Celebration K 8 School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Celebration K 8

510 CAMPUS ST, Celebration, FL 34747

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.

Celebration K-8 School will educate each student to his/her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebration K-8 School will be a nationally recognized, top performing school in the state. (#1)

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
Weeden, Gary	Principal	Instructional Leader of the school and making all final school-based decisions relative to both students and teachers. Mr. Weedan oversees the fidelity of building a strong climate and culture that fosters quality pedagogy. Mr. Weedan includes also stakeholders including but not limited to the School Advisory Council (SAC), PTA and community assets to support overarching goals.
Connolly, Elisa	Assistant Principal	
Pollzzie, Rose	Assistant Principal	4-5 grade
Jones, Deborah	Assistant Principal	Elementary K-2
DeSimone, Anna	Dean	K-3 Dean
Shawna Long, Shawna Long	Reading Coach	Literacy K-8

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.

The school leadership team includes instructional coaches (mathematics and literacy), student services (school psychologist, RCS, school counselors and school social workers), and deans (behavioral

intervention specialist) to design, plan and execute a holistic improvement model whose mission and vision is to close achievement gaps, support prosocial behaviors, and expand equity to all students. Data mining from FAST PM3 was used to analyze sub -group proficiencies and deficiencies. Attendance data, academic data, and discipline data was also considered in an effort to develop intervention plans and monitoring of progress. Three pillars of focus will be used to model data. Business partners are used as community assets to volunteer, teacher initiatives, and donating school supplies and supplemental technology. We have collaborated with Celebration Foundation, AmeriFactors, LaRosa Realty, and local retired teachers to use as resources for teacher and student incentives.

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))

Instructional leadership team will use the SIP to assess progress using a Stocktake model. Each area of focus will be color coded to assess the team's task and progress toward successful execution of assigned team member tasks. Each meeting we will present data to measure progress from the previous meeting. The group will analyze the data to determine if the action items have been implemented correctly, and whether they were effective. Each meeting will include next steps to be completed before the next meeting. One member of the team will be responsible for ensuring that the step is implemented correctly and that supporting data is brought to the next month's meeting.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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: A

		2019-20: A
		2018-19: A
		2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History		
DJJ Accountability Rating History		

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	44	23	29	28	22	30	36	212
One or more suspensions	0	10	5	5	9	4	13	29	29	104
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	24	41	55	65	200
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	26	26	54	37	35	181
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	47
	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	0	0	6	7	7	4	33	38	32	127

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	21	25	16	20	19	25	27	21	37	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	29	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	17	26	52	47	59	205
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	26	27	64	60	54	235
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	17	16	17	26	52	47	59	249
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	15	17	16	10	15	25	30	25	153

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
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	21	25	16	20	19	25	27	21	37	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	29	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	17	26	52	47	59	205
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	26	27	64	60	54	235
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	17	16	17	26	52	47	59	249
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	15	17	16	10	15	25	30	25	153

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
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*	65	48	53	67	50	55	73		
ELA Learning Gains				62			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			60		
Math Achievement*	67	47	55	66	42	42	71		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				67			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			54		
Science Achievement*	66	46	52	71	45	54	74		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	67	68	88	53	59	90		
Middle School Acceleration	92	75	70	92	45	51	85		
Graduation Rate		77	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		59	53		67	70			
ELP Progress	67	53	55	53	73	70	70		

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	675
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	67			
HSP	70			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	63			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	57			
HSP	62			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	59			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	65			67			66	88	92			67
SWD	22			25			24	67			6	38
ELL	52			61			56	81	93		7	67
AMI												
ASN	69			82			67				3	
BLK	57			51			48	88	90		5	
HSP	55			61			58	84	93		7	68
MUL	68			70			81				4	
PAC												
WHT	73			72			74	92	91		7	66
FRL	50			55			51	75	92		7	59

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	67	62	49	66	67	60	71	88	92			53
SWD	22	37	36	25	48	42	26	52				32
ELL	51	60	50	54	62	53	50	80	88			53
AMI												
ASN	79	63		83	79		83					
BLK	49	64	50	40	60	56	46	90				
HSP	56	60	51	56	63	57	58	83	90			49
MUL	77	65		74	81		82					
PAC												
WHT	76	65	46	74	68	61	81	93	94			69
FRL	55	56	44	53	60	52	61	81	81			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	73	71	60	71	61	54	74	90	85			70
SWD	27	55	48	36	52	39	23	46				25
ELL	64	75	74	67	65	66	60	80	78			70
AMI												
ASN	85	91		83	57		78	100	91			
BLK	44	57		44	52		20					
HSP	67	68	59	64	58	56	64	85	77			69
MUL	88	90		74	55		60					
PAC												
WHT	78	71	62	78	64	56	84	97	89			74
FRL	61	65	51	60	53	42	52	75	69			56

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	61%	44%	17%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	39%	14%	47%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	40%	22%	47%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	49%	20%	58%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	39%	16%	47%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	44%	17%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	72%	40%	32%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	39%	5%	48%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	49%	8%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	61%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	48%	14%	55%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	41%	13%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	35%	19%	44%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	40%	20%	51%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	40%	53%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	36%	64%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	63%	23%	66%	20%

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.

6. Science was our lowest component. 5th grade dropped 7 points and the school dropped 10 points overall. 2 of the 4 teachers were new to teaching and the school. Support was lacking due to the Science coach being in the classroom.

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

Science showed the greatest decline particularly 5th grade dropped 7 points. Little emphasis was placed on science instruction in 5th grade with the newer teachers. The science coach was covering classrooms and was unable to provide the usual supports.

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.

