School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

St. Cloud High School

2000 BULLDOG LANE, 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.

St. Cloud High School is a positive, nurturing and safe environment where everyone participates in building pathways to success through rigor, hard work, responsibility and accountability.

Failure is not an option.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Saint Cloud High School creates an environment where students have a sense of belonging while engaging in rigorous academic experiences. Through this, our students will be well-rounded, independent, and prepared to be successful in an ever-changing world.

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
Fancher, Nate	Principal	Instructional Leader of the school and making all final school-based decisions relative to both students and teachers.
Wrona, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction, managing testing and assessments, clerical and community outreach, stocktakes, professional development, new teacher development, and ELL.
Dombo, Robert	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of College and Career, counseling team, managing all CTE courses and certification courses, master schedule, AVID, AP, attendance, and PLCs.
Muller, Shane	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, managing Exceptional Student Education, 504, Gifted, Supplemental Academic Instruction, school facilities, discipline, MTSS, PBIS, Threat Assessment team, and all social media.
Neglia, Alyssa	Other	MTSS Coach, PBIS coordinator, and ESE Student Dean. Implements campus-wide PBIS initiatives. Tracks and monitors MTSS interventions for academic, attendance, and behavior. Creates and provides teacher support for ESE student behavior interventions.
Holmes, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach-Instructional support for all ELA and Reading teachers, managing Khan and Achieve 3000 and STAR. Offers schoolwide quarterly PD specific to needs of teachers by content, and assist new and struggling teachers with pedagogy. Member of MTSS team to assist in assessing student data and providing interventions.
Bruns, Diane	Instructional Coach	Math/Science Coach-Instructional support for all Math and Science teachers, managing STAR and School City. Offers school-wide quarterly PD specific to needs of teachers by content, and assist new and struggling teachers with pedagogy. Member of MTSS team to assist in assessing student data and providing interventions.
Domres, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator in charge of AVIS school-wide, professional development for instructional strategies, AVID Site team, member of the Stocktake team

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.

Multiple SIP meetings were held as we developed this year's focus. Initial meetings included the leadership team, teachers, and staff. Student input was gathered and shared by Ms. Neglia through the

Student Voice Club and our Student Government. Finally, all stakeholders give their input and ultimately their approval through our School Advisory Council. The input gathered clearly showed trends in student attendance and engagement as a common area of concern.

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))

Snapshot data will be collected via forms utilized during walkthroughs. Walkthroughs will be conducted regularly by the instructional leadership team. Data collected during these walkthroughs will reflect our SIP focus (Evidence of planning, student engagement levels, AVID strategies used, etc.). Data will be discussed weekly with the instructional leadership team. As areas of focus are identified, the team will decide what types of professional development will be offered, what teachers may need additional support, and if any revisions to our plan need to be made.

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)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	

DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	47	46	50	51	45	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				51			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			40		
Math Achievement*	35	27	38	39	37	38	32		
Math Learning Gains				41			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			33		
Science Achievement*	59	63	64	65	32	40	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	61	66	75	39	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	93	86	89	97	54	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	62	60	65	59	60	67	61		
ELP Progress	51	46	45	53			55		

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	616
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	50			
HSP	56			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	54			

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	3	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	47			
HSP	53			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY (title row of above table)

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	47			35			59	70		93	62	51
SWD	16			13			30	39		27	6	
ELL	26			28			53	52		42	7	51
AMI												
ASN	62			58				73			3	
BLK	32			15			42	59		55	6	
HSP	40			30			54	63		61	7	50
MUL	45			37			71				3	
PAC												
WHT	58			46			71	85		65	6	
FRL	39			29			53	64		42	7	50

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	51	51	43	39	41	42	65	75		97	59	53
SWD	19	41	36	20	34	38	30	45		97	17	
ELL	26	48	51	28	40	48	44	51		98	68	53
AMI												
ASN	47	60								100	69	
BLK	40	50	38	23	32	29	41	66		100	50	
HSP	43	47	42	34	39	40	60	69		98	57	52
MUL	64	68		56	62		77	85		100	62	
PAC												
WHT	62	56	42	50	45	49	77	87		95	63	
FRL	43	50	45	32	40	42	59	66		98	55	44

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	51	48	40	32	30	33	57	67		98	61	55
SWD	19	29	23	15	29	37	33	30		94	23	50
ELL	23	49	52	21	34	29	29	38		96	60	55
AMI												
ASN	67	59		50								
BLK	36	38	31	24	19	31	48	70		100	48	
HSP	44	47	42	28	32	33	52	63		99	58	53
MUL	62	52		21	23					94	73	
PAC												
WHT	60	50	36	40	29	39	66	72		95	65	
FRL	41	44	38	27	28	35	52	63		97	56	51

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
10	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	50%	2%
09	2023 - Spring	42%	43%	-1%	48%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	40%	-17%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	36%	10%	48%	-2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	65%	-6%	63%	-4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	57%	12%	63%	6%

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.

SWD student proficiency showed the lowest proficiency across all subjects. These students often start the year with a higher achievement gap. Lack of engaging activities and differentiation contribute to low performance for this subgroup.

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

Biology EOC data shows the greatest decline from the prior year, decreasing from 65% proficiency to 59%. Teacher turnover contributed to this decline.

