

School District of Osceola County, FL

Reedy Creek 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	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Reedy Creek Elementary School

5100 EAGLES TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34758

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.

Reedy Creek Elementary School, in alliance with family and community, will provide a positive, safe environment where children will be challenged academically to become lifelong learners and respectful, contributing members of an ever changing, diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Reedy Creek we care enough about our students to make sure we meet the individual needs of every student.

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
Adams, Katie	Principal	Write, implement and maintain the SIP. Communicate goals associated with the SIP to all stakeholders. Provide support to instructional coaches and leadership team members in achieving SIP action steps.
Langley, Ashlee	Assistant Principal	Assist with writing, implementing, communicating, and maintaining the SIP. Provide support to instructional coaches and leadership team members in achieving SIP action steps.
Reid, Jasmine	Instructional Coach	Coordinate action steps and monitor data in achieving ELA SIP goals. Coach teachers and provide support to meet instructional needs to further the SIP goals and provide professional learning as needed.
Guider, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Coordinate action steps and monitor data in achieving Math and Science SIP goals. Coach teachers and provide support to meet instructional needs to further the SIP goals and provide professional learning as needed.
Cramer, Emily	Staffing Specialist	Monitor achievement of ESE student subgroup using FAST, STAR, and CIM data. Coordinate ESE supports with the VE team and classroom teachers. Attend MTSS Meetings to discuss student progress and provide professional development as needed.
Cowin, Jacira	Instructional Coach	
Singh, Klrn	School Counselor	
Diaz, Ivette	School Counselor	
Delgado, Ruth	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Beahm, Michael	Instructional Coach	

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.

Members of the school leadership team help to draft the first version of the SIP and create school goals based on data from student achievement. The SIP is then shared with teachers and staff during pre-planning to layout plans for the upcoming school year and solicit feedback. Next, the plan is presented to parents/families during the School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. Revisions take place along the way based on feedback from various stakeholders.

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))

Goals for the SIP will be monitored on a monthly basis during our school Stocktake Meetings. At these meetings, the school leadership team will focus on data and feedback surrounding the SIP goals and the progress toward those goals from various assessments. During monthly MTSS meetings, grade levels will meet with the school MTSS Coach and instructional coaches to examine data on a student-by-student basis and determine which interventions are most effective and appropriate for each group of students based on data. Finally, grade level PLCs will meet weekly to examine data from district-created formative assessments. This data will guide the formation of small group instruction and the intervention needs of each grade level. The school Leadership team will revise the plan based on the data discussed from all stakeholders and create action steps to address targeted areas of concern.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	7	107	100	116	106	120	0	0	0	556	
One or more suspensions	2	5	1	1	4	14	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	7	29	27	21	0	0	0	84	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	11	18	17	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	38	61	0	0	0	105	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	47	77	0	0	0	130	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	37	19	50	70	74	49	0	0	0	299	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	7	9	8	33	66	80	0	0	0	203

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	7	6	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	32
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	48	44	44	37	36	29	0	0	0	238	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	6	8	1	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	46	41	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	65	39	0	0	0	107	
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	7	17	8	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	6	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	27
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	48	44	44	37	36	29	0	0	0	238	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	6	8	1	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	46	41	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	65	39	0	0	0	107	
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	7	17	8	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	6	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	27
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*	41	44	53	40	48	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				58			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			41		
Math Achievement*	37	46	59	35	44	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				52			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			45		
Science Achievement*	39	43	54	42	46	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	59	59	51			52		

** 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	224
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
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	23	Yes	2	1
ELL	30	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			

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	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	1	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	44			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	42			

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	41			37			39					67
SWD	23			21			25				4	
ELL	22			22			15				5	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			33			42				4	
HSP	36			32			32				5	66
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	49			51			56				5	73
FRL	37			31			33				5	67

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	40	58	48	35	52	47	42					51
SWD	16	32	33	17	43	50	14					47
ELL	26	52	53	22	35	41	23					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	65		36	59		47					
HSP	36	55	49	31	50	50	35					49
MUL	69			46								
PAC												
WHT	49	63		45	50		56					60
FRL	33	55	50	30	50	43	35					42

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	40	48	41	39	45	45	36					52
SWD	23	20		25	40		31					31
ELL	22	39	45	23	49	60	17					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	40		44	60		33					
HSP	35	48	41	36	49	46	34					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	52		43	29		38					33
FRL	34	47	41	34	39	39	33					47

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	42%	44%	-2%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	49%	-8%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	44%	-7%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	30%	49%	-19%	59%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	41%	1%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	40%	-3%	51%	-14%

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.

