

School District of Osceola County, FL

Flora Ridge Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Flora Ridge Elementary School

2900 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

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.

AT FLORA RIDGE ELEMENTARY ALL STAFF, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS ARE COMMITTED TO CREATING A UNIFIED FOUNDATION THAT CELEBRATES DIVERSITY AND FOSTERS ACADEMIC RISK TAKING TO EMPOWER STUDENTS TO BE SUCCESSFUL AND PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create an environment of high expectations where all learners achieve their full potential.

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
Sassic, Dustin	Principal	Guide the Vision and collective commitments. Follow the mission and vision of the school. Monitor all areas of the SIP for implementation and follow through by staff. Support staff with the resources and tools they need to be successful to ensure proper implementation with fidelity.
Nicholson, Randa	Assistant Principal	Follow the mission and vision of the school. Monitor all areas of the SIP for implementation and follow through by staff. Support staff with the resources and tools they need to be successful to ensure proper implementation with fidelity.
Barbour, Emily	Math Coach	Oversee all math/science instruction. Monitor and support teachers with student monitoring and all levels of tier support. Ensure teachers/staff have the tools to be successful, trainings to be aware of all implementation expectations. Support classrooms in modeling lessons and assist teachers in creating small groups and monitoring. Attend trainings and meetings to stay up to date on district/state expectations.
Wolferd, Joanne	ELL Compliance Specialist	Responsible for the implementation of PLC's. Will work with all PLC groups to ensure norms, expectations and goals are put in place. Track that all grades are documenting their levels of where they are and goals of next steps on how to get to the next level and achieve their ultimate goal. Attend trainings and meetings to stay up to date on district/state expectations.
Rodriguez, Maria	Reading Coach	Oversee all reading and writing instruction. Monitor and support teachers with student monitoring and all levels of tier support. Ensure teachers/staff have the tools to be successful, trainings to be aware of all implementation expectations. Support classrooms in modeling lessons and assist teachers in creating small groups and monitoring. Attend trainings and meetings to stay up to date on district/state expectations.
Gonzalez, Ana	Dean	Dean of students, restorative coach and PBIS coordinator. Ensuring a welcoming environment to maximize learning in a open environment to achieve.
Phelps, Christy	Staffing Specialist	RCS, compliance specialist, ensuring all students IEPS are up to date and all students with ESE labels are receiving their services

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 process for involving stakeholders and all parties will take place in receiving Input, feedback and planning will take place in the following events: SAC, Parent Nights (informational sessions), PTO, STOCKTAKE, student meetings, leadership meetings and staff meetings.

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 will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement in the following events: Stocktake, SAC, Leadership, student meetings and staff meetings. Through these meetings we will share data and make adjustments to our action steps in our SIP to ensure students are making progress. When a goal is reached or action step is created it will be updated in the SIP.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	53	57	45	38	28	37	0	0	0	258	
One or more suspensions	7	9	5	4	17	35	0	0	0	77	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	21	2	17	0	0	0	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	3	17	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	73	77	0	0	0	156	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	73	90	0	0	0	167	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	43	22	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	

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	4	4	0	10	19	0	0	0	0	37

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	4	3	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	12
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	0	0		
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	22	2	16	0	0	0	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	2	16	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	70	75	0	0	0	150	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	73	87	0	0	0	164	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	23	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	12
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	22	2	16	0	0	0	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	2	16	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	70	75	0	0	0	150	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	73	87	0	0	0	164	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	23	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	12
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*	37	44	53	38	48	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				52			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			41		
Math Achievement*	34	46	59	36	44	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				46			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			31		
Science Achievement*	30	43	54	34	46	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	61			54		

** 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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	1	1
HSP	41			
MUL	38	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	42			
HSP	45			
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	43			

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	37			34			30					61
SWD	20			23			17				5	26
ELL	31			29			24				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			27			23				4	
HSP	38			34			29				5	60
MUL	50			25							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			47			50				5	62
FRL	33			30			25				5	60

