

School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 23 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 23 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Kissimmee Elementary School

3700 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Kissimmee Elementary School will provide an enriched and rigorous learning environment within a diverse community where all children succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kissimmee Elementary will unlock the full potential of all students by empowering learners as they journey to academic success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| DeRight, Nathan | Principal | Create a safe school culture that is conducive for learning. Carry out the school mission statement. Serve as the lead instructional leader who sets forth procedures and systems that create opportunity and increase student learning. |
| Terry, Elizabeth | Assistant Principal | Duties assigned by the principal. Duties may include, school safety, scheduling, Title I, SAC meetings, instructional leadership, mentoring, and more. |
| Hinson , Katrina | Math Coach | School Math/Science Coach School AVID Coordinator |
| Wright , Jade | Reading Coach | School literacy Coach |
| Kane, David | Instructional Coach | Testing and Interventions |
| Reyes, Yudelca | ELL Compliance Specialist | ELL Specialist |
| | Instructional Coach | Resource Compliance Specialist |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

All required stakeholders attend the School Advisory Council where they review, give input, and approve the School Improvement Plan. Our SAC committee is made up of parents, teachers, administration and local businesses. Boys and Girls Club representatives attend and always do what is best for the students of the school.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be regularly monitored during monthly Stocktakes which is a monthly meeting of stakeholders. The leadership team will review the data towards students meeting their goals and the plan will be revised as necessary through next steps planned by the team. The SIP is taken to the SAC multiple times a year to review and amend as needed.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 89% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: B |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: B 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 27 | 29 | 29 | 21 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 9 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 48 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 49 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 37 | 65 | 58 | 69 | 55 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 | |
| | 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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 5 | 11 | 28 | 44 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 32 | 30 | 33 | 25 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 8 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 48 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 32 | 30 | 33 | 25 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 8 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 48 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 38 | 44 | 53 | 39 | 48 | 56 | 36 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 51 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42 | | | 55 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 40 | 46 | 59 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 40 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51 | | | 48 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 27 | 43 | 54 | 37 | 46 | 59 | 41 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 55 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 42 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 42 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 66 | 59 | 59 | 59 | | | 44 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
|--|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 213 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
|--|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 46 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 367 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD | 19 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| ELL | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | | | |
| HSP | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | |

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 29 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 44 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 46 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | | | |
| FRL | 43 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 38 | | | 40 | | | 27 | | | | | 66 |
| SWD | 11 | | | 11 | | | 0 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| ELL | 27 | | | 35 | | | 20 | | | | 5 | 66 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | | | 58 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 34 | | | 37 | | | 27 | | | | 5 | 67 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | 43 | | | | | | | 4 | 57 |
| FRL | 35 | | | 34 | | | 25 | | | | 5 | 64 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 39 | 50 | 42 | 39 | 50 | 51 | 37 | | | | | 59 |
| SWD | 16 | 30 | 36 | 20 | 34 | 38 | 29 | | | | | 31 |
| ELL | 34 | 46 | 39 | 36 | 45 | 54 | 37 | | | | | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 50 | | 30 | 50 | | 18 | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 49 | 43 | 38 | 49 | 55 | 39 | | | | | 58 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 53 | | 47 | 53 | | 27 | | | | | 50 |
| FRL | 35 | 49 | 43 | 34 | 47 | 48 | 33 | | | | | 56 |

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 36 | 51 | 55 | 40 | 50 | 48 | 41 | | | | | 44 |
| SWD | 16 | 42 | | 21 | 47 | | 32 | | | | | 50 |
| ELL | 31 | 48 | 52 | 35 | 49 | 54 | 36 | | | | | 44 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 46 | | 48 | 50 | | 43 | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 52 | 54 | 37 | 51 | 59 | 38 | | | | | 43 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | | | 59 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 51 | 54 | 35 | 52 | 50 | 35 | | | | | 42 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 44% | -16% | 54% | -26% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 49% | -15% | 58% | -24% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 44% | -12% | 50% | -18% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 49% | -14% | 59% | -24% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 48% | -6% | 61% | -19% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 41% | -11% | 55% | -25% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 22% | 40% | -18% | 51% | -29% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Subgroups that showed the lowest performance were students with disabilities and African American students. Attendance was a contributing factor with these students and need for parental trainings.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science data showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Previously, Science was comparable to Reading/literacy data. This year, upon reflection, students scored higher in reading meaning that they are in need of additional science content knowledge.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap between Kissimmee Elementary and the state was in the area of science. The state average was 51% proficient. The average proficiency at Kissimmee Elementary was 27%. Many factors contributed to the gap in proficiency, with overall knowledge of the science content being the biggest contributor.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In the 2022-23 school year, students in grades 3-5 showed large improvements in mathematics. From progress monitoring 1 to progress monitoring 2, students in grades 3-5 moved from 5% proficient to 43% proficient. Lead team and teachers worked hard to instill fundamental mathematics skills in all students in every grade level. Knowing there are many gaps in education at KMES, we utilized various tools to improve skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The number of students that have less than 90% attendance for the school year is concerning. KMES also have a large number of students that scored a level 1 on the ELA and/or Math state exams.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Number sense strand within mathematics
2. Science Content K-5
3. Teacher release during tier 1 instruction
4. Collaborative learning (purposely planned)
5. Grade appropriate text

