

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Reedy Creek 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>  |

# Reedy Creek Elementary School

5100 EAGLES TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Katie Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <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)  | 100%  |
| <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>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (46%)<br>2018-19: C (52%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)  |
| <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>  |

## Reedy Creek Elementary School

5100 EAGLES TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34758

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                    | 100%   |
| 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                     | 80%  |

### 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.**

Reedy Creek Elementary School, in alliance with family and community, will provide a positive, safe environment where children will be challenged academically to become lifelong learners and respectful, contributing members of an ever changing, diverse society.

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

At Reedy Creek we care enough about our students to make sure we meet the individual needs of every student.

### 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  |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Adams, Katie     | Principal                 | The principal works with students, parents, and staff to maintain an atmosphere focusing on performance through a culture of shared excellence and reaching college and career goals. The principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP, and receive monthly reports and give feedback. The principal oversees all student data, tier levels and instruction. |
| Langley, Ashlee  | Assistant Principal       | The assistant principal works directly with staff in the area of scheduling students and handles extended learning opportunities. The assistant principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The assistant principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback.  |
| Reid, Jasmine    | Reading Coach             | The literacy coach provides support for ELA (reading and writing) instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in reading and writing. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.   |
| Beahm, Michael   | Instructional Coach       | The MTSS and AVID coach supports all tiers of learning through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for all students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. In addition, she models AVID strategies.   |
| Moraguez, Amanda | ELL Compliance Specialist | The ESOL compliance specialist provides support for ELL instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESOL students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.  |
| Singh, Klran     | School Counselor          | The guidance counselor provides SEL support for all through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the SEL content and curriculum for our students. She works through the MTSS  |



| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
|                  |                     | process with teachers to provide support by modeling, intervention, small group and enrichment strategies.  |
| Cramer, Emily    | Staffing Specialist | The ESE compliance specialist provides support for ESE instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESE students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. |
| Guider , Rebecca | Math Coach          | The math and science coach provides support for math/science instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in math and science. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.            |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/15/2022, Katie Adams

**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.*

34

**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.*

0

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

57

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

845

**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.**

9

#### 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                              | 128         | 119 | 146 | 139 | 136 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 810   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 48          | 44  | 44  | 37  | 36  | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 238   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 2           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 5   | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 6   | 6   | 8   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 4   | 3   | 5   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 46  | 41  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 89    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 65  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 1 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |

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     | 5           | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| 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

Monday 8/15/2022

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 111         | 104 | 132 | 127 | 127 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 727   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 11          | 14  | 12  | 18  | 6   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 71    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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   | 6   | 46  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 7   | 67  | 37  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 111   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 46  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |

**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     | 4           | 5 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| 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                              | 111         | 104 | 132 | 127 | 127 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 727   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 11          | 14  | 12  | 18  | 6   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 71    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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   | 6   | 46  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 7   | 67  | 37  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 111   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 46  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 38 |

**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     | 4           | 5 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 40%    | 48%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 54%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 58%    | 56%      | 61%   |        |          |       | 59%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 48%    | 47%      | 52%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 35%    | 47%      | 60%   |        |          |       | 52%    | 55%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 52%    | 55%      | 64%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 59%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47%    | 46%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 44%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 42%    | 43%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 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 | 48%    | 51%      | -3%                        | 58%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 51%      | 0%                         | 58%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -48%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 48%      | 4%                         | 56%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -51%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 43%    | 54%      | -11%                       | 62%   | -19%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 56%    | 53%      | 3%                         | 64%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 48%      | -3%                        | 60%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -56%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 45%      | -5%                        | 53%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 16       | 32     | 33          | 17        | 43      | 50           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 26       | 52     | 53          | 22        | 35      | 41           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 65     |             | 36        | 59      |              | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       | 55     | 49          | 31        | 50      | 50           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 69       |        |             | 46        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 49       | 63     |             | 45        | 50      |              | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 33       | 55     | 50          | 30        | 50      | 43           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 23       | 20     |             | 25        | 40      |              | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 22       | 39     | 45          | 23        | 49      | 60           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 51       | 40     |             | 44        | 60      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 35       | 48     | 41          | 36        | 49      | 46           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 48       | 52     |             | 43        | 29      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 47     | 41          | 34        | 39      | 39           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 29       | 50     | 53          | 33        | 59      | 56           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 54     | 49          | 42        | 54      | 41           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 53       | 63     |             | 40        | 43      | 25           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 58     | 53          | 51        | 59      | 44           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 64       | 18     |             | 64        | 45      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 59       | 62     | 58          | 60        | 56      | 64           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 56     | 51          | 49        | 51      | 38           | 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  | 47   |
| 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 | 51   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 373  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 32   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 38   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| 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                                | 50  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 44  |
| 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   | 58  |
| 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   | 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                                | 42 |
| 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?

