

School District of Osceola County, FL

Osceola County School For The Arts



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Osceola County School For The Arts

3151 N ORANGE BLOSSOM TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Dennis Neal

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 48% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (83%) 2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (85%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Osceola County School For The Arts

3151 N ORANGE BLOSSOM TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34744

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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 6-12 | No | 48% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 75% |

School Grades History

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

It is our Mission to provide a community that nourishes and nurtures the personal integrity and creative expression of our students in their pursuit of artistic and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.:

The Osceola County School for the Arts will grow to become an artistic showcase where the community gathers to appreciate the artistic talents and academic achievements of its students.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Neal, Dennis | Principal | Principal oversees all team members Stocktake, holds team members accountable for results, asks questions that challenge and support, actively engages in problem solving. |
| Conners, Mark | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of College and Career Readiness Administrator for Math and Science Departments Stocktake |
| Gilford, Lisa Renee | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of of Instruction Master Schedule, Curriculum and Instruction Stocktake: facilitator, prepares Principal for meeting, designs agenda, keeps meeting on track. |
| Alexander, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | Math Coach, MTSS Interventions, Math Curriculum Coach, Professional Development, Math Stocktake PP. PLC |
| Vedder, Jay | Dean | Oversees MTSS, academic interventions, MTSS, Science Stocktake PP |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/22/2020, Dennis Neal

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.*

4

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

970

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

12

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

15

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 110 | 143 | 181 | 165 | 148 | 130 | 991 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 43 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 23 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 139 | 135 | 177 | 152 | 134 | 139 | 967 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 27 | 42 | 53 | 61 | 39 | 251 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 26 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 19 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 19 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 139 | 135 | 177 | 152 | 134 | 139 | 967 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 27 | 42 | 53 | 61 | 39 | 251 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 26 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 19 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 19 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 89% | 45% | 52% | | | | 89% | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 71% | 48% | 52% | | | | 69% | 48% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 40% | 41% | | | | 74% | 43% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 87% | 32% | 41% | | | | 91% | 46% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 65% | 39% | 48% | | | | 79% | 41% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 75% | 44% | 49% | | | | 85% | 46% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 83% | 54% | 61% | | | | 87% | 69% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 94% | 61% | 68% | | | | 97% | 70% | 73% |

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 |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 89% | 48% | 41% | 54% | 35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 88% | 47% | 41% | 52% | 36% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -89% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 90% | 49% | 41% | 56% | 34% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -88% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 92% | 45% | 47% | 55% | 37% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -92% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 88% | 47% | 41% | 46% | 42% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 42% | 36% | 48% | 30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 93% | 62% | 31% | 67% | 26% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 99% | 73% | 26% | 71% | 28% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 89% | 62% | 27% | 70% | 19% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 89% | 49% | 40% | 61% | 28% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 94% | 44% | 50% | 57% | 37% |

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 | 67 | 60 | | | | | | 54 | | | |
| ELL | 79 | 78 | 71 | 86 | 66 | 80 | 68 | 90 | 91 | | |
| ASN | 94 | 78 | | 100 | 74 | | 94 | 100 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 95 | 70 | 83 | 91 | 68 | | 86 | 95 | 100 | | |
| HSP | 86 | 71 | 66 | 86 | 65 | 75 | 78 | 92 | 94 | 100 | 85 |
| MUL | 92 | 83 | | 89 | 71 | | 93 | | | | |
| WHT | 92 | 67 | 59 | 89 | 63 | 68 | 91 | 100 | 97 | 100 | 82 |
| FRL | 84 | 68 | 60 | 80 | 63 | 65 | 79 | 94 | 91 | 100 | 80 |
| 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 | 40 | 53 | 45 | 50 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 72 | 73 | 69 | 76 | 66 | 70 | 73 | 95 | 91 | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 91 | 70 | | 96 | 82 | | 89 | 100 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 85 | 66 | 50 | 79 | 54 | 50 | 83 | 89 | 88 | 100 | 72 |
| HSP | 85 | 66 | 69 | 78 | 57 | 63 | 77 | 92 | 84 | 100 | 75 |
| MUL | 89 | 76 | | 80 | 63 | | 82 | 100 | | | |
| WHT | 92 | 73 | 67 | 86 | 55 | 81 | 89 | 100 | 91 | 100 | 91 |
| FRL | 83 | 69 | 68 | 77 | 57 | 62 | 70 | 94 | 86 | 100 | 83 |
| 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 | | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | 73 | 80 | 86 | 76 | 74 | 75 | 100 | | | |
| ASN | 96 | 73 | | 95 | 95 | | 100 | 100 | | | |
| BLK | 88 | 76 | 86 | 84 | 86 | 93 | 65 | 89 | | 100 | 95 |
| HSP | 86 | 67 | 72 | 90 | 78 | 82 | 87 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 79 |
| MUL | 81 | 70 | | 88 | 63 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 97 | 70 | 78 | 96 | 77 | 96 | 94 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 84 |
| FRL | 85 | 65 | 70 | 88 | 77 | 86 | 83 | 93 | 100 | 99 | 84 |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 83 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 912 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 60 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 79 |
| 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 | 91 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 86 |
| 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 | 82 |
| 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 | 86 |
| 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 | 83 |
| 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 | 79 |
| 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?

