Narcoossee Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Narcoossee Elementary School

2690 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

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.

Narcoossee Elementary School's mission is:
"Learning and leading. Every one. Every day."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Narcoossee Elementary School's vision is:
"NCES-Where a foundation is built for a successful future."

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
Honeycutt, Wendy	Principal	Monitor SIP monthly through Stocktake Meetings.
Bynum, Rachel	Assistant Principal	Monitor SIP through Monthly Stocktake Meetings
Smith, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Monitor the SIP through Monthly Stocktake Meetings
Staley, Kristen	Instructional Coach	Monitor our ELA SIP goal through monthly Stocktake Meetings. She will also edit as necessary if/when our students' and teachers' needs change.
Whitehouse, Danielle	Instructional Coach	Monitor our Math and Science SIP goal through monthly Stocktake Meetings. She will also edit as necessary if/when our students' and teachers' needs change.
Omer, Julia	School Counselor	Monitor the MTSS process to ensure student progress toward our academic goals. Will attend monthly Stocktake Meetings and report on progress.
Lowe, Ashley	Dean	

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.

Our leadership team met this Summer to determine the SIP goals and develop action steps to work toward our goals. We then presented with staff for input and made changes accordingly. Our first SAC meeting was at the beginning of August and spoke with them about our main academic goals and gave time for any questions or concerns on that.

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))

We will use our monthly Stocktake Meetings to asses our SIP goals and ensure progress toward them. During our Stocktake meetings, we will review progress monitoring data from each of the SIP Focus Areas and make adjustments as needed, if either we aren't on track to meet our goal or if we are on track to exceed our goal. This is a time for us to make sure that in each of the focus areas, we are on pace to meet our goal. We will also edit/change goals or needs dependent on student data review each month at Stocktake.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: B
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	41	33	22	34	32	25	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	7	20	23	4	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	15	17	15	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	57	38	59	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	40	61	72	0	0	0	173
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	34	19	39	88	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	1	0	3	15	17	15	0	0	0	51

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	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	24	57	34	36	37	39	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	5	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	21	29	11	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	24	21	12	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	42	49	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	48	66	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	1	3	18	19	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	6	7	0	1	0	0	0	25
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	24	57	34	36	37	39	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	5	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	21	29	11	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	24	21	12	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	42	49	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	48	66	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	1	1	1	3	18	19	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	6	7	0	1	0	0	0	25
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*	60	44	53	65	48	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				65			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			38		
Math Achievement*	62	46	59	64	44	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				66			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			24		
Science Achievement*	58	43	54	59	46	59	54		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	59	59	66			63		

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
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	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	53			
HSP	54			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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	52			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	65			
HSP	57			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	49			

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	60			62			58					62
SWD	21			30			29				5	24
ELL	44			52			48				5	62
AMI												
ASN	67			72							3	
BLK	56			59		44					3	
HSP	52			55			49				5	62
MUL	86			77							2	

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	70			70			74				4	
FRL	46			51			45				5	65

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	65	65	46	64	66	44	59					66
SWD	24	46	40	28	44	23	29					71
ELL	45	53	40	52	61	39	37					66
AMI												
ASN	80	77		90	92							
BLK	69	74		59	78	50	59					
HSP	59	58	44	59	64	47	58					66
MUL	71	45		64	55		54					
PAC												
WHT	72	74	45	68	67	38	60					
FRL	51	51	39	48	57	41	38					70

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	66	53	38	56	35	24	54					63
SWD	25	38	29	21	23	24	19					50
ELL	39	50	40	39	42	40	42					63
AMI												
ASN	89			78								
BLK	72			56			70					
HSP	60	55	38	49	27	23	43					62
MUL	76			50								
PAC												
WHT	70	51		65	39	30	65					
FRL	51	50	32	42	27	19	44					60

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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide
assessments.</u>

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	60%	44%	16%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	49%	16%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	49%	20%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	41%	18%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	40%	15%	51%	4%

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.**

Our lowest area (since there were no gains last year) was Science with a 58%. This was a drop from
59% in 2022. Our 5th graders in 2022 overall scored higher in all subject areas in comparison to our
2023 5th graders. This is what we think the contributing factor was for our science being so low. Our
2022 and 2023 5th graders also came into 5th grade with a lot of learning gaps in math and another
contributing factor could be too much focus on math and not enough on science.