According to the Spring FSA assessment our FSA ELA Proficiency average was 40% for the 2021-2022 school year which was maintained from the 2020-2021 FSA administration. ELA learning gains in 4th & 5th Grade were at 58% which was a 10% increase from the previous year. ELA LQ learning gains were at 48% which was a 7% increase. For our FSA Math proficiency the school average was 35% which was a decrease of 4% points from the previous year. Math learning gains were 52% which was an increase of 7% points from the 2021-2022 test administration and Math LQ learning gains were 47% which was an increase of 2% points. For the FCAT science assessment our 5th grade proficiency scores were at 42% which was an overall increase 6% points from the previous year.

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

Based off of the 2022 state assessments our English Language Learners (ELL's) and SWD (ESE students) continue to show the great need for improvement. Specifically, ELL Females demonstrated only 12% proficiency. ELL males demonstrated 16% proficiency. Additionally, Female SWD students demonstrated only 5% proficiency, and Male SWD students demonstrated 20% proficiency.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement were the continuation of the global COVID-19 pandemic which presented many challenges. Even though we returned to face-to-face learning, students experienced varying levels of social need responses that all resulted in the overall low levels of proficiency in ELA and Math. As an ESE department there were struggles providing support and interventions due to class changes and quarantines which all resulted in significant drops in students' performance. In order to address these needs, we will need to show improvement in the following areas:

1. Need to improvement consistency in Tier 1 instruction across all grade levels.
2. For students with disabilities consistent support and services will need to be provided.
3. Training and support will need to be provided to all faculty and staff to provide consistency in expectations of delivering content and instruction throughout the year.
4. Interventions will need to be purposely developed to help meet needs of students to support their learning.

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

Based off of the NWEA progress monitoring our Winter scores showed a dramatic need for improvement. Overall projected proficiency levels were extremely low for students in 3rd-5th in the areas of both ELA and Math. Math was substantially lower, but ELA still had a cause for concern. However, our



projected outcome of the Winter NWEA was increased based off of the Spring FSA assessments. We showed improvements from the Winter NWEA in Math to the actual outcomes of the Spring FSA.

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

Consistency of implementation in Tier 1 instruction and MTSS was critical to the success of the school. Without the focus on specific instruction of targeted students through the MTSS process we would not have made the gains from the NWEA projected Winter Outcomes to the actual outcomes that were evident on FSA.

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

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support process will need to be closely analyzed to see where student support is needed and addressed. Teachers will have an increased role in providing tiered interventions and recommendations based on academic and assessment data review. Additionally, the incorporation of the Jan Richardson Leveled Library will help to focus our guided reading instruction during Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional opportunities.

**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.**

A comprehensive professional development plan was developed to focus on providing training and support in areas that teachers have determined need. MTSS structures were re-vamped and shared through PD on how to support students through intervention. NSGRA training and Guided Reading implementation training was also a focus throughout the school year. Additionally, continued training in Core Connections Writing and in the areas of math and science were focused based on faculty needs.

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

Structures and procedures are being put into place to promote ongoing services that will be designed with a sustainable future. Coaching and training is being conducted to support train the trainer models and to promote teacher leadership.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

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

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

If teachers participate in authentic PLCs in all accountability areas, then engaging lesson plans using high yield strategies and best practices can be planned and common formative assessments can be developed to monitor student achievement. Then student achievement will increase.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Increase achievement in ELA for all grade levels to 50%. Increase mathematics achievement from 35% to 39 %. Increase Science achievement from 40% to 43%.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Administration, leadership team, and PLC Leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the PLC teams individually and collectively.
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

PLC is defined as "...an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (DuFour, 2006).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

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.

PLCs will participate in the "Are we a group or a team?" professional development during pre-planning.

**Person Responsible**

Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will meet weekly in designated areas of the media center to allow collaboration with coaches and administration.

**Person Responsible**

Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will use the monthly district placemat and current student data to guide their student-centered discussions.

**Person Responsible**

Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

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

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

Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 35% of students were proficient in math in Grades 3-5, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Math, proficiency, and gains will increase by 4% in all groups.