The lowest area of performance was 3rd grade Math at 33% proficient. Historically, this group of students has underperformed on progress monitoring assessments, but the percentage of students proficient on FAST increased from 1% on PM1 to 33% on PM3. In addition, the lowest performing subgroups include ESE and ELL students who scored between 15 and 26 percent proficient in ELA, Math, and Science. These areas of low performance may have occurred due to new BEST benchmark implementation, new curriculum, gaps in foundational skills, and/or a lack of collaborative planning.

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

The greatest decline was in ELA proficiency for students in Grades 3-5 which went from 50% proficient in 2021-2022 to 40% proficient in 2022-2023. This occurred in combination with a lack of understanding of new BEST standards, new curriculum implementation, and a lack of collaborative planning.

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 largest gap when compared to the state average was in 3rd grade Math. Reedy Creek students were 33% proficient and the state average was 59% proficient. This occurred in combination with a lack of understanding of new BEST standards, new curriculum implementation, and a lack of collaborative planning.

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

Based on the school district data analysis, Reedy Creek students showed the most improvement in 5th grade Math, where 74% of students showed learning gains. Our school implemented a modified CIM calendar and formative assessments to track data on benchmarks and provide interventions to students.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the number of students with attendance less than 90% and the number of students scoring a Level 1 in ELA or Math.

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

1. ELA proficiency (including ELL and ESE subgroups)
2. Math proficiency (including ELL and ESE subgroups)
3. Science proficiency (including ELL and ESE subgroups)
4. Student attendance

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.

Standards-based data collected from the 2022-2023 FAST show that students performed below grade level proficiency in ELA (43 %) in Grades 3-5. This is attributed to lesson planning that lacks consistency in meeting the full intent of the grade-appropriate benchmarks. There is a need for teachers to collaboratively plan during common grade-level planning sessions and be provided with support from content courses that enable coaches to have an increased overall presence in classroom as it relates to feedback, and modeling is evident as based on student success on the grade-level appropriate benchmarks. Student formative assessments collected during the 2022-2023 school year have also showed a deficiency in being able to successfully complete grade-appropriate benchmark-aligned tasks. There is a need for planning sessions to be structured and aligned to the full intent of the benchmark, as well as resources, student tasks, assessments, scaffolds, and transfer to instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2022-2023, 43% of students in Grades 3-5 scored in the proficient range on the statewide FAST Spring assessment. This included 38% in Grade 3, 41% in Grade 4 and 44% in Grade 5. Through the improvement of instructional planning and practice, the goal for 2023-2024 is to increase student achievement and reach the state average score in each grade level - 51% in Grade 3, 59% in Grade 4, and 55% in Grade 5. This would increase the average for Grades 3-5 to 55%. In addition, ESE students in Grades 3-5 are scoring 26% proficient and ELL students are scoring 23% proficient in ELA. The goal for 2023-2024 for both of these subgroups is also 55%.

Monitoring:

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

The Literacy Coach will meet with teachers weekly to support standards-based planning. The MTSS Team will also meet with grade level teams on a monthly basis to review data and interventions based on results from FAST, STAR, and CIM formative assessments. The ECS and EES will monitor data for our subgroups of students with disabilities and English language learners and contribute to monthly MTSS meetings. Administration and the leadership team will walk classrooms weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@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.)

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies and Benchmark curriculum, as well as the school district curriculum unit plans when planning for instruction with professional learning teams. Teachers and coaches will then monitor student progress using weekly common formative assessments and state-wide progress monitoring through FAST and STAR. Teachers will use Benchmark, Lexia, Open Court and STAR to provide interventions for students who are not meeting progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed above include direct instruction with an effect size of .59; phonics instruction with an effect size of .70; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41 based on the Visible Learning data compiled by John Hattie. In addition, Lexia Core 5 has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

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 will plan weekly with Literacy Coach to support standards-based planning aligned with the rigor of the benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 9/30/23

Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to document trends

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/24/2023

Master Schedule will be selected that allows for consistent frequency of grade level content area planning

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 7/1/2023

Develop content planning protocols that will provide clear expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/3/2023

Provide professional development for teachers regarding expectations and strategies for ESE students

Person Responsible: Emily Cramer (emily.cramer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 1/31/2024

Provide professional development on Lexia English and Pre-Teaching using Canvas to support staff and teachers of ELL students.

