School District of Osceola County, FL

Osceola County School For The Arts School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Osceola County School For The Arts

3151 N ORANGE BLOSSOM TRL, Kissimmee, FL 34744

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.

It is our Mission to provide a community that nourishes and nurtures the personal integrity and creative expression of our students in their pursuit of artistic and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Osceola County School for the Arts will grow to become an artistic showcase where the community gathers to appreciate the artistic talents and academic achievements of its students.

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
Neal, Dennis	Principal	Principal oversees all team members Stocktake, holds team members. accountable for results, asks questions that challenge and support, actively engages in problem solving.
Dolhon , Sugeily	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of College and Career Readiness Administrator for Math and Science Departments Stocktake: facilitator, prepares Principal for meeting
Gilford, Lisa Renee	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction Master Schedule, Curriculum and Instruction Stocktake
Alexander, Jennifer	Math Coach	Math Coach, MTSS Interventions, Math Curriculum Coach, Professional Development, Math Stocktake PP. PLC
Ortiz, Ivett	Dean	Oversees MTSS, Academic Interventions, Student Discipline
Karaki, Rikako	School Counselor	Will provide support for staff and students in areas of mental health and behavior, assigned students for counseling case load, oversee various performing art majors
Gonzalez, Catherine	Reading Coach	Reading/ ELA Curriculum Coach, Professional Development, ELA Stocktake

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.

School Leadership Team:
School based leadership will collaborate during the initial leadership meeting and review areas of focus regarding student achievement scores. We will review data and analyze areas of improvement and discuss interventions currently in place and make necessary adjustments as needed. Adjustments to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be made during monthly Stock take meetings where we will review current instructional trends and interventions based on student data using the Continuous Improvement Model.

Teachers and School:
During pre-planning staff will be presented areas of focus leadership had reviewed. With student achievement and other general schoolwide data, they will discuss as a Professional Learning Team (PLT) content specific areas that they feel impact their content area and provide suggestions based on recommended best practices focused on student achievement that can be delivered during daily instruction.

Parents, Students, and Business Partners:
During our initial SAC meeting, leadership will present to parents, students, and community members school wide achievement data previously discussed at leadership and with school-based staff. Parents will have the opportunity to discuss their observations regarding student achievement and provide their input on areas for improvement based on school data. These reflections will be shared with the leadership team during Stocktake meetings and added to the school improvement plan.

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))

Monthly Stocktake meetings will be used to progress monitor the implementation of SIP goals and areas of focus. During each meeting, data will be discussed pertaining to each area of focus along with interventions and support systems. Adjustments to interventions, professional development plans, and instructional focus will be completed in order to align our efforts to our goals using a continuous improvement model.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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	0	0	0	0	6	4	13	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8
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	1	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	1	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	23
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	10
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	1

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*	86	46	50	89	45	51	87		
ELA Learning Gains				71			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			65		
Math Achievement*	87	27	38	87	37	38	81		
Math Learning Gains				65			58		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75			66		
Science Achievement*	90	63	64	83	32	40	81		
Social Studies Achievement*	95	61	66	94	39	48	94		
Middle School Acceleration	96			96	38	44	87		
Graduation Rate	99	86	89	100	54	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	82	60	65	85	60	67	80		
ELP Progress		46	45				76		

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	91
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	635
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	912
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	100

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	55			
ELL	89			
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	83			
HSP	90			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	89			

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	60			
ELL	79			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	86			
HSP	82			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	79			

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	86			87			90	95	96	99	82	
SWD	47			63							2	
ELL	75			90			86	100	95	75	7	
AMI												
ASN	97			95			100	100			4	
BLK	85			69			83			80	5	
HSP	84			87			90	97	97	76	7	
MUL	76			82							2	
PAC												
WHT	90			87			89	94	94	94	7	
FRL	83			83			86	94	95	82	7	

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	89	71	67	87	65	75	83	94	96	100	85	
SWD	67	60						54				
ELL	79	78	71	86	66	80	68	90	91			
AMI												
ASN	94	78		100	74		94	100	100			
BLK	95	70	83	91	68		86	95	100			
HSP	86	71	66	86	65	75	78	92	94	100	85	
MUL	92	83		89	71		93					
PAC												
WHT	92	67	59	89	63	68	91	100	97	100	82	
FRL	84	68	60	80	63	65	79	94	91	100	80	