The apparent trends which is prevalent across grade levels is an increase in the academic performance in each of the content areas. The average being 2 percentage points in ELA and Science and 7% in Math over the previous year on the FSA.

The subgroup trend which emerges as an area of opportunity based on the FSA , are the SWD (Students with Disabilities) population with 60%, English Language Learners 79%, and Economically disadvantaged students 79%, scores are significantly lower that the school index of 83%.

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

Mathematics Achievement - SWD - all grades
 Science - Improving
 ELA - 9th and 10th grades

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 primary contributing factor for this need for improvement is this serving as the first full year in which we returned to a "normal" academic setting following the impact of the environmental concern in the preceding year. Many student were impacted by gaps in skills and learning. In addition, providing our teachers with the necessary professional develop to best serve these students while teaching the academic standards and meeting those SEL needs.

New actions to address this need for improvement is that it will be imperative to utilize the PLC process to ensure appropriate planning, adherence to standards, overall instructional integrity and analysis of data. Identifying and addressing student academic and skills and addressing those skill deficits. This includes proper utilization of district resources. Returning to our regular Professional Development schedule and that which focus on WICOR strategies and increasing rigorous classroom instruction. Also, review PLC expectations as a faculty during pre-planning. Provide guidelines/template to be completed for each meeting. Jennifer Alexander to monitor and provide support as need in the process, ensure that data analysis (student work) is occurring. Finally, in an effort to decrease the achievement gap, ensuring that these trainings include a focus for out ELL and SWD students and encompass MTSS and PBIS.

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

The areas with the most improved area on the FSA was Math, with Math Achievement improving my 6 percentage points over last year. Math Learning Gains increased by 7 percentage points over the previous year and the most significant increase was demonstrated by 9 percentage points in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile.

Though the school-wide score is 87% proficiency, data indicates a gap in learning gains between high and low achieving students with lower achieving students scoring higher, thus, a need to ensure higher achieving students are receiving high level of rigor and opportunities for extended learning with a goal of 90%.

ELA and Science Achievement both increased by 2 percentage points. in addition, ELA scores improved by 2 percentage points for ELA Learning Gains and the ELA Lowest 25 Percentile.

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

The contributing factors which lead to the increased Math academic achievement included afterschool tutoring with focus on Algebra, PLC meetings with planning emphasizing effective research based instructional strategies, utilizing the resources provided by the district, use of the most recent text adoption, FNSI, and the quality of our teachers.

The contributing factors which lead to the increase in the ELA achievement include effective assistance from the Literacy Coach, PLCs focusing on data analysis, Core Connections training for the ELA staff, MTSS small group instruction, Smart Board tools and interactive computer usage which has lead to increased engagement with the interactive technology. Use of the 1-1 technology. Students grouped by ability and differentiated instruction. Writing camps held on Saturdays.

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

Ongoing Professional Development for all staff which center on topics as dictated by the data, Focused utilization of Instructional Coaches and Instructional Mentors, use of WICOR strategies, focused PLC meetings which focus on data analysis, usage of district resources, instruction driven by the BEST Academic Standards, increased usage of math manipulatives, continued to clarify new math standards, ensure implementation of B1G-M and mathematical thinking and reasoning standards (WICOR), continuation of the MTSS process for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, instruction targeting our subgroup populations to ensure their continued growth.

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.