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 1/31/2024

Analyze data from PM 2 to provide interventions and remediation for standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 1/31/2024

Use data from STAR Universal Screener to identify areas of need for each student and plan purposefully interventions based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Jacira Cowin (jacira.cowin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/31/2023

Implement ESE accommodation logs through RCS for identified ESE students in combination with the GoalBook application.

Person Responsible: Emily Cramer (emily.cramer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Create ways for students and teachers to monitor student data: 1) classroom data chats 2) ELA student data tracker 3) School-wide FAST data wall

Person Responsible: Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Implement and monitor CIM assessments using Check for Understanding assessments created in School City.

Person Responsible: Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Monitor the data and progress toward SIP goals monthly using data from CIM assessments and progress monitoring during Stocktake Meetings.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Langley (ashlee.langley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Collaborate with Poinciana High School for Latinos in Action to volunteer with ELL students during Reading small groups. The relationships the high school students establish with the students motivate them to participate in class and grow their confidence as they learn new skills.

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 11/1/2023

Establish MTSS procedures and determine which interventions will be used for each grade level and subject.

Person Responsible: Jacira Cowin (jacira.cowin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/31/2023

Literacy Coach provides PD for Words Their Way intervention for ELA

Person Responsible: Jasmine Reid (jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/31/2023

#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.

Standards-based data collected from the 2022-2023 FAST and Star Data show that students performed below grade level proficiency in Math (38%) for Grades 3-5. This is attributed to lesson planning that lacks consistency in meeting the full intent of the grade-appropriate benchmarks. There is a need for teachers to collaboratively plan during common grade-level planning sessions and be provided with support from content courses that enable coaches to have an increased overall presence in classroom as it relates to feedback, and modeling is evident as based on student success on the grade-level appropriate benchmarks. Student formative assessments collected during the 2022-2023 school year have showed a deficiency in being able to successfully complete grade-appropriate benchmark-aligned tasks. There is a need for planning sessions to be structured and aligned to the full intent of the benchmark, as well as resources, student tasks, assessments, scaffolds, and transfer to instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2022-2023, 37% of students in Grades 3-5 scored in the proficient range on the statewide FAST Spring assessment. This included 30% in Grade 3, 28% in Grade 4 and 41% in Grade 5. Through the improvement of instructional planning and practice, the goal for 2023-2024 is to increase student achievement and reach the state average for each grade level - 59% in Grade 3, 61% in Grade 4, and 55% in Grade 5. This would increase the average for Grades 3-5 to 58%. In addition, ESE students in Grades 3-5 are scoring 22% proficient and ELL students are scoring 26% proficient in Math. The goal for 2023-2024 for both of these subgroups is also 58%.

Monitoring:

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

The Math/Science coach will meet with teachers weekly to support standards-based planning. The MTSS Team will also meet with grade level teams on a monthly basis to review data and interventions based on results from FAST, STAR, and CIM formative assessments. Administration and the leadership team will walk classrooms weekly to review trends and adjust planning sessions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@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.)

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies and Benchmark curriculum, as well as the school district curriculum unit plans when planning for instruction with professional learning teams. Teachers and coaches will then monitor student progress using weekly common formative assessments and state-wide progress monitoring through FAST and STAR. Teachers will use DreamBox, the Osceola Numeracy Project, and STAR to provide interventions for students who are not meeting progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed above include feedback with an effect size of .73; distributed practice with an effect size of .71; direct instruction with an effect size of .59; worked examples with an effect size of .57; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41, according to Visible Learning data compiled by John Hattie. In addition, DreamBox Learning has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

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.

Master Schedule will be selected that allows for consistent frequency of grade level content area planning and consistent intervention time for mathematics.

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 7/10/2023

Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to document trends using a classroom walkthrough tool

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning 8/10/2023 and continuing through 5/30/2024

Instructional coaches will conduct weekly planning sessions with grade level teams to implement district curriculum unit plans and determine appropriate instructional strategies to meet the needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Implement ESE accommodation logs through RCS for identified ESE students in combination with the GoalBook application.

Person Responsible: Emily Cramer (emily.cramer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Create ways for students and teachers to monitor student data: 1) classroom data chats 2) Math student data tracker 3) School-wide FAST data wall

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Implement and monitor CIM assessments using Check for Understanding assessments created in School City.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Monitor the data and progress toward SIP goals monthly using data from CIM assessments and progress monitoring during Stocktake Meetings.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Langley (ashlee.langley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Math/Science Coach provides PD for ONP to be used during Math Intervention time.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/31/2023

#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.