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

Our greatest decline was in ELA, from a 65% in 2022 to 62% in 2023. When looking at the data by grade level, in 2022 our 5th graders scored 72% in ELA and in 2023 our 5th grade ELA was at 62%. Our 3rd grade ELA data also dropped from 63% in 2022 to 59% in 2022 and our 3rd graders will count twice this year, bringing our overall ELA score down. This data is comparing different students. Last year's 5th graders came into 5th grade with a higher number of students below grade level that the year prior. If we compare student to student, their proficiency decreased by 1% from 4th grade to 5th grade. Our drop in 3rd grade proficiency could be partially because our team had 14 teachers on it and they were split up geographically, which caused a lot of barriers when it came to planning for flexible grouping during intervention time.

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.

We were above the state and district average in every grade level and subject area, except for 4th grade math, where we were equal to the state average, at 61%. 4th grade math was lower because we had high teacher turnover in 4th grade last year.

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

We saw an increase of 1% in overall math, from a 64% to 65%. We worked with teachers on math talks and math discourse a lot last year.

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

The biggest area of concern from the EWS for our school is attendance, and the amount of students who have more than 10% of the year absent.

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

Focusing on MTSS processes to help with our learning gains and LQ learning gains especially with our students with disabilities. Our goal in this particular subgroup is to be at or above 41% proficient.
Focus on support facilitation and what is being taught during that time, also HOW it is being taught during that time.
Focus on ELL strategies, historically, this school has a lower percentage of ELLs but that population has been consistently growing over the last few years.

| **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.

Based on the 2023 data, 62% of our grades 3-5 students scored proficient on the ELA Spring FAST Assessment.

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

Our goal is to maintain or increase our 62% proficiency in ELA. For our students with disabilities, we will improve to 41% proficiency.

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

Student achievement will be monitored through FAST assessment progress monitoring, grade level common assessments and classroom observations through our observation tool. Data will be reviewed and discussed with the leadership team and used in making grade level instructional decisions in PLT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@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.)

Teachers will be using small group reading instruction and flexible grouping of students during intervention times to support learners at all levels. Teachers will integrate AVID and WICOR strategies into instruction and review student data during PLT meetings. The leadership team will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs using our observation tool to collect data and support grade level teams in analyzing and planning for student achievement. Collaborative analysis of assessments can be used to adjust instruction and produce significant learning gains for all students. Early intervention types have an effect size of .26 according to Hattie's research.

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

By meeting with students in small groups during core instruction and during flexible intervention groups, all student needs will be met and addressed to fill learning gaps and improve reading proficiency. Research shows that schools are consistently utilizing and implementing common assessments can increase the speed of student learning (Marzano, 2003; William, 2007).

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Using small group reading to support core reading instruction in K-3 and flexible grouping of all students in K-5, teachers will differentiate instruction and use research-based strategies to meet all student learning needs and improve overall ELA proficiency.

Person Responsible: Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will be monitored by Mrs. Staley through weekly grade level PLT meetings. She will use progress monitoring data to determine teachers who need help with differentiation.

Teachers will participate in monthly MTSS meetings with the MTSS coach to address academic literacy support for Tier 2 and 3 students. The leadership team and grade level teachers will use the data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Once per month, teachers will look at growth data and decide if a student's intervention is working or if that needs to be changed.

Literacy coach will provide on-going professional development, as needed, for Open Court and small group and differentiated reading instruction, as well as provide lesson modeling and feedback.

Person Responsible: Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: She will do coaching cycles once per month with each of our struggling teachers in need of help with ELA. This will include coaching cycles.

As an AVID school, we will continue to utilize AVID and WICOR strategies during instructional lessons. Strategies will be implemented in all K-5 classrooms. Curriculum coaches will provide ongoing professional development to teachers in need of support in these areas.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Mrs. Whitehouse will meet with site team once per month to determine needs. The job of this site team is to provide professional development on AVID strategies each month.

Using prior year and current year data, the interventionist team will work with the grade level teachers to determine which students would benefit from more intensive interventions. The interventionist team will use research-based, explicit instructional materials to support our Tier 2 and 3 reading students. Intervention data will be reviewed throughout the year to determine the program's effectiveness for each individual student.

Person Responsible: Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Problem Solving Team once per month to ensure that students are progressing toward their learning targets. If not, appropriate adjustments will be made.

Conduct classroom walkthroughs to collect data using our observation tool. The data collected will be used in conjunction with progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and team meetings, to support improving student achievement. Data will support the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction and provide information on any necessary additional professional development or instructional coaching or mentoring.

Person Responsible: Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Classroom walkthroughs will be done weekly with data being collected on specific instructional strategies and the implementation of the core curriculum.

The leadership team will identify students present for both FTE windows to create flexible ELA groups based on student need to provide targeted instruction and improve literacy proficiency. These are students who will contribute to the actual school grade calculation.