Provide Professional Development on WICOR strategies, increase use of manipulatives, continued to clarify new math standards, ensure implementation of B1G-M and mathematical thinking and reasoning standards (-> WICOR), continue MTSS process for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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

Continued data driven practices serving as the focus during PLCs, Professional Development centering on XX, appropriate tiering for our MTSS students, ensuring sustainable measuring of each component, monitoring each component through Stocktake, meeting with staff to understand and address their needs to lend to job satisfaction, sense of belonging, and retention, classroom walkthroughs (NEST Tool) and observations (Marzano), discussing and addressing trends, will each serve as the additional services which will be provided to ensure the continued improvement next year and beyond.

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. | Develop and continue effective Professional Learning Communities across each content area. Teachers will produce a shared vision for improving student learning outcomes, create engaging lessons which involve high yield strategies, and best instructional practices. School level instructional development, ensuring that teachers meet regularly with other teachers teaching the same content and share instructional strategies and are trained on new district implementations such as new standards, non-evaluative tools, best strategies for student in Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction. Teachers will disaggregate and analyze data, share content knowledge, discuss student achievement, BEST standards, discuss classroom interventions, examine student performance as it relates to MTSS, determine information to be shared for academic intervention and the extended learning opportunities, all in an effort to increase student academic achievement. Teachers will also discuss best practices based upon COVID loss, and share/discuss instructional practices/ strategies. It is imperative to utilize the PLC process to ensure appropriate planning, adherence to standards, overall instructional integrity and analysis of data. |
|--|---|

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

Increase ELA proficiency in each grade levels to 90%.
Increase Math schoolwide proficiency to 90% for all grade levels.
Improve Science proficiency to 85% across all grade levels, including subgroups.

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

1.The Administration and Leadership Team will conduct classroom observations. Feedback and follow up based upon classroom meeting (i.e. NEST tool, Marzano/ iObservation, Kiano).
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:

Dennis Neal (dennis.neal@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

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).

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

Explain the

**rationale for
selecting**

**this specific
strategy.**

**Describe the
resources/**

criteria used

for selecting

this

strategy.

Clear objectives for student learning will be established. Meetings will be structured and a specified date and time will be allotted for meetings. A culture of collaboration will be established which is focused on results. Professional Learning Communities are necessary to offer a consistency and opportunities to examine the instructional process and to take an in depth look at the student achievement data.

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. Leadership Team to monitor and provide support to ensure data analysis of student work and from formative, summative, and district assessments occurs for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.
2. PLC teams will:
 - a. Adhere to and develop agenda
 - b. Implement formulated meeting Collective Commitments (NORMs) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members during all meetings.
 - c. Have a dedicated meeting time focused on working together as a team for student success purposes.
 - d. WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies
3. Mentoring by PLC administrator and PLC facilitator for teams who are struggling, support will be provided
4. Re-Delivery of Professional Development content to others in the PLC who did not attend. Apply content to learned in classrooms.
5. Teachers will produce a shared vision for improving student learning outcomes.

Person

Responsible

Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Even though 2021-2022 scores for ELA demonstrated a lower proficiency in grades 9th and 10th, we will focus on improving those scores, as well as continued proficiency in grades 6th through 10th to ensure higher achieving students are receiving high level of rigor and opportunities for extended learning with a goal of 90%.

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

Increase school-wide proficiency to 90% and decrease the gains gap between higher and lower performing students.

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

1. Administration, Leadership Team, Literacy Coach, and the Instructional Mentors will each monitor the PLC to ensure that time is being used wisely, data is being used to drive instruction, research based instructional strategies are being used, and that district resources are being utilized.
2. Administration, Leadership Team, and the Literacy Coach, Instructional Mentors will conduct classroom observations and walkthroughs to ensure that rigorous instruction is delivered.
3. The Instructional Coach will share departmental progress during monthly Stocktake meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dennis Neal (dennis.neal@osceolaschools.net)

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

Effective data analysis depicts what students have comprehended and identifies those areas which need to be taught.

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

Data analysis can provide a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data, educators can make informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes." (Lewis, Madison-Harris, Muomeke, & Times, 2021)

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. Instructional components for ELA include whole group, small group, and one-on-one conferencing in an effort to meet the individual needs of all students.
2. The Literacy Coach will provide training and support to all teachers on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement.
3. OCSA Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.
4. Academic Intervention will be offered daily across each content area to provide targeted intervention time to support struggling students in Tiers Tier 1,2, & 3.