Standards-based data collected from the 2022-2023 FAST show that students performed below grade level proficiency in Science (37 %) in Grade 5. This is attributed to lesson planning that lacks consistency in meeting the full intent of the grade-appropriate benchmarks. There is a need for teachers to collaboratively plan during common grade-level planning sessions and be provided with support from content courses that enable coaches to have an increased overall presence in classroom as it relates to feedback, and modeling is evident as based on student success on the grade-level appropriate benchmarks. Student formative assessments collected during the 2022-2023 school year have showed a deficiency in being able to successfully complete grade-appropriate benchmark-aligned tasks. There is a need for planning sessions to be structured and aligned to the full intent of the benchmark, as well as resources, student tasks, assessments, scaffolds, and transfer to instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2022-2023, 37% of students in Grade 5 scored in the proficient range on the statewide Spring Science assessment. Through the improvement of instructional planning and practice, the goal for 2023-2024 is to increase student achievement and reach the state average score of 51%. In addition, ESE students in Grade 5 are scoring 25% proficient and ELL students are scoring 15% proficient in Science. The goal for 2023-2024 for both of these subgroups is also 51%.

Monitoring:

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

The Math/Science Coach will meet with teachers weekly to support standards-based planning. The MTSS Team will also meet with grade level teams on a monthly basis to review data and interventions based on results from grade level unit assessments, NWEA and CIM formative assessments. The ECS and EES will monitor data for our subgroups of students with disabilities and English language learners and contribute to monthly MTSS meetings. Administration and the leadership team will walk classrooms weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Adams (katie.adams@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.)

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies and the school district curriculum unit plans when planning for instruction with professional learning teams. Teachers and coaches will then monitor student progress using common formative assessments, CIM, and NWEA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed above include feedback with an effect size of .73; direct instruction with an effect size of .59; cooperative learning with an effect size of .41; and inquiry-based teaching with an effect size of .31 based on Visible Learning data compiled by John 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.

Monitor the data and progress toward SIP goals monthly using data from CIM assessments and progress monitoring during Stocktake Meetings.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Langley (ashlee.langley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Implement formative assessments to monitor student progress based on data.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Instructional coaches will conduct weekly planning sessions with grade level teams to implement district curriculum unit plans and determine appropriate instructional strategies to meet the needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Monitor ELL content-based glossary usage in Science classrooms. EES will provide modeling and resources for teachers not using content glossaries as part of their Science instruction.

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 9/1/2023

Review data for ESE subgroup at monthly Stocktakes using formative assessments and data from School City and other formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Emily Cramer (emily.cramer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 11/1/2023

Review data for ELL subgroup at monthly Stocktakes using formative assessments and data from School City and other formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 11/1/2023

Provide professional development regarding AVID strategies for collaboration and reading strategies.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Monitor data for students scoring at Level 1 on NWEA Science and create an intervention plan based on the lowest performing standards.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/30/2023

#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.

Reedy Creek Elementary will work to promote a positive culture and environment specifically relating to students who are part of our Early Warning System. These students are often not engaged in learning and may have attendance and behavior barriers that prevent them from being academically proficient. Therefore, AVID, strategies should be used during instruction to increase student engagement and PBIS will be used to help support positive behavior. In addition, programs will be implemented to encourage student attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Data indicate that 130 students in Grades 3-5 scored at a Level 1 in Math and 105 students in Grades 3-5 scored a Level 1 in ELA. This represents approximately 33% of students in Grades 3-5. Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to lower this to 20% as measured by the Spring FAST results in ELA and Mathematics. In addition, ESE and ELL students scoring in the Level 1 range would also decrease to 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional coaches will help teachers plan for instruction to meet the needs of these subgroups. Student achievement will be monitored throughout the school year using common formative assessments, and statewide FAST progress monitoring. Data will also be collected from classroom walkthroughs to determine which instructional strategies are being implemented to increase student engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Adams (katie.adams@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.)

Instruction will include AVID strategies to promote student engagement. Lexia Core 5, DreamBox Learning, and STAR. Attendance and discipline data will also be monitored monthly through the PBIS site team and MTSS Meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed above include feedback with an effect size of .73; distributed practice with an effect size of .71; direct instruction with an effect size of .59; worked examples with an effect size of .57; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41 based on Visible Learning data compiled by John Hattie. In addition, DreamBox Learning has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

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.

Provide professional development in AVID strategies using the school district Curriculum Unit Plans.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Guider (rebecca.guider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/7/23

Implement a New Student Orientation Program to welcome students, stress the importance of coming to school, and encourage family involvement.