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.

Algebra 1 student proficiency data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (24% compared to 32%). Lack of differentiation to address foundational skill deficits contributed to this gap.

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

Acceleration increased by 3%. Structures were put in place to ensure all students are given the opportunity for acceleration through DE and AP classes, certification programs, and ROTC.

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

Daily attendance is a large area of concern This has been a growing concern in the past few years. Student performance on state-wide math assessments is also a concern we will be focusing on.

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

1. Instructional planning to increase student engagement and differentiation
2. Student attendance
3. Continued growth in our PLC's

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 Differentiation

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.

2022-2023 Spring assessment data show a decrease in proficiency in all academic areas except math (ELA -3%, science -6%, social studies -6%, math remained the same). In order to increase achievement in all subgroups, intentional planning of differentiation strategies based on progress monitoring data must take place within the PLC and individual teacher lesson plans. These strategies need to be incorporated daily to ensure high levels of student engagement in learning.

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

Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase proficiency in ELA by 9%, math by 8%, science by 9%, and social studies by 8%.

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

We will ensure high quality differentiated teaching and learning is occurring every day through weekly snapshot data, timely lesson plan submission and review, purposeful PLC meetings, and aligned professional development support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Dombo (robert.dombo@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 plan for high levels of student engagement through differentiated instruction. Student assessment data will be monitored regularly to address specific student needs.

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

Research shows positive results for full implementation of differentiated instruction in mixed-ability classrooms (Rock, Gregg, Ellis, & Gable, 2008)

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.

Structured classroom snapshot data will be collected weekly to provide evidence of teacher planning for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Robert Dombo (robert.dombo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: weekly

Each PLC will be overseen by one member of the Instructional Leadership Team. ILT member will assist PLCs with data analysis, evidence-based instructional strategies, differentiation, and feedback on planning and lesson plan documentation.

Person Responsible: Robert Dombo (robert.dombo@osceolaschools.net)

By When: monthly

Professional development on differentiated instructional practices in literacy will be provided to ELA, science, and social studies teachers and supported through instructional coaching and within the PLCs by an ILT member.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Holmes (stephanie.holmes@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Professional development in differentiated instructional practices in math will be provided to Algebra and Geometry teachers and supported through instructional coaching and within the PLCs by an ILT member.

Person Responsible: Diane Bruns (diane.bruns@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Algebra 1 and Geometry Teachers will intentionally plan for the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for a unit of study.

Person Responsible: Diane Bruns (diane.bruns@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level fluency benchmarks and provide targeted remediation based on the identified needs of the student using STAR, ALEKS and iXL.

Person Responsible: Diane Bruns (diane.bruns@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Diane Bruns (diane.bruns@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will participate in targeted professional development covering Differentiation, AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes, interactive notebooks and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Holmes (stephanie.holmes@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Instructional coaches will attend PLC meetings to facilitate data analysis, implementation of standard aligned curriculum and planning for differentiation, as well as work with new teachers to improve instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Diane Bruns (diane.bruns@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level BEST benchmarks and provide targeted remediation based on the identified needs of the student using STAR, FAST, and Achieve3000.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Holmes (stephanie.holmes@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing

#2. 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.

Well-implemented programs designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to increase better test scores, higher engagement, increased attendance, higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. These competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively and handling stressful situations. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships that foster an engaging support for learning. It provides the foundation that student need to develop a positive culture they need to be successful young adults. 2022-2023 Panorama survey showed 32% of our students answered favorably about sense of belonging. In 2023-2024 we want to increase by 10%.

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

In 2023-2024 we want to increase favorability of student sense of belonging from 32% to 42%.

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

1. All surveys will be analyzed to identify school's interventions that will support a positive culture within the school.

2. The leadership team will review monthly during stocktakes, PBIS, MTSS (behavior and attendance data subgroups), and develop interventions as required.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Alyssa Neglia (alyssa.neglia@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.)

Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individuals and be focused and flexible to allow for meeting these different needs.

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

A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

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.

Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students: identifying and building on students' individual assets and passions, build an environment of belonging, increase student input and voice through collaboration during their PLC planning time, use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities, and integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self-confidence, self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.

Person Responsible: Alyssa Neglia (alyssa.neglia@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 2024

School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support a positive culture for students and staff development.

Person Responsible: Alyssa Neglia (alyssa.neglia@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 2024

PBIS will be implemented with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school and monitored through the PBIS leadership team and reported out at monthly stock-takes.

Person Responsible: Alyssa Neglia (alyssa.neglia@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 2024

PBIS training will be conducted by the district and the school PBIS leadership team for all staff throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Alyssa Neglia (alyssa.neglia@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 2024

A Student Voice group will be formed comprised of a variety of students to gain input as to their perspective on our school climate. We will listen to their recommendation's to make this school a better place to learn.

Person Responsible: Alyssa Neglia (alyssa.neglia@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 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).

Our Reading Coach provides support to teachers of Student with disabilities. Our Reading Coach provides instructional strategies on differentiation and literacy for teachers to implement while working with SWD's. Our reading coach also works within PLC's to help identify what specific learning targets SWD's need tiered intervention for. The Reading Coach also aides in structuring and monitoring interventions for SWD's during our school-wide intervention period.