3rd grade math was the only grade level and subject area that was lower than the state average. A combination of new teachers in the area as well this being the first-time 3rd graders were state tested. Good growth was shown from PM1 to PM3 which may also point to these students being at a lower starting point from 2nd grade.

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

From Progress Monitoring 2 to Progress Monitoring 3 6th grade math had the greatest increase of 36 points. Specific students were scheduled into intervention period to target specific needs. Additionally, the math team offered before school tutoring 4 days a week for the entire second semester.

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

Incoming second grade students discipline data indicates 15 students had two or more referrals in first grade.

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

Tier 1 Instruction across Math, Science, and ELA. Providing support for ESE students to achieve success with grade level curriculum leading to increased proficiency on statewide testing. Decrease student absences school-wide. 257 students were not present for 90% of the school year.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

SWD was our lowest performing ESSA Group with a composite score of 38%

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

Increase composite score for SWD to 45%

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

Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, reviewing ESE data at each district common assessment, FAST, Star, Teenbiz, Alecs, Dreambox, and HD Word and Open Court. These checks will be done monthly at Stock Take Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anna DeSimone (anna.desimone@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 will receive math intervention that provide systemic instruction and understanding of mathematical ideas. Clear and concise mathematical language will be taught to help students communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts. Reading interventions will take place during intensive reading in grade s6-8 and during Triple I time in grades K-5. Teachers will help students build decoding skills using HD Word in Middle School and Open Court in elementary. Additionally, students will participate in purposeful fluency building activities to help students read effortlessly. (What Works Clearinghouse)

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

Focusing on students building their decoding skills and reading fluency will first help students read the text and then understand the text they read. Students will further develop automaticity by using these interventions. The results of six randomized controlled trials of mathematics interventions show extensive support for combinations of the following components of explicit and systematic instruction, teacher demonstration, and student verbalization." (National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 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.

FDLRS will provide training to the whole faculty on two Wednesday afternoons during the first quarter. The training will focus on behavior management which is a barrier identified by staff to student learning for

SWD students. This training will focus on classroom strategies for all students but focus on classroom-based interventions for SWD students.

Person Responsible: Deborah Jones (deborah.jones@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 13th and October 14th

VE teachers will meet with Math and ELA PLT monthly to plan accommodations for upcoming units of study. VE teachers will ensure that accommodations are being implemented on daily basis in class. VE teachers will work with gen. ed. teachers to intervene when students do not show proficiency on common formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Elisa Connolly (elisa.connolly@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Expectation will be set during PLC meeting on Wednesday, 9/30

Each PLT will write a Smart Goal specifically for students which is tied to proficiency and not simply to growth.

Person Responsible: Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 2nd quarter

Identify SWD bubble students after PM2. This will include students who are on the brink of showing a learning gain in either Math or ELA.

Person Responsible: Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

By When: January after PM2 data is available.

SWD bubble students will be grouped according to areas of need in ELA and Math. Interventions will be developed to specifically target areas of need.

Person Responsible: Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: January-April

#2. 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.

In 2022-2023, 257 students were not present for 90% of the school year. Chronic absence — missing 10 percent or more of school days due to absence for any reason—excused, unexcused absences and suspensions—can translate into students having difficulty learning to read by the third-grade, achieving in middle school, and graduating from high school (Attendance Works)

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

For 2023-2024, we will lower this number by 10% or 25 students. By increasing students' attendance, proficiency level will rise in both reading and math.

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

We will implement interventions for students who are approaching multiple absences. These interventions will be monitored in Stocktake meetings and MTSS meetings. Additionally, guidance counselors and clerical staff will monitor students' attendance and contact parents and send home letters when students have 5 or more absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@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.)

Implement a 3- tiered approach to lower chronic absenteeism. Tier 1 is a schoolwide focus on attendance. Tier 2 targets students who have missed over 10% of school days and Tier 3 targets students who have missed the most school.

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

A 3-tiered approach will allow for the school to focus on creating a culture that values attendance, allow for systematic tracking and interventions for students exhibiting signs of chronic absenteeism and secure support for our most chronically absent students. Attendance Works has developed strategies at each one of these tiers that are researched based and proven.

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.

Engage parents and students by educating all on the importance of attendance (Attendance Matters)

Person Responsible: Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin in October and continue each month for the remainder of the year.

Include research about chronic absenteeism in Pride Press each month. Research from Attendance Matters will be included.

Person Responsible: Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning in October and in each monthly newsletter.

Recognize students who are demonstrating good attendance through quarterly rewards programs (Attendance Matters)

Person Responsible: Anna DeSimone (anna.desimone@osceolaschools.net)

By When: At the end of quarters 1, 2, and 3

Review data monthly to identify students who are chronically absent. This is defined as having missed 10% of school days.

Person Responsible: Rose Pollzzie (rose.pollzzie@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin at the start of October and be done at the beginning of each month.

Implement one or more of following Tier 2 interventions from Attendance Matters:
- Contact parents
- Counselor meeting with student
- Engage teacher in monitoring and recognizing attendance

Person Responsible: Deborah Jones (deborah.jones@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly beginning in October.

Implement Tier 3 interventions for the most chronically absent students. Evidenced based interventions include:
- Student Attendance Success Plans
- Meeting with students and parents
- Home Visit from social worker
- Involve nurse in health plan

Person Responsible: Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning in October and continuing monthly.

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

The literacy coach will be working with VE teachers to ensure that iii and Pride time are using interventions that are researched based and tailored to individual needs. The coach will also be working with the MTSS team to spot trends in our SWD data on Star, HD Word, FAST and Checks for Understanding assessments. The coach will also be developing CIM lessons in the spring to target bubble ESE students as they prepare for PM3. PM2 data will be used to determine the students and standards to targeted during this intervention.