Person Responsible: Klran Singh (klran.singh@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 1/10/2024

Implement a daily attendance award to encourage and reward daily student attendance.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Langley (ashlee.langley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 9/1/2023

Recognize students with 97% attendance or better at Quarterly Awards ceremony

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/30/2023

Provide monthly school-wide student incentives that can be earned using Eagle cash as part of our PBIS initiative.

Person Responsible: Ashlee Langley (ashlee.langley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Implement Eagle of the Month program to reward students who demonstrate positive behavior in the classroom by following the school-wide PBIS expectations. Students will participate in an assembly and special reward if selected by their teacher.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz (ivette.diaz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/1/2023

Host family engagement nights such as Math Night, Literacy Night, Multicultural Night, and Sports Medicine (STEM) Night to increase parent engagement.

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 5/1/2024

Host programs to increase family engagement for ELL students (including participation in Hispanic Heritage Month and Multicultural Night).

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 5/1/2024

Review data for ESE subgroup at monthly Stocktakes using formative assessments and data from School City and other formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Emily Cramer (emily.cramer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 11/1/2023 and continuing through 5/2024

Implement ESE accommodation logs through RCS for identified ESE students in combination with the GoalBook application.

Person Responsible: Emily Cramer (emily.cramer@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/2023

Implement classroom labels for ESOL students

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/31/2023

Help teachers begin a word wall and provide PD for ESOL teachers (Focus: 3rd-5th grade classrooms).

Person Responsible: Ruth Delgado (ruth.delgado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 10/31/2023

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)).

Reedy Creek Elementary School has a Literacy Coach that plans with teachers and collaborates with grade level teams as needed. The Literacy Coach works with the MTSS Coach to determine and provide interventions based on school-wide data and the school district reading plan. The Literacy Coach also conducts classroom walks with administrators to analyze trends in data among our school. As a member of our MTSS team the Literacy Coach works with SWD (Students With Disabilities) and ELL (English Language Learners) to identified needs and to support students accordingly.

As a Title 1 school, we utilize Title 1 funds to employ a full-time Math and Science Coach who plans with teachers and collaborates with grade level teams as needed. Additionally, we also have 2 teachers that support student achievement through the instruction of a Science STEM block for all students K-5. We also have 3 full time paraprofessionals that support student achievement during instructional intervention time.

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

Standards-based data collected from the 2022-2023 FAST show that students performed below grade level proficiency in ELA in Grades K-2. This is attributed to lesson planning that lacks consistency in meeting the full intent of the grade-appropriate benchmarks. There is a need for teachers to collaboratively plan during common grade-level planning sessions and be provided with support from

content courses that enable coaches to have an increased overall presence in classroom as it relates to feedback, and modeling is evident as based on student success on the grade-level appropriate benchmarks. Student formative assessments collected during the 2022-2023 school year have also showed a deficiency in being able to successfully complete grade-appropriate benchmark-aligned tasks. There is a need for planning sessions to be structured and aligned to the full intent of the benchmark, as well as resources, student tasks, assessments, scaffolds, and transfer to instruction.

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

Standards-based data collected from the 2022-2023 FAST show that students performed below grade level proficiency in ELA (43 %) in Grades 3-5. This is attributed to lesson planning that lacks consistency in meeting the full intent of the grade-appropriate benchmarks. There is a need for teachers to collaboratively plan during common grade-level planning sessions and be provided with support from content courses that enable coaches to have an increased overall presence in classroom as it relates to feedback, and modeling is evident as based on student success on the grade-level appropriate benchmarks. Student formative assessments collected during the 2022-2023 school year have also showed a deficiency in being able to successfully complete grade-appropriate benchmark-aligned tasks. There is a need for planning sessions to be structured and aligned to the full intent of the benchmark, as well as resources, student tasks, assessments, scaffolds, and transfer to instruction.

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

Through the improvement of instructional planning and practice, the goal is to increase student achievement and reach 50% proficiency in kindergarten, 1st and 2nd Grade. This would increase the average for grades K-2 to 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Through the improvement of instructional planning and practice, the goal for 2023-2024 is to increase student achievement and reach the state average score in each grade level - 51% in Grade 3, 59% in Grade 4, and 55% in Grade 5. This would increase the average for Grades 3-5 to 55%. In addition, ESE students in Grades 3-5 are scoring 26% proficient and ELL students are scoring 23% proficient in ELA. The goal for 2023-2024 for both of these subgroups is also 55%.

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.

