math, and science. Tier 1 interventions will happen during the science block. An identified group of Tier 1

students will receive additional instruction during the science lab. P.E. waivers will go home to ensure parents grant permission for extra support.

**Person Responsible** Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

AVID Professional development- professional learning focus on improving AVID strategies identified by the leadership to improve teaching practices and support tier 1 instruction. Weekly walkthroughs with immediate feedback following observations.

**Person Responsible** Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

Mini-PDs will focus on specific instruction trends identified by the leadership team. Mini-PDs will be offered twice a month on different components of math and science. After mini-PD, teachers will discuss with science point person will require an action plan.

**Person Responsible** Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@osceolaschools.net)

PLC- Weekly meetings with PLCs and individual teachers will provide the evidence needed by the Math Point Person to assess the effectiveness of the school math plan and give feedback to the Stocktake team to make schoolwide decisions.

Person Responsible Rafael Booker (rafael.booker@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

We will be focusing on teacher Professional Development in Tier 1 teaching practices, BEST Standards and differentiation. We will also be using our grade level PLCs to analyze data and strengthen our teaching practices. Open Court will be used as our Tier 1 to teach phonics in grades K-2 and we have specific interventions planned for grades K-2. 42% of 2nd graders are below grade level in Reading and 53% of our 1st graders are below grade level in Reading according to our 21-22 Progress Monitoring tool (NWEA).

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

We will be focusing on teacher Professional Development in Tier 1 teaching practices, BEST Standards and differentiation. We will also be using our grade level PLCs to analyze data and strengthen our teaching practices. 53% of our 3rd graders are below grade level in Reading according to our 21-22 progress monitoring tool (NWEA). 63% of 4th graders and 55% of 5th graders are below grade level in Reading according to state assessment data.

#### 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)**

Using our Progress Monitoring tool, we will decrease our students who are not proficient in Reading in grades K-2 to 48%.

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

Using state assessment tool, we will decrease students who are not proficient in reading by 8% (3rd grade will decrease to 45%; 4th grade will decrease to 55%; 5th grade will decrease to 47%).

#### **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.

We will monitor implementation of each action step throughout the year through check ins with teachers and classroom walks. We will review progress monitoring data throughout the school year and hold data digging sessions with teachers to adjust instruction and intervention groups.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Murphy, Dennise, dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net

#### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

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

In grades K-2 we will use Lexia and FCRR Student Center Activities (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary

programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate) This will be used in addition to our Tier 1 foundational skills (Open Court). We will use Benchmark Quick Reads and RISE/RISE UP accelerated intervention (Visible Learning effect size - small group learning: .47 promising) in grades 3-5 for students who are below grade level.

#### 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?

The selected programs listed above are aligned with our K-12 Reading Plan and BEST Standards. Furthermore, they support closing learning gaps for struggling students. Effect size for phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and small group learning are at least .50 or higher.

#### **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

We will strategically select a school Literacy Leadership committee to review data and work with teachers across campus in the area of literacy. They will problem-solve and work together on ensuring Literacy Practices across campus are solid in structure. This will support Action Step 1 in the Area of Focus.

Murphy, Dennise , dennise.murphy@osceolaschools.net

The Literacy Coach will conduct coaching cycles with teachers in need based on student data. The Literacy Coach will meet with grade levels regularly to monitor implementation of Tier 1 Core Instruction. Using the literacy assessment tools, the Literacy Coach will progress monitor student learning/progress and develop Professional Learning for teachers as needed based on student data and classroom walkthrough data.

Dos Santos, Kimberley, kimberley.dossantos@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.

We are a Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports (PBIS) school. We have established STARS Expectations and these expectations are communicated to students and families in a variety of ways. We publish them in our school newsletter as well as our student/parent handbook. We also communicate these expectations and other school news via social media (Facebook, Twitter, website, etc.). Additionally, we provide a district Code of Conduct for every family which was created using input from a variety of stakeholders.

We hold School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings regularly to involve all stakeholders in all that is taking place with the school. We review data and ask for input on planning for student learning and improvement.

Student success is at the core of all we do. We work together as a school and community to make sure our students can be successful. Our school holds grade level PLCs/PLTs each week and a school-wide PLC/PLT every month. We collaborate on best teaching practices and cultivate a growth mindset community which allows all staff to grow professionally. We hold meetings with parents to involve them in education decisions and to help them support their children at home.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their

input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

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

Our school Leadership Team is key in ensuring our teachers and staff are well-supported to provide a positive environment for our students. We also involve business partners to support our teachers and staff in keeping an upbeat, positive morale. Business partners also assist in us providing incentives for our students. Parents and family members are essential to our culture and environment. We invite parents and families to many meetings and events on campus so they can be a part of the school family and so their children can see them in the school community.