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	38	52	54	36	46	50	34					61
SWD	20	55	46	16	38	46	26					52
ELL	30	51	63	30	44	49	25					61
AMI												
ASN	78	54		72	54							
BLK	39	52		33	38		50					
HSP	35	51	57	33	45	49	27					61
MUL	41			35								
PAC												
WHT	42	67		48	55							
FRL	35	51	55	32	41	45	30					57

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	41	50	41	36	30	31	36					54
SWD	14	26		21	11		22					27
ELL	37	53	48	33	32	27	35					54
AMI												
ASN	50			71								
BLK	36	42		27	25		8					
HSP	41	53	43	35	32	27	39					53
MUL	43			21								
PAC												
WHT	45			43								
FRL	31	47	43	29	25	25	31					49

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	35%	44%	-9%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	29%	49%	-20%	58%	-29%
03	2023 - Spring	29%	44%	-15%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	49%	-17%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	61%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	24%	41%	-17%	55%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	23%	40%	-17%	51%	-28%

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.

Our lowest performing area is Math achievement, with a 38%. We had new teachers to the grade levels and to teaching. We had vacancies that were filled with coaches. Majority of our students did not have basic math foundational skills and struggled with transitioning from concrete to abstract.

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

Our greatest decline was Science. Last year our students scored a 34% and this year prior to students who do not count for our school we have a 23%. Regardless of the number going up or down slightly this is a huge slide for this subject area. More than half of each grade level did not come in proficient in reading, and reading is an essential skills for success on the science assessment.

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.

Our Largest GAP from the state average was also Science. Last year our students scored a 34% and this year prior to students who do not count for our school we have a 23%. Regardless of the number

going up or down slightly this is a huge slide for this subject area. More than half of each grade level did not come in proficient in reading which we know has a huge impact on the science test.

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

The most improved area was our Math Learning Gains. We grew from a 46 to a 59%, the 13% growth we made was very intentional. The gaps of foundational skills were addressed in PLC and hit in small group and in math tutoring.

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

Two potential areas of concern from the 2022-2023 are the level 1's in both 4th grade and 5th grade in both reading and math as well as the amount of suspensions in grades 3, 4, 5.

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

Our priorities for SIP in the upcoming school year are PLC, Science, Math, ELA and positive culture. We feel the highest priority is PLC and a good foundation and planning will trickle down to the other domains.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

CWT Data demonstrates that 26% of teachers deliver explicit benchmark aligned instruction. As a result student proficiency will increase on state assessments. SWD and ELL scored an index of 21% proficiency on State FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

CWT Data will show that 80% of teachers delivering differentiated instruction to meet the needs of subgroups in their classrooms, which will result in SWD and MUL performance rising to 41% at the end of the year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use common formative assessment, FAST Data, and walkthrough data to determine if the goal is on track to being met. Leadership team will meet with PLC's weekly to support planning for differentiated instruction. Leadership team will walk classrooms weekly in all grades to monitor delivery of instruction. Lead team will meet weekly to discuss trends and determine supports that are needed. During Stocktake we will utilize Educlimber to monitor our SWD and MUL students to ensure they are making progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@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.)

We will use Open Court to teach foundational reading skills, and Language Power along with Lexia English to build foundations of language.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The impact of Core5 was examined in a cluster-randomized study of five schools in the greater Chicago metropolitan area. The study focused on 116 students in grades K-5 receiving special education support for reading difficulties. Students received "push-in" and/or "pull-out" support from a special education teacher. After 1 year, students who used Core5 had significantly higher MAP scores compared to a control group (ES = +0.23), qualifying it for an ESSA "Strong" rating.

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.

Instructional coaches with administration will facilitate weekly grade level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark aligned lessons.

Person Responsible: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly on Wednesday and Thursdays

Instructional Coaches and Administration will collaboratively review lesson plans and provide feedback at least one week ahead of when lessons will be presented.

Person Responsible: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Every Thursday during PLC's.

Provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/01/23

Coaches will model implementation of instructional frameworks, instructional practices, and utilization of students tasks aligned to the benchmark.

