
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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Osceola Virtual Franchise (Secondary)

1907 MICHIGAN AVENUE, St Cloud, FL 34769

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.

The Osceola School District's mission is to inspire all learners to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive citizens.

Osceola Virtual School's mission is to provide enriching online educational choices to enhance students' future potential in our growing virtual community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Osceola Virtual School's vision is to provide a K-12 education through a powerful, personalized and student-centered online program with educational experiences delivered via competency-based, blended and flexible full time education programs supported by positive school relationships.

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
Clevenger, Marcia	Principal	Monitoring student performance to ensure the success of all students. Monitoring teacher data to provide guidance and promote growth to ensure student success.
Laser, Sabine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction, Testing Administrator, Stock Take Administrator, MTSS Administrator, Administrator Over School Improvement
Calderon, Marta	Administrative Support	Scheduling, monitoring and ensuring compliance regarding all district and state mandated assessment administration.
Ortiz, Jeriel	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Monitoring all students identified as needing intensive intervention in either Reading, Mathematics, or both. Creating and monitoring schoolwide supports in the form of Progress Lab, as well as attendance in schoolwide initiatives such as Homeroom and Live Lessons.
Morgan, Katelyn	School Counselor	School Counselor for Flex Students Districtwide
Arrington, Christopher	School Counselor	School Counselor Full-time Students
Vergon, Kelley	School Counselor	School Counselor for Flex and Home Education

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.

We share our initiatives with all stakeholders through the School Advisory Committee meetings which take place on the third Thursday of each month. Our SAC committee consists of school leadership, teachers and staff, students, as well as our Partners in Education community members.

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 and each area of focus will be reviewed monthly through our StockTake meetings. We will review ongoing formative assessment data as well as Progress Monitoring results to ensure we are making progress towards our established goals, and make adjustments to our practices as needed.

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	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	19%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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

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	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	1	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	1	0	2	5

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	1	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	1	0	2	3

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	84	46	50	77	45	51	89		
ELA Learning Gains				64			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			81		
Math Achievement*	58	27	38	55	37	38	72		
Math Learning Gains				54			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			60		
Science Achievement*	86	63	64	67	32	40	77		
Social Studies Achievement*	95	61	66	81	39	48	91		
Middle School Acceleration	58			71	38	44	42		
Graduation Rate	100	86	89	98	54	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	65	60	65	64	60	67	76		
ELP Progress		46	45						

* 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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	625
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	737
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

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				
ELL	91			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	88			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	74			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	74			

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	50			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	58			
HSP	71			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	74			

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	84			58			86	95	58	100	65	
SWD												
ELL	91										1	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	73			55							2	
HSP	93			71			88	100		75	6	
MUL	73			58							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	79			42			88	87		50	6	
FRL	89			56						50	4	

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	77	64	65	55	54	41	67	81	71	98	64	
SWD	62	69		32	36							
ELL	70	72		53	67							
AMI												
ASN	90											
BLK	61	53		52	64							
HSP	86	71	75	55	57	43	62	85		100	72	
MUL	83			33								
PAC												
WHT	68	59	60	60	52		71	87		95	50	
FRL	74	62		69	82					94	63	

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	89	71	81	72	40	60	77	91	42	94	76	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	91	71	75	62	31		68	89		94	73	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	67		87	52		87	95		94	81	
FRL										100	79	

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	88%	47%	41%	50%	38%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	44%	29%	54%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	89%	39%	50%	47%	42%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	40%	35%	47%	28%
09	2023 - Spring	80%	43%	37%	48%	32%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	49%	33%	58%	24%
06	2023 - Spring	100%	39%	61%	47%	53%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	44%	35%	50%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	64%	40%	24%	54%	10%
07	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	48%	-3%	61%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	87%	48%	39%	55%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	41%	-1%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	35%	36%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	*	40%	*	51%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	40%	15%	50%	5%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	36%	11%	48%	-1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	65%	29%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	63%	31%	66%	28%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	57%	39%	63%	33%

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.

