School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Amy Flowers

Start Date for this Principal: 1/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
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 (53%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Education which inspires all to their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At St. Cloud Elementary we focus on the child and expect success to promote lifelong learners. We lead with vision because education must be a shared responsibility between the home, students, school and community.

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
Flowers, Amy	Principal	To administer the programs, facility and personnel of SCES and develop positive school-community relations with parents, students, community members, business partners, and other educational programs.
Crawford, Melanie	Assistant Principal	Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Collaborating with teachers and coaches to ensure curriculum standards are being implemented with fidelity. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. Oversee school safety and school-wide discipline.
Souza, Genevieve	Reading Coach	Develop capacity with teachers to deliver curriculum in effective and engaging ways. Model lessons for new or struggling teachers. Support the district curriculum goals and provide professional development to educators.
Farrell, Matthew	Math Coach	Collaborates with the team to plan and deliver quality professional learning and specific feedback aligned to the needs of the school and staff. Supports the development of high-quality, standards-based instruction in the areas of Math and Science; Supports and mentors teachers through the use of the coaching cycle; provides training and support in the use of collecting data, assessment, tracking students' progress, using the data to drive classroom instruction, and providing interventions. Supports the school in using data to plan, implement and track the effectiveness of interventions (iii).
Gray, Kelly	School Counselor	Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principals of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies. Promote and support a safe school
Haines, Lacey	School Counselor	Utilizes technology effectively and efficiently to plan, organize, implement and evaluate the comprehensive school counseling program. Uses legal and ethical decision-making based on standards and principals of the school counseling profession and educational systems, including district and building policies. Promote and support a safe school.
Gardner, Laurie	Other	Coordinate testing schedule and testing materials.
Savillo, Sandra	Other	Analyze and monitor student achievement data at the individual and group level. Develop, implement, and monitor academic and behavioral interventions for fidelity of delivery and effectiveness. Model effective delivery of intervention instruction. Select and coordinate material support for instructional and support personnel. Facilitate and monitor the MTSS process at the group and individual student and teacher level. Coordinate and support sub-group specific interventions. Report analysis of intervention data trends to school administrators.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/21/2020, Amy Flowers

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

860

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

8

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	122	114	121	147	148	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	14	30	22	16	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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

Wednesday 9/14/2022

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	97	116	129	138	144	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	765
Attendance below 90 percent	19	23	15	16	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	5	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	97	116	129	138	144	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	765
Attendance below 90 percent	19	23	15	16	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	5	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	59%	48%	56%				63%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						57%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						46%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	44%	50%				72%	55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						60%	59%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						38%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	46%	59%				66%	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	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	48%	13%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	74%	54%	20%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	53%	15%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	48%	17%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	64%	45%	19%	53%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	24	38	48	30	32	23	17				
ELL	44	46	52	49	49	26	29				
BLK	50	47		64	47		60				
HSP	57	56	53	60	54	39	36				
MUL	48	55		52	64						
WHT	66	62	61	66	60	21	52				
FRL	48	54	54	50	49	32	37				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	43	47	31	47	42	17	40				
ELL	39	45		41			32				
BLK	55	30		44	20		55				
HSP	55	50	29	52	14	5	45				
MUL	56			69							
WHT	68	59	38	78	41		68				
FRL	50	43	27	53	13	5	31				

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	42	62	47	56	64	38	45				
ELL	48	50	43	59	62	41	63				
BLK	56	58		63	47						
HSP	57	50	34	64	56	32	55				
MUL	61	77		78	85						
WHT	69	62	60	79	63	42	78				
FRL	52	57	46	59	56	35	56				

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	54

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
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	53
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	55
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	55
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA & Math students with disabilities (SWD) continue to show the lowest performance when compared to their peers.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in the area of Math L25 for grades 3 through 5 and Science for grade 5.

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

Lack of knowledge of instructional practice related to providing effective intervention and differentiation in the area of math, especially for our ESE students. We also lost an ESE allocation last year, which created a challenging situation when developing the master schedule. This year we utilized school discretionary funds to hire an additional support facilitation ESE position to provide services to students.

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

ELA learning gains in L25 for SWD showed the most improvement with an increase of 17 percentage points. (31 to 48). The use of targeted interventions and collaborative planning contributed to this gain.

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

Our ESE team participated in a weekly PLC with the Interventionist/MTSS coach where student data/ progress monitoring data was reviewed and learning paths for students were adjusted as needed.