Person Responsible: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 12/1/23

School leadership team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning.

Person Responsible: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly through 5/30/24

Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible: Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly on Friday through 5/30/24

#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.

Deliver Math content, concepts, and skills that are aligned to benchmarks and intended learning outcomes.

This will ensure that data is being utilized to plan for differentiation which meets the needs of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

80% of classroom walkthroughs among the leadership team will show differentiated instruction being implemented.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly walkthrough data with a focus on engagement and differentiated instruction will be collected. Lead team will use walkthrough forms and meet weekly to determine tiered PD needs. Trends will be analyzed to ensure what is being planned for is being put into practice. Specific feedback will be delivered and coaching cycles conducted based on data collected.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@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.)

iii time for Math is embedded into the school day to ensure that all students get an extra 30 minutes of Math. DreamBox math program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to provide Math intervention time for all students that require extra support in order to move students and close gaps. One study of DreamBox Learning took place in grades K-1 in three Rocketship charter schools over a 4-month period. Students who used DreamBox Learning gained more than controls on NWEA tests, with an effect size of +0.11. This qualifies DreamBox Learning for the ESSA "Strong" category.

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.

PLC leads will meet with a leadership team member to support and develop agendas that keep PLC's focused on the 4 guiding questions.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Conduct weekly walkthroughs to collect data with a focus on engagement and differentiated instruction. Trends will be analyzed to ensure what is being planned for is being put into practice.

Person Responsible: Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

By When: weekly throughout the school year

Lead team will use walkthrough forms and meet weekly to determine tiered PD needs.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: weekly throughout the school year

Specific feedback will be delivered and coaching cycles conducted based on data collected.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 25, 2023

Tier 3 time will be built into the Master Schedule and students will be tracked by Essential Standard to ensure mastery.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: 8/30/23

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

CWT Data demonstrates that 26% of teachers deliver explicit benchmark aligned instruction in Science. As a result student proficiency will increase on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through classroom observations we expect 100% of teachers to deliver explicit benchmark aligned instruction.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly walkthrough data with a focus on engagement and differentiated instruction will be collected. Lead team will use walkthrough forms and meet weekly to determine tiered PD needs. Trends will be analyzed to ensure what is being planned for is being put into practice. Specific feedback will be delivered and coaching cycles conducted based on data collected.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@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.)

Fair game science intervention. Science Block in which all students will attend bi weekly to complete hands on Science labs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to 5th grade being tested on all grade level standards, we have built time for students to engage in Fair Game standards.

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.

Tier 1 planning for Science weekly with Teams.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Conduct weekly walkthroughs to collect data with a focus on engagement and differentiated instruction. Trends will be analyzed to ensure what is being planned for is being put into practice.

Person Responsible: Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

By When: weekly throughout the school year

Lead team will use walkthrough forms and meet weekly to determine tiered PD needs.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: weekly throughout the school year

Specific feedback will be delivered and coaching cycles conducted based on data collected.

Person Responsible: Emily Barbour (emily.barbour@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 25, 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.

According to the Panorama Survey Data 63% of students feel a sense of belonging at school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our students will feel a sense of belonging as measured by the Panorama survey data.

Monitoring:

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

During monthly stocktakes we will review morning meeting data to determine specific supports. The leadership team will identify students that do not feel a sense of belonging to problem solve and involve them in a schoolwide activity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

We will use the School Enrichment Model to incorporate multiple interests for students to be involved in according to their needs, and wants of the students. A culture calendar will ensure we recognize each other's culture and background to build understanding of each other in the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who feel a sense of belonging at school are typically more energized, more likely to spend time on-task and return to activities, and more likely to choose to be in the school environment¹. Belonging is a fundamental human need, and students spend a huge portion of their time during childhood and adolescence at school, which makes it essential that the learning environment cultivates a sense of belonging for students². A high sense of belonging is linked to better psychological wellbeing and academic performance, while low belonging is a predictor of poor engagement and an array of difficulties at school

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.