Person Responsible: Amanda Smith (amanda.smith@osceolaschools.net)

By When: After October FTE, these students will be identified and then we will use Star Reading data to rearrange students based on their progress to that point.

In order to address our ELA proficiency in our ESE student population, we will plan classroom walkthroughs using our observation tool during ELA support facilitation to ensure that our ESE students' IEP goals are being addressed during that time. Our VE teachers will join in during common planning time and will participate in grade level PLT meetings.

Person Responsible: Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will happen once/month that we intentionally walk during the ELA support facilitation. We will use that walkthrough data to determine teachers who need to attend support facilitation training.

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.

Person Responsible: Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Review BOY assessment data in September, and EOY data in May.

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.

Person Responsible: Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Review BOY assessment data in September, and EOY data in May.

#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.

Based on the 2023 data, 65% of our grades 3-5 students scored proficient on the Math Spring FAST Assessment.

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

Our goal is to maintain or increase our 68% proficiency in math. For our students with disabilities, we will improve to 41% proficiency.

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

This area will be monitored through FAST data, administration and leadership walkthroughs, progress monitoring through common assessment planned by PLT's, observation data using our observation tool, and progress monitoring using the Dream Box Learning digital component.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@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. We will utilize flexible grouping during our intervention time to meet the needs of all students as well as use the Curriculum Unit Plans during core instruction. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize AVID strategies during learning.

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

Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts and procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use on 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). Meeting the needs of all students will help fill gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and proficiency. Effect size of early intervention types is .26 according to Hattie's research.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Teachers will intentionally plan for the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for a unit of study. The Math Coach will monitor and assist grade levels in planning.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will be monitored weekly during grade level PLT's as they look at progress monitoring data and informal assessment data.

Meet with the MTSS coach monthly to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of math support for all students. The leadership team and teachers will use this data to determine the most effective plans for flexible grouping.

Person Responsible: Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly. Students will be discussed who are making enough progress to move a tier/change their intervention or are not making enough progress and need to be moved based on need.

Professional Development will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of fluency across grade levels though Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training and follow up training on our Reveal Math Curriculum, and updated Math Talk procedures.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Mrs. Whitehouse will attend weekly PLT meetings and use the student data and her observations to determine which teachers need what specific professional development.

Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect trend data using our observation tool in order to improve student achievement on formative and summative assessments including, but not limited to, FAST. Data gathered through walkthroughs will be utilized to make informed decisions based on student and teacher needs.

Person Responsible: Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly to assess needs based on observations while walkthroughs are conducted.

The Dream Box program will be utilized for all math students weekly to support their individual academic needs. Data from this program will guide decisions regarding Tiered interventions based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Mrs. Whitehouse will present data from Dreambox during our monthly Stocktake Meetings. We will then adjust professional development based on the implementation of the program.

Our school will continue to implement AVID ensuring that students understand the importance of college and career readiness. Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups. The job of this site team is also to provide professional development on AVID strategies through our staff wide PLC once per month.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: A meeting with the AVID site team once per month. The team will look at data from classroom walkthroughs to put systems in place to support teachers with AVID implementation.

Teachers will teach problem-solving strategies and higher-order thinking concepts using the aligned tasks and will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will be monitored during weekly walkthroughs done by the leadership team.

#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 2023 data, 58% of our grade 5 students scored proficient on the Science Spring State Assessment.

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

Our goal is for our science proficiency on the end of year science test to increase from 58% to 62%. For our students with disabilities, we will improve to 41% proficiency.

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

This area will be monitored through the end of year state science test, NWEA Science data, administration and leadership walkthroughs, progress monitoring through common assessment planned by PLT's, observation data using our observation tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@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.)

Teachers will be using small group instruction and flexible grouping of students during core instruction times to support learners at all levels. Teachers will integrate AVID and WICOR strategies into instruction and review student data during PLT meetings when they have given progress monitoring assessments. The leadership team will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs using our observation tool to collect data and support grade level teams in analyzing and planning for student achievement. Collaborative analysis of assessments can be used to adjust instruction and produce significant learning gains for all students.

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

-Academic discourse through collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts (in ideal settings, without judgement and with a clear prompt and structure) WICOR (AVID).
-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) Effect size of early intervention types is .26 according to Hattie's research.

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 2 - Moderate 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 classroom walkthroughs, focusing on highest priority science instructional strategy. Walkthrough should be focused on student learning (not teacher facilitating). What are students doing? Can students describe what they are learning and why they are learning it?

Person Responsible: Wendy Honeycutt (wendy.honeycutt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Meet quarterly as a Leadership Team to look at trends. This will be evidenced on our Leadership Team Meeting Agenda.