Literacy Coach will meet with teachers weekly to support standards-based planning. The MTSS Team will also meet with grade level teams on a monthly basis to review data and interventions based on results from FAST, STAR, and CIM formative assessments. The ECS and EES will monitor data for our subgroups of students with disabilities and English language learners and contribute to monthly MTSS meetings. Administration and the leadership team will walk classrooms weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Reid, Jasmine, jasmine.reid@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?

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies and Benchmark curriculum, as well as the school district curriculum unit plans when planning for instruction with professional learning teams. Teachers and coaches will then monitor student progress using weekly common formative assessments and state-wide progress monitoring through FAST and STAR. Teachers will use Benchmark, Lexia, Open Court and STAR to provide interventions for students who are not meeting progress.

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?

The interventions listed above include direct instruction with an effect size of .59; phonics instruction with an effect size of .70; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41. In addition, Lexia Core 5 has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

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
Teachers will plan weekly with Literacy Coach to support standards-based planning aligned with the rigor of the benchmarks.	Reid, Jasmine, jasmine.reid@osceolaschools.net
Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to document trends	Adams, Katie, katie.adams@osceolaschools.net
Master Schedule will be selected that allows for consistent frequency of grade level content area planning	Adams, Katie, katie.adams@osceolaschools.net
Develop content planning protocols that will provide clear expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices.	Adams, Katie, katie.adams@osceolaschools.net

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

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

During the September 2023 SAC meeting, Reedy Creek Elementary School will present and discuss the SIP and the UniSIG budget with all stakeholders to gather feedback. Reedy Creek will share flyers with students and post on the school website and social media at least seven days prior to the meeting in English and Spanish to announce and invite stakeholders to participate and provide input. In addition, the school will provide translation of other meeting documents like the agenda. The SIP and meeting documents will be disseminated on the school website, social media, and a hard copy will be available in the school's front office. The SIP's progress will be monitored during the December 2023 SAC meeting by sharing data to evaluate the progress of the plan and the effectiveness of the activities and determine if an amendment is needed.

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

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School plans to create a positive culture with parents, families, and stakeholders by providing several meetings throughout the school year for families to be involved in the development of the school's Parent and Family Engagement (PFEP) plan, PFEP summary/brochure, school-parent compact and use of the PFEP funds for improved academic achievement. The PFEP documentation will be made available in both English and Spanish at the school as well as on the website. Notifications will be disbursed from the school through automated calls/texts, flyers and invitations, School Advisory Committee Meetings, Parent-Teacher conference nights, social media, and the school website. Building Capacity events will be held throughout the year inviting families to participate in learning activities specific to academic goals.

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School will implement AVID WICOR strategies to foster positive culture and environment by cultivating and stimulating positive relationships, participation, and engagement to increase student achievement as indicated in the areas of focus. In addition, Reedy Creek Elementary School will implement PBIS strategies to support positive behavior throughout the school. Teachers will participate in collaborative team meetings and planning sessions with instructional coaches to implement these strategies into classroom lessons.

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School coordinates the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state, and local services such as: Title 1, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education for disadvantaged students; Title II, Part A for the implementation of various Professional Development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title II for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of enrichment activities; Title IX for the implementation and support of students and families in transition; and Perkins Center for Technical Education for the implementation of postsecondary opportunities and experiences.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School ensures that student skills are improved outside the academic subject areas by providing several strategies such as the integration of supplemental paraprofessional personnel to assist with high-needs intervention areas; the registration of teachers to attend Professional Development conferences in areas such as AVID programs; and the employment of a tiered support system for students that is provided by targeted MTSS strategies and personnel.

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School will have a STEM program on campus for students in grades K-5. The focus of this class provides students with an in-depth curriculum that introduces students to careers in science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics, with a specialized emphasis on sports medicine.

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School has an MTSS coach who works with grade level teams to systematically monitor data, track students' progress, and create and implement interventions to increase student achievement. This system identifies students who need support with both academics and behavior. Reedy Creek Elementary also has two school counselors and a social worker who assist with addressing problem behavior and connecting families with necessary services. In addition, the school uses the PBIS program to provide positive behavior supports for students, as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior interventions as needed.

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

Reedy Creek Elementary School provides staff with professional development based on need throughout the school year. Teachers may participate in AVID, ESE, ESOL and PBIS learning opportunities, as well as planning sessions with instructional coaches.

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

Reedy Creek Elementary school will invite preschool children and their families to attend our family engagement nights that center around resources and expectations with Reading, Math and Science. These resources will be available to families attending to support the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs.