

School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

St. Cloud Elementary School

2701 BUDINGER AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

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.

Education which inspires all to their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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

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.

We worked with staff and SAC committee to analyze school wide data for trends and areas which need additional support to improve student achievement.

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 monitored through monthly Stocktake meetings with the leadership team. As well as monitoring action steps to ensure they are occurring, and the response is producing the desire outcome. Our SIP is a fluid living document in which all stakeholders will actively monitor and adjust 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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	62%
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) 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B

	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	1	25	19	20	17	15	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	16	6	5	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	19	31	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	40	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	21	27	17	29	0	0	0	0	116

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	2	2	9	18	28	0	0	0	0	61

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	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	14	30	22	16	25	18	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	23	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	27	25	0	0	0	52
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	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	14	31	30	26	22	19	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	5	0	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	23	33	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	42	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	21	27	17	29	0	0	0	116

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	2	8	6	10	10	11	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
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*	51	44	53	59	48	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				58			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			27		
Math Achievement*	50	46	59	62	44	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				56			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			9		
Science Achievement*	45	43	54	43	46	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	70	59	59	67			71		

* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275
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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	23	Yes	2	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	51			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	58			

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	47			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	53			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

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	51			50			45					70
SWD	13			9			0				5	67
ELL	28			34			33				5	70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			46			18				3	
HSP	51			46			42				5	68
MUL	60			60							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	53			53			56				4	
FRL	41			40			35				5	70

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	59	58	57	62	56	33	43					67
SWD	24	38	48	30	32	23	17					
ELL	44	46	52	49	49	26	29					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	47		64	47		60					
HSP	57	56	53	60	54	39	36					67
MUL	48	55		52	64							
PAC												
WHT	66	62	61	66	60	21	52					
FRL	48	54	54	50	49	32	37					57

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	61	52	27	63	26	9	56					71
SWD	43	47	31	47	42	17	40					80
ELL	39	45		41	0		32					71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	30		44	20		55					
HSP	55	50	29	52	14	5	45					72
MUL	56			69								
PAC												
WHT	68	59	38	78	41		68					
FRL	50	43	27	53	13	5	31					77

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	49%	44%	5%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	49%	3%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	49%	16%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	41%	3%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	40%	3%	51%	-8%

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.

5th grade science students showed the lowest performance. Students are showing growth in day to day learning and school-wide progress, however this is not evident in FCAT State Science data. There is a disconnect between the learning observed and application to standardized measures. Students with Disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance/proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline in the 2022-2023 school year was 4th and 5th grade Math. Some factors that contributed to the decline are the lost instructional time, student attendance, length of assessment, and teacher capacity for the new standards and assessment.

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 data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th and 5th grade Math FAST. Based on the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment, 4th grade scored 50% compared to the state average that was 61%. 5th grade scored 44% compared to the state average that was 55%. Some factors that contributed to the decline are the lost instructional time, student attendance, length of assessment, and teacher capacity for the new standards and assessment.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade math. Some new actions that we had taken are implementing Math iii attached to the math block and detailed-oriented standards-based lesson planning.

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

According to the EWS data we saw a significant increase in students with attendance below 90% from 110 students to 142 students, which is an increase in 32 students.

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

Our highest priorities are culture and climate, teacher retention and professional development.

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 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.

Fifth grade proficiency data showed a decrease in overall science achievement and below district and state average. Strengthening our science content knowledge across all grade levels will increase our ability to ensure high levels of learning for all students. Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.

Measurable Outcome:

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

St. Cloud Elementary will increase their overall student achievement in Science from 43% to 55% proficient. The SWD subgroup will be 50% proficient on the Spring Science 2024 NGSSS.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored through Unit Assessments, Mock Exams, and Canvas Science Review. In addition, Fair Game standards will be monitored through our Houses of Science program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Gardner (laurie.gardner@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 effectively provide opportunities for inquiry-based learning through collaborative structures, engagement in active learning experiences (such as labs, activities, and investigations), and authentically using their interactive science notebook to process their learning, then student engagement and learning will increase.

