

School District of Osceola County, FL

Celebration High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Celebration High School

1809 CELEBRATION BLVD, 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 High School is a challenging and rigorous educational learning community that is dedicated to the preparation of all students to be life-long learners and contributing members in a rapidly changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To accomplish our purpose, our school must be committed to being transparent amongst our strengths and weaknesses to ensure we are helping all students achieve proficiency on all academic content.

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
Todd, Christopher	Principal	Observations, budget and finance, attendance, master calendar, CTE programs, data analysis, department chairs, ELL compliance, athletics
Seabolt, Justin	Assistant Principal	Observations, Math Department, PE Department, Student Services, Testing and & Assessment, MTSS, Let's Talk
Bass, Kendyl	Assistant Principal	
Armour, John	Assistant Principal	
Miglionico, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Osborne, Lauren	Graduation Coach	
Munoz, Beltran	Dean	
Santiago, Keith	Dean	
Martinez Gonzalez, Samuel	Dean	
Taylor, Rokaia	Dean	
Russell, Crystal	Administrative Support	
Callaghan, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Galarza Gonzalez, Idelisse	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Rock, Elizabeth	ELL Compliance Specialist	

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 is assembled in June to discuss SIP goals for the upcoming school year. Then, a select number of members from the leadership team are sent to a workshop in the summer to write the initial draft of the SIP. During this time, surveys from students and staff are analyzed and incorporated into the SIP. In August, the SIP is submitted to the district for initial approval. And in September, the school SAC gets presented with the SAC for their approval.

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))

The SIP is reviewed monthly at the school Stocktake meeting. Any revisions to the plan, especially in the topics of ELA & Math, are made during weekly instructional leadership meetings.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47	46	50	51	45	51	60		
ELA Learning Gains				52			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			50		
Math Achievement*	34	27	38	40	37	38	41		
Math Learning Gains				42			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			40		
Science Achievement*	72	63	64	63	32	40	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	61	66	62	39	48	65		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	86	86	89	94	54	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	61	60	65	57	60	67	63		
ELP Progress	48	46	45	52			58		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	601
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	94

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	4	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	54			
HSP	56			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	52			
HSP	53			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			34			72	69		86	61	48
SWD	22			13			29	50		14	7	38
ELL	31			27			61	49		61	7	48
AMI												
ASN	59			35			82	50		74	6	
BLK	44			27			65	54		44	6	
HSP	40			32			68	63		59	7	48
MUL	52			50			92	81		47	6	
PAC												
WHT	67			47			82	86		67	7	43
FRL	41			31			69	66		41	7	45

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	51	52	50	40	42	38	63	62		94	57	52
SWD	18	35	30	13	28	31	33	29		88	24	50
ELL	30	51	54	31	40	35	48	45		94	51	52
AMI												
ASN	71	61		59	56		69			95	67	
BLK	44	53	47	33	40		64	50		91	46	
HSP	42	51	52	37	41	38	57	58		94	55	53
MUL	63	50		36	40		71	60		85	73	
PAC												
WHT	67	55	43	52	46	36	78	75		94	62	47
FRL	45	48	41	30	33	29	54	61		93	52	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	60	60	50	41	38	40	62	65		94	63	58
SWD	22	43	39	23	42	48	20	35		87	24	33
ELL	35	58	53	32	42	39	46	42		94	55	58
AMI												
ASN	68	60		25	8		67	75		100	75	
BLK	45	51	33	28	28	27	60	81		88	47	
HSP	54	59	55	37	42	42	57	54		95	61	59
MUL	48	55		50	53		60	86		100	78	
PAC												
WHT	73	63	32	55	29	42	72	82		94	68	45
FRL	54	57	46	34	34	36	56	60		91	64	50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	50%	-6%
09	2023 - Spring	42%	43%	-1%	48%	-6%

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

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	36%	2%	48%	-10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	65%	2%	63%	4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	63%	1%

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.

Algebra 1 achievement was at 24% in 2023 (the prior year it was at 22%). Traditionally speaking, students enrolled in Algebra 1 in high school have come to us with skill gaps (based on data we have collected). This task presents an additional challenge for teachers as they are not only tasked with teaching the current standards of Algebra 1 but also bringing students up to par with foundational skill sets that were not mastered in previous grades.

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

Geometry proficiency dropped from 53% to 38%. A majority of the student population taking Geometry during the 2022-23 school year were the same students who contributed to the 22% proficiency rate in Algebra 1 the prior year. Therefore, overwhelming number of students were progressing from Algebra 1 as not proficient and then expected to be proficient in Geometry. If anything, 38% proficiency (given the prior year proficiency for this particular group of students) could be looked at as a positive and not necessarily a negative.

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.

Geometry proficiency was 11% below the state average of 49%. The factors contributing are the same as it was for question #2, however. A majority of the student population taking Geometry during the 2022-23 school year were the same students who contributed to the 22% proficiency rate in Algebra 1 the prior year. Therefore, overwhelming number of students were progressing from Algebra 1 as not proficient and then expected to be proficient in Geometry. If anything, 38% proficiency (given the prior year proficiency for this particular group of students) could be looked at as a positive and not necessarily a negative.