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

1. Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. Administrative team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions should be focused on Costa's higher levels of questions (Inquiry).
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
4. Monthly MTSS grade level meetings will be held to discuss student progress on grade level materials.
5. Progress Monitoring with state-wide assessments
6. Grade Level common assessments through PLCs
7. IEP goals for ESE Students will be evaluated on a regular basis to ensure accurately and relative goals.
8. Monitoring instructional strategies with NEST
9. ONP Monitoring Tools

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based**

Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly.

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based**

**Strategy:** 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.

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

**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.

ONP Professional Development will be provided by Assistant Principal and Math/Science Coach to increase numeracy across all grade levels.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development for tasks, strategies, and new textbook resources provided during Pre-Planning by Math/Science Coach. This training will provide systematic training that takes the information from the CUPS and helps to make sense of the tasks and standards alignment.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

Math Coach will create School Wide Math Problem of the Week-grade level specific. Students will then use their devices to interact with math challenge problems.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

Formative assessments will be created by the Math/Science coach with a focus on the priority standard for the grade level during the intended time. Additionally, a review scaffold standard from the previous grade level will also be assessed. The formative quick checks will then provide the necessary relevant data to support the ongoing PLC questions.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that less than 50% students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable**

**outcome the school plans to achieve.**

**This should be a**

**data based,**

**objective outcome.**

ELA, proficiency, and gains will increase to 50% in all groups.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this**

**Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

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

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

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

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

Literacy Coach will provide both instructional staff and paraprofessionals NSGRA and Guided Reading Professional Development.

**Person Responsible** Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

An interactive NSGRA data wall will be in the media center to encourage students and staff to track reading progress throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Grade levels 3-5 will be utilizing the RISE intervention program to support students that are an NSGRA level C-N to support ongoing literacy acceleration.

**Person Responsible** Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Formative assessments will be utilized by the Literacy coach with a focus on the spotlight standard for the grade level during the intended time. Additionally, a review scaffold standard from the previous grade level will also be assessed. The formative quick checks will then provide the necessary relevant data to support the ongoing PLC questions.

**Person Responsible** Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

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

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

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.**

Increase achievement for grade 5 from 40% to 43%

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction.
2. Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA, PM, and mock) will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning and coaching for teachers based on individual and small group needs.
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the leadership and/or coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

- Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures
- Engage in active learning experiences
- Process learning using interactive science notebooks

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

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).

Active learning experiences: Students who are “doing” are learning. Providing opportunities for students to investigate through inquiry, participate in experiments, develop models, and engage in simulations and activities remember the experience, especially if it is connected and relevant to their lives (which is possible in almost all science content).

Interactive science notebooks: provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence in science as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, synthesizing information, and more.



**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.

STEM block for grades 3-5. Students will engage in hands on STEM inquiry-based lessons during their block time.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

Support will be provided for Math/Science teachers to encourage the use of AVID strategies such as interactive notebooks, organization, inquiry-based activities, and collaboration techniques.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

Provide opportunities for students to interact with science-focused informational text in ELA. District Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPS) align science topics with texts from the Benchmark series.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

Formative assessments will be created by the Math/Science coach with a focus on the priority standard for the grade level during the intended time. Additionally, a review scaffold standard from the previous grade level will also be assessed. The formative quick checks will then provide the necessary relevant data to support the ongoing PLC questions.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)



**#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS and Post-Secondary Planning****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Well-implemented programs designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to generate, better test scores and higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. These competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop a positive culture they need to succeed in life.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable**

**outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

2021-2022 Panorama Survey showed a 61% of students answered favorably about school belonging (which was 4% down from the Fall survey which reported 65%). In 2022-2023 this question will be increased by 2%

**Monitoring:**

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

1. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive culture within the school.
2. The leadership team will review monthly during the Stocktake PBIS, behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop interventions as required.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individuals and be focused and flexible to allow for meeting these different needs.

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

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

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

### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students with an emphasis on post-secondary planning. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions. Students will be encouraged to explore and discover interests relative to the "4 E's" of Educate, Explore, Employ or Enlist.

**Person Responsible** Klran Singh (klran.singh@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging but utilizing school-wide currency of Eagle Cash, as well as developing in-class incentives to support our expectations.

**Person Responsible** Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will increase student input and voice through collaboration during their PLC planning time. Teachers will utilize the WICOR strategies to engage students in collaborative activities that help the students to dive deeper into the content.

**Person Responsible** Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

All surveys will be analyzed to identify school interventions that will support student needs and schoolwide plan will be developed to help determine appropriate levels of support for all students.