Create Culture Calendar to recognize various cultures in schools.

Person Responsible: Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Aug 10, 2023

Quarterly Parent Engagement Meetings. This will engage all parents in how to support their students in a school setting.

Person Responsible: Joanne Wolferd (joanne.wolferd@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Oct. 8, 2023

Create monthly Morning Meeting Topics in Canvas to build community. Students will answer questions based on positive behavior traits and sense of belonging around the Panorama survey.

Person Responsible: Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning of every month

Identify students from the Panorama survey who are not feeling a sense of belonging and engage them in a cluster of their liking.

Person Responsible: Rosani Morales (rosani.morales@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Oct. 1, 2024

Enrichment Clusters on Wed.

Person Responsible: Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Every Wednesday throughout the year.

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).

As a ATSI school Using funding: we will host the following activities to engage with families; Student led conference nights, reading night, STEM night, Academic and parent nights.

ATSI Resource -> Reading Coach-Support Instructional Planning, Instruct Proficiency bubble student, Coach teachers on Best Practices.

ESOL Para Professionals-Run small group interventions daily with groups of students.

ESE Para- Support SWD students with instruction.

MTSS Coach-Monitor Student Progress, Coach and Support teachers in tracking data and instructional decision making.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will raise our Proficiency to 50% in grades k-2

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

We will raise our ELA Proficiency to 50% in grades 3-5

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

According to the K-2 STAR Reading Test, at least 50% of our students will be proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to PM 3 FAST Reading, at least 50% of our students will be proficient.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will track progress through common formative assessments, STAR data, throughout the year to ensure students are making progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rodriguez, Maria, maria.rodriguez2@osceolaschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

CWT Data demonstrates that 26% of teachers deliver explicit benchmark aligned instruction. As a result student proficiency will increase on state assessments. SWD and ELL scored an index of 21% proficiency on State FAST.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The impact of Core5 was examined in a cluster-randomized study of five schools in the greater Chicago metropolitan area. The study focused on 116 students in grades K-5 receiving special education support for reading difficulties. Students received “push-in” and/or “pull-out” support from a special education teacher. After 1 year, students who used Core5 had significantly higher MAP scores compared to a control group (ES = +0.23), qualifying it for an ESSA “Strong” rating.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Coach will meet weekly with PLT leads to ensure Tier one instruction is being planned effectively.	Rodriguez, Maria, maria.rodriguez2@osceolaschools.net
Professional Development for Analyzing Data and differentiating instruction for each grade level.	Rodriguez, Maria, maria.rodriguez2@osceolaschools.net
Weekly walkthrough to give feedback on differentiated instruction.	Rodriguez, Maria, maria.rodriguez2@osceolaschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

osceolaschools.net/fres

The SIP will be shared via stakeholders in a SAC meeting, at a Staff meeting and our school website. Translation will be available for all meetings.

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

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

osceolaschools.net/fres

Our school will continue to strive to build relationships with all stakeholders. We will do this with a variety of events and inviting the community. We will hold breakouts with admin during the parent/academic nights to share out and answer any questions as well as listen to any questions. We will have parent/academic nights to review student(s) progress, every semester. We will utilize ALL pro Dads program to engage families with their children and the school.

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

Throughout the planning of academics in PLC, we will increase quality learning and enrich curriculum in small group iii in both ela and math. Offer tutoring in both reading and math with a focus on students who are not proficient. We will utilize teachers who are reading endorsed to teach reading.

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

Flora Ridge Elementary School coordinates the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state, and local services, such as: Title I, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education for disadvantaged students; Title II, Part A for the implementation of various Professional Development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title III for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of student enrichment activities; Title IX for the implementation and support of students and families in transition; and Perkins Career and Technical Education for the implementation of postsecondary opportunities and experiences. We will work with stakeholders and community members to connect our parents with resources to help grow the whole child to ensure their needs are met both at home and at school. Our counselors will work with outside community members to offer career and technical fair to demonstrate and engage students in future opportunities.