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the 2022 -2023 school data finding that only 42% of students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA will increase by 11% points, equating to 53% of students proficient in ELA. Students with disabilities and Black students will increase to 41% proficient in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLT.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
3. Using walkthrough data, leadership team will monitor classroom instruction, focusing on standards-based lessons and AVID strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

KMES utilizes Open Court K-5 (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: strong) or remediation in ELA. For Tier 2 services, we are using Magnetic Reading Foundations to Fluency across grades 2-5. We will also be using Corrective Reading (ESSA evidence rating: strong).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Open Court program specializes in phonemic awareness and phonics. The program also works with foundational word formation and vocabulary. Magnetic Reading Foundations of Fluency works specifically with fluency within Reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

All staff will be trained by the district and Literacy Coach in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

Person Responsible: Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This training will be given to staff by October 31 along with other ongoing strategic professional development based on teacher need.

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

Person Responsible: Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Submitted lesson plans will be monitored weekly.

Content-relevant strategies will be taught to teachers to apply during whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 30, 2023 followed by walkthroughs to monitor implementation.

Following analysis of assessment results, instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied and utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text using research-based instructional strategies to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

Person Responsible: Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: District/ State assessments will be analyzed quarterly. Grade level assessments will be analyzed bi-weekly.

Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development will take place in grades K-2.

Person Responsible: Jade Wright (jade.wright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: All teachers will be Open Court trained by October 27, 2023. Training will be followed up by walkthroughs to monitor implementation.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the 2022 -2023 school data finding that only 45% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math proficiency will increase by 13% in all groups to reach a school proficiency of 58%. Students with disabilities and Black students will increase to 41% proficient in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

1. Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. Administrative team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions should be focused on Costa's higher levels of questions (Inquiry).
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts or procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use one procedure for a given situation. Procedural fluency builds on a foundation of conceptual understanding, strategic reasoning, and problem-solving (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010; NCTM, 2000, 2014). All students need to have a deep and flexible knowledge of a variety of procedures, along with an ability to make critical judgments about which procedures or strategies are appropriate for use, in particular, situations (NRC, 2001, 2005, 2012; Star, 2005). Procedural fluency extends students' computational fluency and applies to all strands of mathematics.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Trainings will be given to staff during the month of August 2023. Additional trainings will be given to individuals as needed. The rest of the steps are ongoing.

Students will be presented with a problem of the week focused on the fluency benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Problem given and completed one a week throughout the year.

PD will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of fluency across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: As needed throughout the year.

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

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Done during the Tuesday planning meetings with teachers.

Teachers will implement a fluency center that focuses on developing appropriate automaticity within the grade-level benchmarks through game-based learning.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Daily/as needed

The ELL and ESE teachers and students will receive support from the RCS and EES.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: As needed throughout the year.

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

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Within daily lesson plans and activities.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the 2022-23 data, 27% of students were proficient. 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 create a product using the five E's. (Engage, Explore, Explain, Extend, Evaluate).

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 24%, equating to 51% of the students being proficient. Students with disabilities and Black students will increase to 41% proficient in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Data will be collected for ALL progress monitoring for ATSI subgroups (Black, SWD). Using collected data, students will be placed in appropriate intervention groups to address growth and proficiency needs.

- Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures
- Engage in active learning experiences
- Process learning using inquiry-based activities

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- o Academic discourse through collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts. WICOR (AVID)
- o Active learning experiences: 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: Interactive science notebooks provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence in science as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, and more. WICOR (AVID)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Teachers will look at all standards (including fair game standards) and plan hands-on lessons.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Trainings will be given to staff during the month of August 2023. Additional trainings will be given to individuals as needed. The rest of the steps are ongoing.

Students will take part in inquiry Wednesdays twice a month.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Two times per month

PD will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of basic Science content.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: PD will be offered/given on the October PD day and as needed. Math coach meets with grade level during common planning each Tuesday. Through a needs assessment, PD will be planned for and delivered.

The math coach will co-plan and model lessons as needed.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: As needed throughout the year.

Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on learned content and remediate/accelerate based on student level.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: -Planning Tuesdays -PLC's -Coaching discussions with teachers

The ELL and ESE teachers and students will receive support from the RCS and EES.

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: As needed throughout the year.

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

Person Responsible: Katrina Hinson (katrina.hinson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Incorporated within lessons plans and lessons/activities throughout the year.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Over the last few years, the teacher turnover rate at KMES has been extremely high. Due to a high turnover rate, a positive culture and environment may be difficult to maintain.

Measurable Outcome:

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

After the 2023-2024 school year, teacher retention will be greater than 85%.