**Person Responsible** Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@osceolaschools.net)

Students will participate in Xello activities which are designed to develop student interests as relating to post-secondary planning.

**Person Responsible** Michael Beahm (michael.beahm@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**

. Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that less than 50% students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

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

Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that less than 50% students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

**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)**

At least 50% of students in our grades Kinergarten-2nd will score on or above grade level on the EOY NSGRA and/Star Reading Assessment. Our current years K-2nd grade students have 56 % of students below grade level. 6% of below level students will need to be on grade level by the end of the school year to meet this goal.

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

At least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score on or above grade level on the FAST end of year administration. Our current 3-5 graders are at 40% as based off of the 2021-2022 FSA.

**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.

Progress will be monitored in various ways. Students will take the NSGRA four times a year at a minimum, and on an as needed basis based on classroom observation. Students will also take in class formative assessments utilizing the Benchmark curriculum, dictation practice in grades K-2 will be utilized to monitor phonics progress, and statewide assessments, Start Reading and FAST will be used as well. Monthly MTSS meetings will also be conducted to discuss progress of all students in each grade level.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Adams, Katie, katie.adams@osceolaschools.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

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

1. Open Court Systematic Phonics Instruction .60 Effect Size
2. Benchmark Reading, RISE/RISE Up, Jan Richardson Guided Reading (Comprehensive Instructional Programs) .72 Effect Size
3. Repeated Reading Programs .75 Effect Size
4. Lexia Core- ESSA Strong Effect
5. FCRR (Phonics .70 strong, vocab .63 moderate, Comprehension .55 moderate, direct instruction .60 moderate)

**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 above programs were selected based on the student need across the district and from our specific school site. The programs help to address the critical needs of all readers from beginning levels to students in need of acceleration. Programs utilized needed to be research-based comprehensive curriculum that aligned with the Florida B.E.S.T standards while using systematic, explicit instruction. The use of these programs based on school data have shown growth in our students.

**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                 |
|---|---|
| Open Court will be used with fidelity in K-2 as part of tier 1 instruction. Open Court will be used during triple iii for students in grades K-5 that have a deficiency in phonemic awareness and phonics.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Leadership: Will monitor for fidelity and provide professional development opportunities for teachers to increase their understanding to implement the program with fidelity.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Coaching: Will provide professional development, modeling, and side by side coaching to ensure that teachers are using the program effectively.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Assessment:<br>NSGRA will be administered three times minimum each year.<br>Tier 2 and Tier 3 the Map NWEA quarterly.   | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Professional Learning: New teachers attended an Open Court PD as they prepared to start the year using the program. The literacy coach will be modeling and providing side-by side coaching.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| RISE will be used with students in grades 3-5 based on NSGRA levels. The focus will be on those students closest to grade level, to get them on grade level and beyond as soon as possible.   | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Coaching: Will train those on the RISE team, and also teach a section or two of RISE.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Leadership: Will review student data with the MTSS team to determine students that would be best served by the RISE or RISE UP program. We will provide the room, schedules, team, and resources to make sure that the program is implemented with fidelity. | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Professional Learning: We will build teacher capacity with training, modeling, coaching, and classroom visits   | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Action Step: Benchmark will be used with fidelity in K-5 as part of tier 1 instruction.   | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Leadership: Will monitor for fidelity and provide professional development opportunities for teachers to increase their understanding to implement the program with fidelity.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Coaching: Will provide professional development, modeling, and side by side coaching to ensure that teachers are using the program effectively.  | Reid, Jasmine,<br>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net |

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring                           |
|--|---|
| <p>Assessment:</p> <p>NSGRA will be administered three times minimum each year.</p> <p>FAST, STAR, and STAR Early literacy will be administered three times.</p> | <p>Henry, Melissa,<br/>melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net</p> |
| <p>Professional Learning: Professional development will be provided on how to use the Benchmark program to best meet the needs of all students.</p>              | <p>Reid, Jasmine,<br/>jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net</p>   |

### Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and holds staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students through programs such as AVID program and ambassadors club.

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff.

The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. Leaders demonstrate how these beliefs manifest in the school building by:

1. Engaging in collaborative planning
2. Displaying student work and achievements throughout school
3. Establishing a clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created.
4. Engaging in PLCs meetings to routinely examine data to look for themes/patterns among student groups and better support ALL students for success

Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. Teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done

as a result.

Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) to promote a positive culture and environment at the school.