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

Algebra 1 increased 2 percentage points. We engaged in more purposeful PLC's, data discussions, and remediation efforts. Specifically, we started targeting students on their weakest standards with a standards progression report. These students were then remediated the following week based on their weakest standard and then reassessed.

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

Last year, approximately 25% of students had attendance below 90 percent. As of September 2023, that number is approximately 18%. Absences, as well as tardies, continue to be an area of concern for the school. It is important that students are in school as that is the best way for them to be successful with their academics.

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

The highest priorities are related to our seniors who in danger of graduation. These students are in danger for a variety of reasons but are mainly tied to either missing math scores, missing reading scores, low GPA, or missing credits. While we are putting a heavy emphasis on the tracking of these students and providing resources and interventions for them, we are also focused on the students who are currently in Algebra 1, Geometry, English 1, and English 2. We are working on the Tier 1 instruction that is happening in these classrooms to curb the amount of students who might potentially be in danger in later years. Lastly, this can also be tied directly to attendance and tardy issues and making sure students are in class to receive this instruction.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

When considering our overall staff allocation for Celebration High School, we are allocated 212 positions. Out of the 212 positions, 42 (19%) of those are new staff members to Celebration High School. To mitigate the attrition rate of staff from year to year, we are planning to build and improve a positive school culture at CHS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for Celebration High School is to be at or under a 5% attrition rate for all staff.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through staff surveys, interviews (stay and exit), department feedback, leadership team feedback, and student feedback from the Panorama survey. Ultimately, this will be measured for success at the conclusion of the school year when determining what the actual attrition rate is.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@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.)

Providing teachers with opportunities to provide specific feedback and then using that feedback to shift practices at CHS will be a focus this year. Utilizing one-on-one interviews with the principal, staff surveys, staff exit/stay interviews, surveys with students, etc. will be helpful in determining the specific needs and wants of the staff at CHS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers do benefit from the encouragement and support of their collaborative colleagues. This includes both their peers and leadership team (Fani & Ghaemi, 2011). Additionally, positive school culture is built when the school leaders and teachers are working together collaboratively toward a common mission for the good of students.

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.

Principal one-on-one interviews with all staff.

Person Responsible: Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Faculty cookout during Friday night football

Person Responsible: Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Dissemination of weekly staff newsletter (Storm Tracker)

Person Responsible: Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Changing of transition music based on staff recommendations

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Monthly update of staff attrition and hiring

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

We "C" You weekly staff recognitions

Person Responsible: Kendyl Bass (kendyl.bass@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Department chair feedback survey

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Miglionico (jacqueline.miglionico@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Cleaning of campus (custodial)

Person Responsible: Kendyl Bass (kendyl.bass@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

New staff shirts/polos

Person Responsible: Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 2023

Updated school calendar with list of events (e.g., dances, sporting events, etc.)

Person Responsible: Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Teacher "candy bar" in principal's office

Person Responsible: Christopher Todd (christopher.todd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Creation of informal feedback tool related to AVID strategies, ESOL strategies, and ESE strategies for teachers to use for instructional practices

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Focus on tracking of student adherence to tardy policies.

Person Responsible: Samuel Martinez Gonzalez (samuel.martinezgonzalez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Focus on tracking of student adherence to dress code policies

Person Responsible: Beltran Munoz (munozbel@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Focus on tracking of student adherence to electronics policy

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 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.

Only 24% of Algebra 1 students showed proficiency on the end of course exam for the 2022-2023 school year. For Geometry 38% of the students showed proficiency. For Algebra 1, this is an increase from the prior year (22%). For Geometry, we decreased from 53%. It should be noted that there was a new version of the test in the 2022-23 school year as compared to the prior year. It's also important to note that even though Geometry dropped from 53% to 38%, many of these students were students who were still struggling from the prior year and are still working on building foundational math skills. This year, all students from Algebra 1 will be progressing to Geometry this year, however, it is critical that we continue to improve math instruction for all students at Celebration High School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For Algebra 1, the goal is for 35% of the students to be proficient on the state end of course exam. For Geometry, the goal is for 50% of the students to be proficient on the state end of course exam. For both Algebra 1 and Geometry, the goal is to also improve math from 34% to 41% for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Progress toward meeting the goal will be monitored by analyzing data in professional learning communities amongst teachers and Stocktake meetings with school leadership. Data will also be collected, and feedback shared with teachers via classroom observations. District assessments, PLC common assessments, and SAT/ACT data will be used to identify areas of growth for math teachers and students. There will also be a closer monitoring of alignment between instruction and assessment to ensure students are meeting the depth of the standards needed for proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will provide differentiated instruction to students that includes scaffolding as well as providing guidance of the transfer of knowledge from conceptual to application-based learning. In addition, teachers will fully utilize the district and state provided resources; including the BIG-M, Osceola County Math K-12 Resource book, and CUPs. The math coach will model instructional strategies and support teachers. The math coach, as well as the assistant principal, will also conduct data chats and provide feedback regarding the alignment of instruction and assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A more conceptual knowledge and deeper understanding of material may be what is needed to help students transfer what they have learned and apply to other situations (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This inability to transfer knowledge is also related to Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory. This theory, which supports scaffolding, helps students perform within their Zone of Proximal Development. The Zone of Proximal Development is the difference between what students can accomplish on their own and what they can do with the help of a more knowledgeable other (Wass, Harland, & Mercer, 2011). The district provided resources will ensure teachers understand the full extent of the content as well as providing a variety of learning strategies and support. Alignment between the standards assessed on the EOC and