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

Standards based collaborative planning via PLC and student centered learning to deepen understanding.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The leadership team will develop whole group, small group, and embedded professional development opportunities which will align resources and support teachers in strengthening their instructional delivery.

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

Standards based collaborative planning via PLT will take place weekly. During collaborative planning, data will be analyzed to develop intentional lessons utilizing WICOR (AVID) strategies which will deepen student learning.

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 ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on 2021-2022 FSA school data, our students' overall ELA learning gains increased from 52% to 58% however, ELA achievement scores dropped from 61% to 59%. This shows a decline in literacy proficiency for our students. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of increasing proficiency and ensuring higher levels of literacy achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA proficiency will increase by at least 3% in all grades and subgroups.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration and leadership team will monitor collaborative grade-level teams to ensure the fidelity of instructional implementation via data chats with grade chairs, plc leads, and individual teachers. 2. School Stocktake will take place every month and the literacy coach will report progress to the Principal on the ELA area of focus. 3. The leadership team will analyze and discuss walk-through/NEST data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Crawford (melanie.crawford@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will continue to utilize a research-based reading curriculum and will implement it with fidelity in ELA. In addition, collaborative analysis of student assessment data will be used to drive instruction in the ELA classroom. Teachers will use assessment data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners through the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows that there is a correlation between student achievement and the use of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. In addition, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Provide teachers with professional development on how to implement and utilize curriculum resources in ELA.

Person Responsible	Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

2. Facilitate professional development on how to use data to drive instructional grouping for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.

Person Responsible	Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

3. Providing training and support for implementing small group instruction.

Person Responsible Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net)

#2. 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.	Teacher collaboration and shared knowledge will strengthen understanding of expected outcomes and the development of effective learning paths to achieve higher levels of student growth.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student achievement will increase 3% in all measured areas.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Data chats with evidence of CFAs. 2. Walkthroughs 3. Monthly Stocktake meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PLTs will meet weekly to collaborate and learn together as address the four critical questions to develop curriculum, plan lessons, create common assessments, analyze evidence of student learning and implement strategies to improve results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Professional Learning Communities develop the instructional capacity of a team. Research indicates that levels of learning increase dramatically when educators work collaboratively and take responsibility for the success of all students. Developing common assessments will focus instruction and measure student progress. Common Formative Assessments have a substantial influence (average effect size of 0.9 - John Hattie) on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Identify PLT facilitators.	
Person Responsible	Laurie Gardner (laurie.gardner@osceolaschools.net)
Monthly meetings with PLT Leads, collective agreements submitted from each PLT.	

Person Responsible Laurie Gardner (laurie.gardner@osceolaschools.net)

Develop common school expectations for PLT meetings, including the development of common formative assessments, data analysis, and lesson plan development.

Person Responsible Laurie Gardner (laurie.gardner@osceolaschools.net)

School leadership monitors student progress on CFAs.

Person Responsible Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)

Coaching support will be provided to build teacher capacity and team efficacy.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	SCE saw an increase in learning gains- (LQ: 9% to 33%) and (Overall LG: 26% to 56%). Our proficiency dropped from 63% to 62%. However, our subgroup data suggests our LY and ESE populations should be our biggest areas of concern. Our SWD population had a 30% proficiency score with 32% making a LG. IN addition, our LY student population has a 49% proficiency rate with only 49% of students making a LG. The gap between our overall performance and our subgroup performance indicates that supporting our SWD and LY student population should be our priority in Math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal is to increase our ESE proficiency scores from 30% to 40% and to increase our LY proficiency score from 49% to 55%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1.The team will review data from FAST, CFA's, and walk-throughs to monitor and project the outcomes monthly. 2.Additional action steps/action plans will be implemented if data suggests we will not meet our goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	For both our LY and ESE students, we will implement hands-on manipulatives to support building core Math concepts. In addition, we will provide PD for teachers on how to use manipulatives and additional resources to support our sub-groups with building foundational understanding of concepts before attempting to move to the procedural steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	If we can provide students with the foundational understanding of core Math concepts, they will understand what is happening "behind the scenes" in Math, which will allow them to master the procedural steps in solving math problems. Manipulatives are a great resource to help students model the "behind the scenes" math and why the actual procedural steps work.

resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

1) Math Coach will provide PD to teams on how to utilize Math Triple I time effectively. The training will include assistance with pulling FAST data to create tiered groups for support, reviewing what instructional materials to use, and discussing ways to track student progress with data.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