5. Instructional Staff will utilize the ELA instructional materials located within the curriculum unit plans (CUPs).
6. Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible Dennis Neal (dennis.neal@osceolaschools.net)

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

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

Given OCSA achieved a school-wide proficiency of 83% in school-wide Science, and our subgroups scored within 1% of the school-wide average, we will look to improve out Tier 1 strategies schoolwide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our schoolwide proficiency to 85%, including all subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

1. Administration, Leadership Team, Literacy Coach, and the Instructional Mentors will each monitor the PLC to ensure that time is being used wisely, data is being used to drive instruction, research based instructional strategies are being used, and that district resources are being utilized.
2. Administration, Leadership Team, and the Literacy Coach, Instructional Mentors will conduct classroom observations and walkthroughs to ensure that rigorous instruction is delivered.
3. The Instructional Coach will share departmental progress during monthly Stocktake meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dennis Neal (dennis.neal@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Evidence-based Strategy

- 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.

- o Collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts (in ideal settings, without judgement and with a clear prompt and structure). WICOR (AVID)
- o 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). WICOR (AVID)
- o Interactive science notebooks: Provide a place for students to process learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. Builds student confidence as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, synthesizing information,

and more. 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. Establish a team of teachers and instructional coaches to assess the needs, plan, and monitor school-wide science instructional practices.
2. This team will:
 - a. Provide training and support for Science Instructional staff to ensure a common understanding of the academic standards, continued utilization of engaging and research based instructional strategies, and set common classroom expectations.
 - b. Develop continuous cycle of learning including developing understanding of strategy, monitoring instructional practice, needs assessment, and addressing needs.
 - c. Conduct classroom walkthroughs, focusing on science instructional strategy and student learning.
 - d. Partner with the district-based science team to develop professional learning.
3. Formative assessment and progress monitoring data will be utilized analyze learning gains, planning for instruction, devising professional learning, and coaching needs
4. Teachers will aid in the improvement of learning by ensuring that students actively participate in collaborative structures, ensure that students engage in interactive learning experiences and interactive science notebooks

Person Responsible Jay Vedder (jay.vedder@osceolaschools.net)

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

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

Even though the school-wide score is 87% proficiency, data indicates a gap in learning gains between high and low achieving students with lower achieving students scoring higher, thus, a need to ensure higher achieving students are receiving high level of rigor and opportunities for extended learning with a goal of 90%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase school-wide proficiency to 90% and decrease the gains gap between higher and lower performing students.

Monitoring:

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

1. Administration, Leadership Team, Math Literacy Coach, Instructional Mentors will each monitor the PLC to ensure that time is being used wisely, data is being used to drive instruction, research based instructional strategies are being used, and that district resources are being utilized.
2. Administration, Leadership Team, Math Literacy Coach, Instructional Mentors will conduct classroom observations and walkthroughs to ensure that rigorous instruction is delivered.
3. The Math Instructional Coach will share departmental progress during monthly Stocktake meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

It is imperative that while teaching students who may have skills deficits in math, to improve the student academic achievement we must be efficient with the instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In order to develop every student's mathematical proficiency, leaders and teachers must systematically integrate the use of concrete and virtual manipulatives into classroom instruction at all grade levels (NCSM, 2013)

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. OCSA Classroom teachers will develop well planned lessons during PLC focused on the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for each unit of study.
2. Teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level fluency.
3. OCSA teachers will
 - a. Assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices.
 - b. Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their work.
4. All OCSA students will participate in targeted intervention according to their respective Tier (1, 2, or 3).
5. The MTSS Coach will hold bi-monthly meetings with Stakeholders to review student data and

interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for Tier 1, 2, & 3 students.

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

Person Responsible Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

It is imperative to ensure that OCSA offers a positive and supportive school environment as an to aid in job satisfaction and retention. This will entail implementing programs which will facilitate improved test scores and continue our graduation rate. Programs focused on students will involve problem solving and will encourage a growth mindset. Teachers express high level of job satisfaction, feeling of belonging, based on staff survey and stay interviews and their increase job retention. As a result, programs will focus on student and staff relationships, activities which support learning, and peer comraderies.

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

2021-2022 Panorama Survey data reflected that OCSA.
Emotion regulation scores are up by 2 pts compared to fall 2021.
Sense of Belonging scores are up by 2pts compared to fall 2021.
Greatest decrease is School Climate (down by 7 pts) .