1. Students will participate in academic discussions through collaborative structures (AVID strategies)
2. Students will engage in active learning experiences, such as inquiry-based labs.
3. Students will process learning using interactive science notebooks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. When students are given the opportunity to openly discuss and explain their thinking they gain a deeper understanding of the content/concept being learned. Students are also able support opinions with evidence. (WICOR AVID)
2. When students are able to explore a science concept in an inquiry-based learning environment (lab) they are able to gain a better understanding of the topic and and connect it to real world experiences. (WICOR AVID)

3. Interactive notebooks allow students to write observations, record data, develop their understanding of the content being learned in a safe environment. They are then able to refer back to their notebook to review, edit and add to their depth of learning. (WICOR AVID)

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. Provide Professional Development to teachers on how to engage students in inquiry-based lessons using hands-on lessons aligned to the grade-level content. The PD will provide support in identifying and understanding the critical content to teach as well as highlighting effective instructional practices- including cooperative learning, Science phenomena, scientific practices, and exploration.
2. Professional Development and instructional support for new teachers. This includes modeling, co-teaching, and/or co-planning lessons with staff as well as supporting PLCs with identifying the critical content to teach and determine the best ways to engage the students in the content.
3. Science Coach will collaborate with teachers to plan, create, and implement STEM lessons aligned to their grade curriculum. The lessons will engage students in critical concepts using technology and hands-on activities. The STEM lessons will occur in the STEM lab, which is available to be reserved by teachers and/or grade levels.

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

By When: May 31, 2024

AVID Site Team will highlight and demonstrate collaborative structures monthly to increase student engagement in all subject areas.

Person Responsible: Taylor Kuwik (taylor.kuwik@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

SCE will host a STEM night for parents and students to actively engage with school staff and community partners to gain a deeper understanding of the Science standards.

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

By When: March 5, 2024

ESE teachers will meet with MTSS coach monthly to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

We will host Houses of Science in 5th grade to review science standards.

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

By When: April 1, 2024

The AVID Team will track data on the implementation of cooperative learning structures in Science via Walk throughs.

Person Responsible: Taylor Kuwik (taylor.kuwik@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

5th grade general education, ELL, and SWD that perform below grade level on the beginning of year NWEA Science assessment will be invited to participate in Science tutoring before school. A pre and post test will be used to assess progress toward proficiency.

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

By When: October 6, 2023 rsvp date for participation, tutoring to begin October 9, 2023.

#2. 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 data from May 2023 ELA FAST Assessment, reading proficiency average is 52% for students in grades 3-5, while the average reading proficiency for ESE students in grades 3-5 is only 15%. One area of focus is to close the achievement gap for our ESE students with a goal of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reading proficiency outcome goal for all students will be 53%.

Reading proficiency outcome for ESE students will increase to a minimum of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

- Administration and leadership team will monitor collaborative grade-level teams to ensure the fidelity of instructional implementation via data chats with grade chairs, plc leads, and individual teachers.
- Weekly assessments to monitor learning; data will be analyzed frequently to provide opportunities for reteaching and enrichment.
- School Stocktake meetings will take place every month and the literacy coach will report progress to administration and leadership team on the ELA area of focus.
- Progress monitoring for Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions will be documented by teachers and collected by administration and the MTSS coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Genevieve Souza (genevieve.souza@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.)

- Benchmark Advance reading curriculum for all Tier 1 reading instruction.
- Small group intensified instruction for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading students, including ESE students, using evidence-based interventions such as Benchmark Advance, Open Court, FCRR, and other SDOC approved intervention resources.
- Explicit vocabulary instruction for ESE and ELL students using Pre-Teaching materials created by SDOC using Benchmark Advance resources.
- AVID/WICOR strategies will be embedded into reading lessons to scaffold and support all learners.
- Students receiving intensive intervention from an ESE certified teacher will receive targeted instructing using Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, or Sondag reading interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Core Curriculum: Florida Benchmark Advance 2022, Florida Edition (FLDOE Review of Instructional Materials Percent of Alignment- K-96.78%, 1st-100%, 2nd-85.94%, 3rd-81.25%, 4th-79.68%, 5th- 95.31%)
- Differentiated instruction provided in small group in classroom (teacher-led) during the 90-minute block of reading. (What Works Clearinghouse Recommend Practice with strong evidence)
- Pre-Teaching Lessons (Visible Learning effect size – Strategy to integrate prior knowledge: .93 strong)
- FCRR Student Center Activities (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)
- Corrective Reading (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong)
- Reading Mastery (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: potentially positive effects)

- Early Interventions in Reading (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: potentially positive effects)
- Words Their Way (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate)
- Open Court Foundational Skills (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: Strong)
- Sonday System (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)
- Lexia Core 5 (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong)

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.

Literacy Coach to provide Benchmark Advance planning support to teachers to ensure high levels of Tier 1 instruction.

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

By When: May 29, 2024

Teachers will use assessment data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners through the MTSS process.

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

Literacy Coach will provide Professional Development for teachers in Grades 3-5 to help them implement Open Court Word Study during Tier 1 instruction.