Math Coach will provide PD on how to implement and utilize instructional materials and manipulatives to help build students' conceptual knowledge before focusing on procedural knowledge (steps). (This will focus on Tier 1 strategies)

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

3) AVID Site Team will highlight and demonstrate collaborative structures monthly to increase student engagement in all subject areas. The Math Coach will track data on the implementation of cooperative learning structures in Math via W/T.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

4) Math Coach will track the achievement gap of our special populations in Math via common formative assessments per unit. Additional action steps will be added based upon the data collected.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

5) Math Coach will provide PD on implementing strategies to support our ELL and ESE students- specifically using manipulatives, representations, and the use of Math Talks. W/T will collect data on the implementation of highlighted strategies.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@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.	Science proficiency will increase by 12 percentage points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Feedback regarding fidelity implementation via data chats with grade chairs, PLT Leads, and individual teachers. 2. Stocktake meetings 3. Walkthroughs/NEST
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Students will participate in academic discussions through collaborative structures (AVID strategies) 2. Students will engage in active learning experiences, such as inquiry based labs. 3. Students will 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.	1. When students are given the opportunity to opening discuss and explain their thinking they gain a deeper understanding of the content/concept being learned. Students are also able support opinions with evidence. (WICOR AVID) 2. When students are able to explore a science concept in an inquiry based learning environment (lab) they are able to gain a better understanding of the topic and and connect it to real world experiences. (WICOR AVID) 3. Interactive notebooks allow students to write observations, record data, develop their understanding of the content being learned in a safe environment. They are then able to refer back to their notebook to review, edit and add to their depth of learning. (WICOR AVID)

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Provide Professional Development to teachers on how to engage students in inquiry-based lessons using hands-on lessons aligned to the grade-level content. The PD will provide support in identifying and understanding the critical content to teach as well as highlighting effective instructional practices- including cooperative learning, Science phenonena, scientific practices, and exploration.

Person Responsible	Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

2. Professional Development and instructional support for new teachers. This includes modeling, co-teaching, and/or co-planning lessons with staff as well as supporting PLCs with identifying the critical content to teach and determine the best ways to engage the students in the content.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

3) Science Coach will plan, create, and implement STEM lessons aligned to the 5th grade curriculum. The lessons will engage students in critical concepts covered in 5th grade using technology and hands-on activities. The STEM lessons will occur on a rotating schedule for 5th grade every 6 days in the STEM room.

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Safety, Belonging, Growth	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and positive academic and behavioral supports for all students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	2021-2022 Spring SEL climate Survey response shows 70% of students answered favorable for sense of belonging. It is our goal to increase school belonging to 75%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Safety and belonging will be monitored through Panorama surveys. Growth will be monitored through FAST, NSGRA, and STAR.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	St. Cloud Elementary is implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Supports. The importance of recognizing and fostering pro-social skills strengthens the positive culture and environment of the school. Family events are planned to build the school home connection.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	PBIS is a nationally recognized and evidence-based practice to promote pro-social behavior and reduce disciplinary referrals. The purpose of the program is to recognize and foster positive behaviors and a supportive culture for all stakeholders.

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.

Ensure STAR expectation posters are up and visible on all areas of the campus.	
Person Responsible	Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)
Distribute star bucks and open PBIS store. Procedures for store will be shared with teachers via email, grade chairs, media time.	
Person Responsible	Sandra Savillo (sandra.savillo@osceolaschools.net)
Implement small group life skills lessons for students experiencing emotional/behavioral difficulties.	
Person Responsible	Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)
Provide resources and tools for teachers to utilize in the classroom for Tier 2 behavior students. Support the collection of progress monitoring data. Adjust intervention in a timely manner if not showing evidence of progress.	
Person Responsible	Lacey Haines (lacey.haines@osceolaschools.net)
Share with teachers the lessons in Xello students should complete each semester.	
Person Responsible	Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@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.

St. Cloud Elementary is implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Supports. The importance of recognizing and fostering pro-social skills strengthens the positive culture and environment of the school. Family events are planned to build the school home connection.

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

School leadership promotes positive school culture and environment through continuous communication with staff, students, and community members. Instructional staff supports the positive school culture through on-going communication with families. All school staff promotes a positive school culture and environment by recognizing and responding to the diverse needs of our students and the importance of fostering a sense of belonging for all people.