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	87	69	65	81	58	66	81	94	87	100	80	76
SWD	40	53	45	50	50							
ELL	72	73	69	76	66	70	73	95	91			76
AMI												
ASN	91	70		96	82		89	100	100			
BLK	85	66	50	79	54	50	83	89	88	100	72	
HSP	85	66	69	78	57	63	77	92	84	100	75	71
MUL	89	76		80	63		82	100				
PAC												
WHT	92	73	67	86	55	81	89	100	91	100	91	
FRL	83	69	68	77	57	62	70	94	86	100	83	

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	85%	47%	38%	50%	35%
07	2023 - Spring	88%	39%	49%	47%	41%
08	2023 - Spring	89%	40%	49%	47%	42%
09	2023 - Spring	84%	43%	41%	48%	36%
06	2023 - Spring	80%	39%	41%	47%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	40%	43%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	100%	39%	61%	48%	52%
08	2023 - Spring	93%	48%	45%	55%	38%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	87%	35%	52%	44%	43%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	40%	51%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	36%	51%	48%	39%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	65%	26%	63%	28%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	63%	35%	66%	32%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	57%	32%	63%	26%

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.

ELA
Our subgroup for Exceptional Student Educaton (ESE) within ELA showed proficiency of 41% within the

Intensive Reading classes teachers focused on the individual needs of the students and worked one-on-one with students and in small groups. Teachers regularly assessed students to gauge learning and skill deficits and used that information to determine and create rigorous lessons. Our bottom quartile learning gains showed 58% with overall learning gains schoolwide at 61%. Many of our teachers were new to Osceola County School for the Arts (OCSA) in recent years and this could have been attributed to the data. Vocabulary was a weaker area for our school as well based on review of data.

MATH
Our bottom quartile showed 70% proficiency while learning gains showed 63%. Use of Intensive math classes and Mulit-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) we were successful in targeting our bottom quartile as shown by these students having 7% more in learning gains compared to our Tier 1 students. Lowest area of Learning Gains was the 6th grade compact at 47% and Geometry at 35%. So, these are two areas where the change in curriculum is extreme from previous year that may be creating part of this discrepancy from the rest of the department.

PANORAMA
Our panorama data showed that Sense of Belonging scored at 50% for both fall and spring administration with no change from fall to spring. School Safety score was at 69% in spring administration. The percentage favorable has consistently dropped since Fall 2020 (82%). 10th graders had the lowest score in School Safety, as well as Black/African American students.

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

ESE
Subgroup showed a decrease to 41%. This decline could have been attributed to limited focus on individual and small group implementation focused on the individual students' areas of need. Also, due to our specific master schedule, common planning has been difficult in recent years to attain.

MATH
Lowest area of Learning Gains was the 6th grade compact at 47% and Geometry at 35%. These are two areas where the change in curriculum is extreme from previous year that may be creating part of this discrepancy from the rest of the department.

The data gathered from the Panorama survey demonstrates that the following are areas of improvement were:
* Sense of Belonging for class of 2027 had the lowest sense of belonging scores since the 21-22 Panorama data. This cohort started middle school in a hybrid digital model which could have hindered their social emotional development. School Safety was down by 4% points from the start of the 22-23 SY.

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.

When comparing the district and state average with Osceola School for the Arts, it is evident that we excelled in nearly all areas tested during Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3) FAST testing. In comparing our ELA scores with district and state averages we had 15% of our students below grade level (level 1 and 2) when compared to the district average of 59% and state average of 52%. In reviewing our math PM3 data, we were below the state average of 48% of students below grade level (level 1 and 2) in math and district average of 58% below grade level by achieving 8% of our students below grade level average. Our school also achieved an average below both state and district level in low performing students when reviewing the Algebra EOC scores since the state average for Algebra was 51% below grade level, district average was 61% below grade level, and our school performed at 10% below grade level. In

reviewing Geometry EOC our school also had the lowest level when compared to the district average of 52% and state average of 63% below with our school average of 13%.

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

ELA:
Level 3, 4, and 5 8th and 10th graders showed growth of 26 points and 24 points, respectively, from PM1 to PM3. 6th graders grew 18 points; 7th graders grew 12 points, and 9th graders grew 15 points. Schoolwide, all grade levels decreased the number of level 3s from progress monitoring 1 to progress monitoring 3 and increased the number of level 4s and 5s. Intentional academic intervention groups were created during intervention time in order to meet the academic needs of students. Groups were interchanged according to the progress of students after reviewing multiple `data point such as student grades and attendance to AI time.

MATH:
Out of 204 Middle school students (not in Algebra or Geometry), showed increased proficiency from progress monitoring 1 40 students proficient to progress monitoring 2 of 117 proficient, to progress monitoring 3 of 179 proficient. Algebra maintained 90% proficiency with new standards and geometry with new standards increased from 83% to 88% proficiency. Intentional academic intervention groups were created during intervention time in order to meet the academic needs of students. Groups were interchanged according to the progress of students after reviewing multiple `data point such as student grades and attendance to AI time.