Use data (formative assessments and progress monitoring) to discuss student learning gains and plan for professional learning and coaching needs.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: After each NWEA Science (September, January, May) or Science Progress Monitoring (October, February, March).

Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data to content mastery, utilizing the provided Curriculum Unit Plans that include the 5E model.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Review quarterly progress during leadership team meetings as evidenced in our meeting agendas.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

We are choosing to focus on school culture as it specifically relates to school attendance. In the last few years, our number of students chronically absent has grown. We are a large school at nearly 1,500 students and if we don't focus on attendance interventions it doesn't improve.

Implementing both PBIS and Leader in Me establishes expectations and promotes behavioral change. They help reward positive behavior and promote change from the inside-out by focusing on our 7 Habits, which centers around paradigms, principles, and practices that build life-long leadership skills.

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

1. We will increase our average daily attendance rate to 95%.
2. We will be under 100 students chronically absent at the quarterly checkpoints. (Last year, we had 135 students chronically absent.) Our goal would be to be at no more than 25 students chronically absent by the end of quarter 1 and no more than 50 students absent by the end of quarter 2. When we check in quarter 3, we want this number to be under 75 to be on track to meet our goal of being under 100 by the end of the school year.

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

When a student has 5 days absent, they will receive a letter home letting the parents know that their child has been out for 5 days and this affects their academic achievement

Through the Stocktake process, we will review PBIS data and behavior/attendance data and develop interventions as needed for those areas. We will focus our progress monitoring on our students with disabilities and our ELL's as those are both historically low performing subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wendy Honeycutt (wendy.honeycutt@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.)

We will use our district procedural flow chart to use the chronic absenteeism flow chart. This includes 5 day letters to parents, adding chronically absent students to our Problem Solving Team Agenda, putting students/parents on attendance contracts if the student reaches 10 absences, and referring to our social services liason if none of the prior interventions work.

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

With elementary students, we believe there are two factors that determine attendance at school. The first of which is, parent motivation to get their student to school and on time. The second of which is, a student wanting to come to school, because they have a sense of belonging and feel that there are people at school that care about them and they are safe. In years past, we haven't done a good job of monitoring attendance as closely as we should. If we monitor more closely, it will decrease our number of chronically absent students. School Climate has a .53 effect size on student achievement according to Hattie.

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.

We want to make sure students feel safe while on a large campus with almost 1,500 students. We will ensure that every point person around campus has the proper equipment to keep our school safe and secure not only during the day, but also during arrival and dismissal.

Person Responsible: Wendy Honeycutt (wendy.honeycutt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Everyone gets a radio and the proper keys and safety vest during pre-planning week. This ensures a safe learning environment. Additional required equipment will be ordered by November 1st.

Counselors will provide instruction with 1st and 2nd grade students on lessons to help develop interpersonal skills and self-awareness so students can be more successful at school. Lessons will be focused on making friends, kindness, problem solving skills, and study skills. They will also do state mandated safety lessons during the school year.

Person Responsible: Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will be done on a 10-day block rotation with 1st and 2nd grade. Bynum with meet with counselors once per month to ensure implementation.

The Problem Solving Team meets once per month and we will look at attendance and discipline data to determine if our Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions are effective. We will also discuss specific students who may be struggling to self-regulate and possible additional interventions for students who are still not showing progress.

Person Responsible: Wendy Honeycutt (wendy.honeycutt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: We will meet monthly to discuss this data, it will be on the Problem Solving Team Agenda for each meeting.

The leadership team will meet monthly for stocktake to be able to continuously monitor behavior and attendance data that will be gathered through our counselors, attendance clerk, and dean.

Person Responsible: Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will happen monthly at our stocktake meeting. It will be listed as a topic on our Stocktake Agenda.

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).

Our reading coach supports our students with disabilities in three main ways. She supports our new and struggling teachers by performing coach cycles and doing model lessons. This then builds the capacity of our most struggling or novice teachers, which in turn positively effects the students with disabilities in each of their classrooms. We have students with disabilities in about 30% of our primary classrooms and more than 50% of

our intermediate classrooms.

She also ensures implementation of our core phonics and foundational literacy program in grades K-2. This is of paramount importance for our most struggling students, which includes our students with disabilities. A strong foundation in literacy will ensure higher student achievement in the area of English Language Arts exponentially as student progress throught their educational careers.

The third main way that our reading coach supports our students with disabilities is that she runs our before and after school tutoring program, where we target our students in the lowest quartile. She helps select the teachers that will teach the program, chooses the curriculum they will use and does regular walkthroughs during tutoring time to ensure implementation.