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

By When: November 17, 2023

PLCs will analyze data from formative assessments to monitor progress and identify student needs for reteaching and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

Literacy Coach will provide monthly professional development opportunities through Coaches Corner.

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

By When: May 29, 2024

Weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of instruction and to identify supports needed for teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Amy Flowers (amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

We will host a Literacy Night for parents and students to actively engage with school staff and community partners to learn ways to develop stronger literacy skills at school and at home.

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

By When: January 25, 2024

ESE teachers will meet with MTSS coach monthly to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

#3. 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.

Math proficiency averages 53% for students in grades 3-5, while the average Math proficiency for ESE students in grades 3-5 is only 13%. One area of focus is to close the achievement gap for our ESE students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math proficiency outcome goal will be 58% for students in grades 3-5. Math proficiency outcome goal for ESE students 3-5 will increase to 16%.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs to ensure high levels of Tier 1 instruction are taking place. Weekly assessments to monitor learning; data will be analyzed frequently to provide opportunities for reteaching and enrichment. Progress monitoring for interventions will be documented and collected.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Gardner (laurie.gardner@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.)

Math coach will provide PD for teachers on how to use manipulatives and additional resources to support all our K-5 students with building a foundational understanding of concepts before attempting to move to the procedural steps. Teachers will also be trained on BrainiacCamp to use for modeling in their classrooms. For our ESE students, we will implement hands-on manipulatives to support building core Math concepts. Teachers will use scaffolding within whole and small groups settings to ensure all student needs are reached. They will also embed content focused vocabulary within their content instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hands 2 Mind, the evidence indicates, in short, that manipulatives can provide valuable support for student learning when teachers interact over time with the students to help them build links between the object, the symbol, and the mathematical idea both represent. Research, also, shows that the systematic use of visual representations and manipulatives may lead to statistically significant or substantively important positives gain in math achievement. (Hands 2 Mind)

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.

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

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

By When: May 31, 2024

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

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

AVID Site Team will highlight and demonstrate collaborative structures monthly to increase student engagement in all subject areas.

Person Responsible: Taylor Kuwik (taylor.kuwik@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

Our school will host a Math and Science night for parents and students to activity engage with school staff and community partners to gain a deeper understanding of the math BEST standards.

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

By When: March 7, 2024

Our school will host a STEM night for parents and students to actively engage with school staff and community partners to gain a deeper understanding of the math BEST standards.

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

By When: March 5, 2024

Math coach will train and implement the Osceola Numeracy Project to use during math Triple I T2 and T3 intervention groups.

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

By When: November 10, 2024

The Math Coach will track data on the implementation of cooperative learning structures in Math via Walk throughs.

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

By When: May 29, 2024

ESE teachers will meet with MTSS coach monthly to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 29, 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

A positive school climate includes a safe environment for students and staff, strong student and staff relationships, and positive academic and behavioral supports for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

2022-2023 Spring Panorama Survey response shows 65% of students answered favorable for sense of belonging. It is our goal to increase school belonging to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Safety and belonging for students will be monitored through Panorama surveys. Safety and belonging for staff will be monitored through a SCES Culture and Climate Staff Survey given three times throughout the school year (Beginning of year, Middle of year, and End of year). Academic growth will be monitored through FAST and STAR data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

St. Cloud Elementary is implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Supports to help motivate students and to reduce negative interactions. Implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Supports will also help support classroom climate. Also, all teachers at Saint Cloud Elementary School are using Harmony Third Edition in their classrooms. In addition, family night events are planned to build strong relationships amongst the school and families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a nationally recognized and evidence-based practice to promote pro-social behavior and reduce disciplinary referrals. The purpose of the program is to recognize and foster positive behaviors and a supportive culture for all stakeholders.

Research shows that Harmony Third Edition has demonstrated positive impacts on children's peer relationships, academic achievement, and social development.

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.

Distribute star bucks and open PBIS store. Procedures for store will be shared with teachers and students by the Leadership Team and Administration during school wide teacher meetings and grade level meetings with students.

Person Responsible: Sean Canning (sean.canning@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

Hang grade level incentive charts in the cafeteria, share procedures with staff and lunchroom monitors, and distribute token economy to earn time in the school's game room.

Person Responsible: Sean Canning (sean.canning@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

School Counselors will implement small group lessons for students experiencing emotional/behavioral difficulties based on panorama data and discipline referrals.

Person Responsible: Lacey Haines (lacey.haines@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

School MTSS Coach will provide resources and tools for teachers to utilize in the classroom for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

The school's Leadership Team will plan family night events to build strong relationships amongst the school and families.