In the 2022-2023 school year the school climate question will increase by 10%.

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

1. Panorama and Insight Surveys, Parent Climate Surveys, TNTP Data, Culture Surveys and Polling Staff and Students results will be analyzed and compared to the current interventions in place.
2. This information will be examined by the school Leadership Team during the Stocktake meetings. We will also examine discipline, attendance, PBIS, and examine how this relates to our subgroups and create the necessary interventions as required.

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

Dennis Neal (dennis.neal@osceolaschools.net)

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

Students learning in very different ways and have varying needs. Determining the individual needs of each student and focusing on those needs is essential to the learning process.

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

With new teachers and all staff it is imperative to ensure that have a positive and supportive school environment and to aid in job satisfaction and retention. Teachers express high level of job satisfaction, feeling of belonging, based on staff survey and stay interviews and their increase job retention.

"An overall culture that emphasizes a sense of belonging at work can nurture a positive environment, one in which achievements are recognized and rewarded, and

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

employees are empowered and more motivated to contribute to a company's success." (Heathfield, 2021)

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 opportunities for staff to know each other and activities that are built upon relationship building.
2. Staff and student monthly recognitions.
3. Schedule One-on-One meetings with staff throughout the year.
5. Create and build upon an environment where staff and students feel that they have a voice.
6. PBIS will be implemented consistently and with fidelity and reported out at monthly Stocktake.
7. Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
8. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support a positive culture for students and staff development.
9. Post-Secondary Considerations include: College Week. allow students to attend the HBCU Fair, College Fair on Campus, Informational Parent Night regarding post-secondary options, In-house Application Days, inviting colleges to visit our campus for the purpose of recruiting our students and disseminating information, which includes military options and employers.

Person

Responsible

Jay Vedder (jay.vedder@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.

A positive school culture and environment will continue to be facilitated through staff (i.e. birthdays, work anniversaries, R-OCSA Stars, Employee of the Month) and student recognition monthly, effective communication channels for parents, students, and community stakeholders using the school website and various social media platforms (i.e. Remind, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram), weekly principal announcement, teachers greeting students at their classroom door, student centered and student-led interest groups and clubs, three monitors projecting school information and school highlights, and daily overhead announcements provided daily. Teacher mentoring programs and support is also offered along with regular meeting with the administrative team for job satisfaction. Each of these components lend to supporting the social emotional learning which is primary contributing factor at OCSA. OCSA students are comfortable and find solace here. OCSA engages students, families, and community in a positive and artistic environment that fosters the creation and celebration of the various art area. OCSA has established

an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as decision-making SAC committee that reaches to families and communities. They assist in the important process of approving funds for students and teacher activities and it acts a forum for develop ideas and assist in the process of ensuring the success of the activities.

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

OCSA stakeholders work collaboratively to promote a positive school culture and environment. Teachers meet weekly with teachers on campus and with teachers within the district in PLCs to review student academic progress, examine and analyze data and utilize that data to create lessons and develop formative and summative assessments. Many of our teachers are the only teacher on campus teaching certain content areas on our campus and therefore meet with other teachers (face to face or through MS Teams) for there content/art area within the district and form a professional learning community. OCSA teachers also meet and work cross-curricular to develop unit plans which encompass more than one content area. Teachers also attend various professional development to enhance their instructional skills and apply what has been learned to their respective classrooms. Faculty PLC meetings are also offered in an effort to share ideas and effective instructional strategies. Those teachers who teacher a full schedule of classes daily find this particularly helpful. Members of the leadership team attends and supports to the content area PLCs and demonstrates continuity in learning. Following these meetings, Leadership team member provide feedback to PLC leads and members and also may suggest evidence-based practices and strategies that could enhance student learning.

The OCSA Administrative Team meets on Friday mornings to review and discuss concerns related to staffing, facilities, upcoming events, the week in review, safety and security, testing, and other items for good of the order. On Mondays, the OCSA Leadership team meets to discuss the week ahead, content agendas, teaching and learning throughout the classrooms, and any issues that may arise. This team is similar to a PLC and data is reviewed bi-weekly to review any opportunities for growth or to create action plans. The team consists of administrators, dean, testing coordinator, guidance director, and instructional coaches. This team implements evidence-based practices to everyday procedures.

Each of these factions are responsible for lending to the strong culture here at Osceola School for the Arts.