district assessments used by teachers is crucial in helping ensure students are reaching their maximum achievement level (Contino, 2012; Roach et al., 2008; Webb, 2007).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 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.

Identification of teacher needs in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Data analysis from first round of STAR testing to determine strengths of weaknesses of students.

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Round 1 of Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers observing other math teachers for pedagogical ideas.

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Mid-year data-digging session with Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: January 2024

Completion of observation data

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: March 2024

Targeted bootcamp/remediation prep for EOC

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 2024

Weekly Algebra 1 data chats established to discuss mini-assessments which are given every Friday.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Weekly Data chats to discuss strategies for ESE and ELL students with Algebra 1 team.

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Weekly meetings with math coach to discuss use of Khan and ALEKS in all classrooms. Also to discuss and plan for instructional adjustments for the following week.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Weekly standards progression reports created for use of remediation of standards in Geometry classes.

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Weekly Data chats to discuss strategies for ESE and ELL students with Geometry team.

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Classroom walkthrough form focused on AVID strategies, use of cognates, and purposeful grouping developed.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Tasks by planner setup with math coach to establish a system for checking off action steps that are in this SIP.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Purposeful section added for ESE and ELL data and support in PLC notes for Alg 1 and Geo teams.

Person Responsible: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Remediation plans discussed at 1st monthly data chat based off ALEKS data of September.

Person Responsible: Amy Callaghan (amy.callaghan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

#3. 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.

The pass rates for 9th and 10th grade ELA (respectively) for the 2022-23 school year was 41.71% and 44.21%. In comparison to the other schools in the district, this places us at an average to above average percent passing. It should also be noted that the pass rates in the 2021-22 school year was 44% (9th grade) and 49% (10th grade). Even though there was a decrease in both grade levels, it should be noted that there was a new version of the test in the 2022-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 2023-24 school year is to have 55% proficiency for both 9th and 10th grade ELA. For both 9th and 10th grade ELA, the goal is to also improve ELA from 34% to 41% for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Progress toward meeting the goal will be monitored by analyzing data in professional learning teams amongst teachers and Stocktake meetings with school leadership. Data will also be collected and feedback shared with teachers via classroom observations. Use of FAST progress monitoring will also be used to identify areas of growth for ELA teachers and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide learning experiences for all students. Additionally, students will be provided multiple opportunities to show mastery for a particular topic to help increase self-efficacy, classroom collaboration, and conceptual understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Any time a student shows mastery of any concept, this moment should be acknowledged to help increase self-efficacy (Bandura, 1993). A study by Galla, Wood, Tsukayama, Har, Chiu, and Langer (2014) stated, "As students changed (relative to their own mean levels) in their ability to focus on learning activities and to exert effort, as well in their perceived confidence to do well in school, so too did their performance."

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.

Identify teacher classroom needs.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Analysis of PM1 FAST to determine strengths and weaknesses, collaborative grouping, and planning for moving forward.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Small group push in and pull out through Intensive Reading

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Analysis of PM2 FAST to determine strengths and weaknesses, collaborative grouping, and planning for moving forward.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: January 2024

Complete classroom observations

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 2024

Targeted bootcamp/remediation preparation for concordant scores.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Various points throughout year, concluding in April 2024

Use of extra hour PLC developing and analyzing common assessments.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: May 2024

Review and restructure VE support times to enable teachers to strategically support SWDs and enable PLTs

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Analysis of STAR data with ELA team.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Progress Monitoring 1 data sent to ESE case managers to be able to provide plans for remediation and support for their caseloads.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Professional Development session on PM 1 data with ELA teachers.

Person Responsible: John Armour (john.armour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 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)).

The reading coach position is the only allocation funded in this manner. This position works closely with both the assistant principal over ELA as well as the principal to ensure weekly duties and assignments are actionable in meeting the goals set forth by this school improvement plan. Specifically, weekly meetings are held with the reading coach to assign duties as well as collect student and teacher data. In particular, these discussions are focused on our students with disabilities population and how this position is used to support these students. The reading coach is also part of the monthly school stocktake meetings, where data will be reported out to the leadership team. During this time, additional strategies and directives are provided to the reading coach to support the goals of the SIP.