Wellness Night/Book Fair - September 7, 2023

ESE Family Night - October 11, 2023

Family Fall Festival - November 8, 2023

Holiday Night - December 7, 2023

Literacy Night - January 25, 2024

STEM Night/Book Fair - March 6, 2023

End of Year Chorus/Book Fair- May 16, 2023

Person Responsible: Amanda Brown (amanda.brown2@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

Sunshine Committee will be for the purpose of recognizing staff birthdays, weddings, achievements, and to spread kindness. Implement STAR (employee of the month) parking spot, monthly gift card giveaway at schoolwide staff meetings, teacher shoutout bulletin board, and token economy for staff.

Person Responsible: Lacey Haines (lacey.haines@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 31, 2024

MTSS Coach will support the collection of progress monitoring data and adjust interventions in a timely manner if not showing evidence of progress.

Person Responsible: Maida Negron (maida.negron@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 6, 2023

Positive Pals program is implemented throughout the school year to provide an opportunity for new friendships, and role model/mentoring experiences between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers.

Person Responsible: Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 2023

Special Olympics is hosted annually to support inclusion initiatives.

Person Responsible: Kelly Gray (kelly.gray@osceolaschools.net)

By When: March 27, 2024

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)).

The coaching model supports students with disabilities by including ESE teachers in professional planning days (full day), common PLC times, and ensuring scaffolds are provided. Literacy Coach has past experience as a VE Teacher which provides a real-life knowledge base to model best practices for inclusion. Exceptional education teachers are also supported during curriculum training and lesson development. Intervention materials for ESE students with iii on their IEPs are strategically utilized so that students have individualized instruction during that time. Coaches also ensure that ESE teachers have access to district, state, and school-wide progress monitoring data for their identified caseloads. Real-time data is available for reporting and analyzing.

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

N/A

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

Based on 5th grade FAST ELA, 51% of our 5th grade students scored below Level 3.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

St. Cloud Elementary will increase 5th grade student achievement in ELA from 49% to 55% 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.

- Administration and leadership team will monitor 5th grade PLC to ensure the fidelity of instructional implementation via data chats.
- Weekly assessments to monitor 5th grade learning; data will be analyzed frequently to provide opportunities for reteaching and enrichment.
- Monthly School Stocktake meetings will take place every month and the literacy coach will report progress to administration and leadership team on the ELA area of focus.
- Progress monitoring for Tier 2 and Tier 3 5th grade reading interventions will be documented by teachers and collected by administration and the MTSS coach.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Flowers, Amy, amy.flowers@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?

-Benchmark Advance reading curriculum for all Tier 1 reading instruction.

-Small group intensified instruction for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading students, including ESE students, using evidence-based interventions such as Benchmark Advance, Open Court, FCRR, and other SDOC approved intervention resources.

-Explicit vocabulary instruction for ESE and ELL students using Pre-Teaching materials created by SDOC using Benchmark Advance resources.

-AVID/WICOR strategies will be embedded into reading lessons to scaffold and support all learners.

-Students receiving intensive intervention from an ESE certified teacher will receive targeted instructing using Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, or Sonday reading interventions.

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?

-Core Curriculum: Florida Benchmark Advance 2022, Florida Edition (FLDOE Review of Instructional Materials Percent of Alignment- K-96.78%, 1st-100%, 2nd-85.94%, 3rd-81.25%, 4th-79.68%, 5th-95.31%)

-Differentiated instruction provided in small group in classroom (teacher-led) during the 90-minute block of reading. (What Works Clearinghouse Recommend Practice with strong evidence)

-Pre-Teaching Lessons (Visible Learning effect size – Strategy to integrate prior knowledge: .93 strong)

-FCRR Student Center Activities (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)

-Corrective Reading (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong)

-Reading Mastery (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: potentially positive effects)

-Early Interventions in Reading (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: potentially positive effects)

-Words Their Way (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate)

-Open Court Foundational Skills (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: Strong)

-Sonday System (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)

-Lexia Core 5 (ESSA Evidence rating: Strong)

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
Literacy Coach to provide Benchmark Advance planning support to teachers to ensure high levels of Tier 1 instruction.	Souza, Genevieve, genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net
Teachers will use assessment data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners through the MTSS process.	Souza, Genevieve, genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net
Literacy Coach will provide Professional Development for 5th grade teachers to help them implement Open Court Word Study during Tier 1 instruction.	Souza, Genevieve, genevieve.souza@osceolaschools.net
PLCs will analyze data from formative assessments to monitor progress and identify student needs for reteaching and enrichment.	Flowers, Amy, amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net
Weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of instruction and to identify supports needed for teachers and students.	Flowers, Amy, amy.flowers@osceolaschools.net