Monitoring:

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

During the 23-24 school year, each teacher will meet with the principal for a STAY interview on two separate occasions. Formal and informal feedback will be given on a timely basis. High expectations will be communicated and upheld.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Stay interviews will be utilized to collect data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Stay interviews bring an opportunity for each teacher to have a one-on-one conversation with the principal.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Conduct a stay interview with each teacher in the fall and spring.

Person Responsible: Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Fall-By end of November Spring-By end of May

Teacher shoutouts are given weekly in schoolwide newsletter. By the end of October, every teacher will receive one piece of positive feedback.

Person Responsible: Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Ongoing (Principal will celebrate success after each progress monitoring)

Plan teacher/staff appreciation event once a month to celebrate hard work and to thank the staff for giving their best each day.

Person Responsible: Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: One event per month

Leave a positive note on the teacher desk during every walkthrough/visit to the classroom.

Person Responsible: Nathan DeRight (nathan.deright@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Each classroom visit

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Previous data and available resources were looked at before moving forward with Title I funding dollars. To better assist our teachers and students, KMES looked to purchase supplemental resources such as Magnetic Reading materials for ELA and Graham Fletcher kids for Mathematics. KMES is also hoping to purchase a school-wide Accelerated Reader license for student use. All funding option above will be brought to SAC to be discussed and agreed upon.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Given the 2022 -2023 school data finding that only 39% of students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

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

Given the 2022 -2023 school data finding that only 34% of students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency will increase 12% to equate to 51% of students being proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency will increase 17% to equate to 51% of students being proficient.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLT.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
3. Using walkthrough data, leadership team will monitor classroom instruction, focusing on standards-based lessons and AVID strategies.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wright , Jade, jade.wright@osceolaschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Grades K-2 use Open Court Foundational Skills (What work clearinghouse evidence: strong). Grades 1-5 use Language Power (Visible Learning effective size-Phonics Instruction: .70 Strong). Pre-teaching lessons are used for grades 2-5 (Visible Learning effective size-Strategy to integrate prior knowledge: .93 Strong). Lexia Core 5 is used for grades K-5 (ESSA Rating: Promising).

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Open Court addresses fluency and vocabulary. Lexia Core 5 addresses fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Language Power addresses fluency and vocabulary. Pre-teaching lessons focus on vocabulary and comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|--|
| Professional Development- Open Court for new teachers that have not been trained in the program. Lexia Core 5 training was given to all teachers to instruct how to use Lexia to determine the individual paths for each student as well as intervention materials available for the students. | Wright , Jade, jade.wright@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy Coach sets up "teachers observing other teachers" for teachers to observe best practices in one another's classrooms. Certain teachers model practices/ activities while others watch, take notes, and fill out a reflection form. | Wright , Jade, jade.wright@osceolaschools.net |
| Literacy coach meets with the school literacy council one a month. Items discussed include the curriculum unit plans, testing, data, school-wide events, etc. Literacy coach takes notes and email committee with all discussed information and next steps (with dates and/or timeline). | Wright , Jade, jade.wright@osceolaschools.net |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is shared with all stakeholders during SAC meetings. Stakeholders are given the opportunity to review and give input, addressing any questions or concerns. The SIP is also available on the school website- www.osceolaschools.net/kmes.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Parent/Family engagement nights are planned throughout the school year. During such events, parents and students have the opportunity to interact with teachers and take part in various activities. These nights target how parents can help the school and their child's learning in the home environment.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Through intensive interventions that are scheduled, students are provided remediation and enrichment to enhance their individual academic goals.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The FIT (Families In Transition) provides our students with resources based on each family's individual needs. The Multicultural Department focuses on our ELL families and how they can provide classes and resources for the parents as well as the students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Title I funds were used to purchase an additional school counselor to meet the emotional and socioemotional needs of the students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

The school uses AVID as a school-wide initiative to promote college and career readiness. KMES also has the Innovation, Diversity, and Opportunity (IDO) program, which gives all students access to the various career paths that may be in their future. Students learn and work with fields such as the environment, philanthropy, the service industry, government, media/journalism, and the health industry.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

KMES utilizes the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) model to help address the behavioral needs of students. A multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) model is used to help track student learning. Magnetic Reading was purchased using Title I funds to help students in grades 2-5 on comprehension.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Academic coaches met with leadership to determine the professional development opportunities that would be best for our students. Coaches are targeting specific programs/processes utilized by teachers daily. In ELA, teachers will be trained in Open Court and Benchmark. Math teachers will be given professional development on how to better use math/number talks within their daily lessons. Coaches also attend teacher planning days every Tuesday, bringing up to date information and use PD when necessary.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) classes provide academic and social skills support to VPK students to prepare them for kindergarten and give students the real-world school environment they will experience throughout their academic careers. The STAR Early Literacy assessment is used to measure the literacy rates of our students and the state-required CLASS assessment to measure the fidelity of instruction in our VPK classrooms.