PANORAMA:
The data component from last year's Panorama data that showed most improvement is Emotion Regulation scores (from 47% to 51%) Looking at data by grade levels, 6th graders and 9th graders demonstrated the highest increase in emotion regulation scores from the Fall 2022 administration to the Spring 2023 administration. Small mentoring groups were provided to students during lunches who were observed in need to emotional regulation based on panorama and student discipline data.

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

In review of the Early Warning System (EWS) data, there appears to be two areas of concern regarding student achievement:
1. 10 total students achieved a level 1 in the state math exam
2. 8 total students achieved a level 1 in state ELA exam

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

1. Provide our students with rigorous curriculum focused on small group instruction.
2. Provide staff opportunities to discuss student data and create assessments based on missed learning opportunities during structured Professional Learning Team (PLT) time. This will allow for PLT's to more forward towards the next stage in the PLT process.
3. Provide professional development on content specific strategies such as WICOR specific to content areas and how it can be implemented into the PLT's.

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.

Based on ELA ESE subgroup, we currently achieved 41% in proficiency. This is a critical point as compared to other subgroups.

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

We will work with our staff and plan to achieve ESE ELA proficiency from 41% to 50%.

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

* The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through formative assessment data. Data will be reviewed during Professional Learning Team (PLT) meeting times monthly. Literacy Coach will monitor.
* Students will be identified based on PM 3 results. Claire McBride, ESE support specialist, and Catherine Gonzalez, Literacy Coach, will monitor.
* Students will be placed in small groups and notified that they will meet for 30 minutes every other day with their assigned reading endorsed teacher. Literacy Coach will monitor using classroom walkthroughs.
* Research based strategies, based on specific grade level standards, will be implemented and assessed by the assigned teacher. Literacy Coach will monitor by classroom visits.
* Data will be reviewed every 2 weeks by teacher and literacy coach to determine progress and areas of concern. Literacy Coach will monitor using student data and visits during Professional Learning Team times.
* ESE students' scores for ELA PM1 and ELA PM2 will be monitored for improvement, as well as the STAR scores in October and March to alter academic intervention groups(AI groups).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Gonzalez (catherine.gonzalez@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.)

Level 1 students will be placed in Intensive Reading classes and monitored for progress via STAR, BEST PM1 and PM2, and Achieve 3000 data that is pulled weekly for review. WICOR strategies will be used throughout the students will also be afforded the opportunity to attend Academic Intervention (AI) sessions offered during the intervention block which will provide opportunity to use Achieve 3000.

Two to three days a week, ESE students who do not meet proficiency in ELA will be supported through small group, standards-based instruction by a reading endorsed teacher, in addition to Tier 1 classroom-based instruction during the reading class.

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

Research and standards-based strategies will be used during all instruction with a reading endorsed teacher and progress monitored through frequent formative assessments. On various independent measures, the AVID program was correlated with better student outcomes, and students who participated were measurably more successful that students who did not, even when compared to like peers (Maddock and Torres, 2020).

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.

Professional Learning will be provided to staff on WICOR in the classroom on a monthly basis as a PLT and individually.

Person Responsible: Catherine Gonzalez (catherine.gonzalez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: March 30, 2024

Review of PM1 data with Stocktake team and create academic intervention groups (AI groups). Groups will be changed based on student progress during PM2 data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 30, 2024

Review of PM1 data with Stocktake team and create academic intervention groups (AI groups). Groups will be changed based on student progress during PM2 data. Data point such as student grades, attendance in AI, and formative data will be reviewed by the Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible: Catherine Gonzalez (catherine.gonzalez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 30, 2023 for PM1 data and January 30th for PM2 data.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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 review of our Professional Learning Team (PLT(data feedback from self-identification, it reflects that many of our PLT's have not surpassed the average level of Stage 3: Lesson Planning.

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

By providing content specific trainings on data analysis with the instructional coaches, PLT's will be able to move forward towards the next level of the PLT process .

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

Student data based on grades, progress monitoring data, and classroom walkthroughs will be used to monitor the desired effect of PLT's moving forward in their process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@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.)

Staff will be provided time within the master schedule to meet as a PLT and discuss, interpret, and desegregate students' data. This process will help increase collaboration as a team, but also increase shared opportunity for creation of interventions that will assist in increasing student achievement.

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

As collaborative inquiry teams carry out their plan, they have opportunities to engage in vicarious experiences as they work together to develop knowledge and competencies and implement change in their practice (Donohoo and Katz, 25). When teachers participate in PLT's, they accept the responsibility for students' learning as well as their own professional growth.

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.

Coaches meet with PLT's during specific times in the master schedule or early professional training days in order to provide guidance on reviewing their current level as a PLT and discuss ways to improve their pedagogy.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

Instructional Coaches will collaborate with new teachers to provide support on lesson planning and formative assessments in order to alter instructional delivery to meet their student's academic needs.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Lowest area of Learning Gains was the 6th grade compact at 47%, ESE Math subgroup at 56%, and Geometry at 35%. These are areas where the change in curriculum is extreme from previous year that may be creating part of this discrepancy.

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

In collaboration with the Math department, we will increase in the following areas:
*6th grade compact math- 55%
* ESE Math subgroup- 60%
* Geometry- 50%

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

Algebra and Geometry will continue to work within their Professional Learning Teams (PLT) in using identified strategies to determine underlying student thinking with conceptual understanding. Grades 6th compact and Geometry teachers will continue to work within the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (BEST) standards and work on level of questioning to provide more rigorous questioning and coursework. Students will be assessed through the Focused Instructional Calendar as put together by district to ensure learning with prioritized standards. Teachers will track student progress within the math assessment and adaptive learning model (ALEKS) and share with students their success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@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.)

Evidence Based Strategy:
* Use of ALEKS to reteach learning gaps in math
* Formative assessment data used to determine student understanding in Algebra and Geometry
* Use of PLT time to allow teachers opportunity to design lesson plans specific to student learning needs
* Use of manipulatives to provide students with visual and conceptual understanding of content

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

For young children from low-income communities, knowledgeable teachers and high-quality mathematics experiences play an especially critical role in successful math learning and achievement later on in school (Geary, 2013; Geary, Hoard, Nugent, & Bailey, 2013; National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 2008). The connection between increasing student success in Algebra and Geometry will in turn allow future opportunities in post-secondary settings for our students.

According to a study from the Institute of Education Sciences, for math, both student-directed formative assessment and formative assessment directed by other agents, such as an educator or a computer program, were effective (Klute, Apthorp, Harlacher, Reale, 2017).

According to the Journal of Education and Practice, students remember information better when it is

represented both visually and verbally. These strategies help students of all ages to better manage learning objectives and achieve academic success (Raiyn, Vol.7, No.24, 2016).

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.

Meet with 6th grade math teachers and provide professional development on the use of formative assessments to drive instructional delivery in all math classes.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 30, 2023

Review initial data on Algebra and Geometry students and create Academic Intervention groups for lunch time tutoring. Groups will be changed based on student progress during midyear formative assessment data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 30, 2023

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the 22-23 school year Panorama Survey data, 50% of students responded favorably to questions related to school-wide Sense of Belonging, and 60% of students responded favorably to questions related to School Safety. Sense of Belonging was identified as a critical need due to this category being one of the lowest scores. School Safety was identified as a critical need after reviewing the longitudinal data starting from the 20-21 school year, which demonstrated a consistent decline in scores.

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

By the winter administration of Panorama, Sense of Belonging scores will increase from 50% to 53%. By the winter administration of Panorama, School Safety scores will increase from 69% to 74%. At the Spring assessment, we hope to remain at 74% or increase to 79% or higher.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through the results of the Panorama survey throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@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.)

The evidence-based strategies implemented will be student focus groups and peer mentoring groups during lunch time intervention time.

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

Culture at school has importance on the academic achievement of students in terms of motivation, sense of competition and development in all respects, both social and physical according to Adem Bayer, International Journal of Education.

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.

Review prior year's Panorama data and share this year's areas of focus with staff.

Person Responsible: Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

Administer the Panorama Survey during its first administration window (Sept 11- October 27) through a Wellness Wednesday lesson.

Person Responsible: Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 27, 2023

Analyze and discuss Fall data with leadership, staff, and stakeholders alongside other data points such as ODRs and breakdown of students passing/failing courses.

Person Responsible: Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 30, 2023

Facilitate student focus group through OneVoice. If the student focus group has been conducted by that point, qualitative data (feedback from Student Voice) can be discussed with school leadership.

Person Responsible: Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 30, 2023

Administer the Panorama Survey during its second administration window (TBA) through a Wellness Wednesday lesson.

Person Responsible: Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 15, 2023

Analyze and discuss Winter data with leadership, PBIS committee, staff, and stakeholders alongside other data points such as ODRs, passing/failing rates, number of students involved in peer mentoring.

Person Responsible: Rikako Karaki (rikako.karaki@osceolaschools.net)

By When: January 30, 2024