Apart from Middle School Acceleration (58% down 13 points from previous year), the area of lowest performance for the 2022-2023 academic year was in Mathematics. Although Math proficiency increased by 7 points from the previous year, it is still the lowest performing academic area for OVS.

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

Middle school acceleration showed the steepest decline from the prior year falling from 71% to 58%. This decline occurred because all 8th graders were enrolled in Algebra 1 at the beginning of the year which would earn them an acceleration point, however a significant number of them requested to be moved to a lower-level math when they were not successful after the first 9 weeks. We did not have any 7th or 8th graders with other courses by which to earn their acceleration point. This will be addressed during the 2023-2024 academic year as guidance will ensure that each student has multiple opportunities built into their schedule by which they can earn an acceleration point before the end of 8th grade.

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.

Although OVS scored above the state average in all subject areas, we did notice that our Mathematics proficiency rate is significantly lower than our ELA proficiency rate. This may be due to the fact that Mathematics MTSS interventions at OVS were a new addition to our intervention plan for the 2022-2023 academic year. We will focus on improving and streamlining our MTSS interventions for Mathematics the 2023-2024 academic year to close this gap in achievement.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in Science Achievement which increased from 67% proficiency to 86% proficiency. During the 2022-2023 school year we hired a new Biology teacher and provided test preparation sessions for both Biology 1 and 8th grade science.

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

Data not available at this time.

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

1. Improve Middle School Acceleration rate by 10 or more points.
2. Improve Mathematics Achievement Level by 5+ points.

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 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.

Schoolwide data from the 2022-2023 academic year indicates that performance in Mathematics is our area in greatest need of improvement with an overall proficiency level of 62%, and particularly with respect to our percent proficient in Mathematics for our ESE (56%), ELL (60%), White (47%) and Black (55%) subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

OVS will increase our overall proficiency in Mathematics from 62% to 65% in the 2023-2024 academic year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will administer ongoing formative assessments during each Live Lesson to collect data on student understanding of benchmarks taught in order to assess the efficacy of Tier 1 instruction. Tier 1 gaps in understanding will be addressed by teacher through group tutoring opportunities on Zoom. Data gathered will also be shared with MTSS interventionists and used to drive MTSS small group interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sabine Laser (sabine.laser@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.)

Small group instruction, $d = 0.46$ (Hattie, 2023)

Teach specific skills, $d = 0.73$ (Hattie, 2023)

Direct and/or guided instruction, $d = 0.56$ (Hattie, 2023)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be provided small group instruction ($d = 0.46$) based on results of progress monitoring assessments and provide tutoring opportunities during which they will teach specific skills ($d = 0.73$) through direct and/or guided instruction ($d = 0.59$) to fill in gaps in understanding. Tier 3 Mathematics students will also receive an additional hour/week of intervention in small groups ($d = 0.46$) to learn specific skills ($d = 0.73$) that they are missing in order to access Tier 1 instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will administer progress monitoring assessments every 5 weeks during the Mathematics Live Lesson. This data will be shared with Dr. Ortiz and Dr. Laser. Teachers will address gaps in understanding from Tier 1 instruction through Zoom tutoring sessions. This data will also be used to drive Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible: Jeriel Ortiz (jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will be an ongoing process throughout the academic year and revisited throughout the year during MTSS and Stock Take meetings.

All students who performed below grade level will be scheduled into MTSS Tier 3 interventions for 1 hour/week.

Person Responsible: Jeriel Ortiz (jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 1, 2023

All students in Tier 3 Mathematics interventions will participate in the Renaissance STAR progress monitoring assessments so that MTSS interventionists will have accurate data to drive interventions.

Person Responsible: Marta Calderon (marta.calderon@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 20, 2023.

All students who will participate in state mandated Mathematics assessments will be provided test prep sessions either virtually and/or in person.

Person Responsible: Sabine Laser (sabine.laser@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

Any student not scoring on grade level (Level 3 or higher) for PM3 Reading and/or Mathematics as measured by the 2023 Spring Administration will need extra intervention to be brought up to grade level during the 2023-2024 academic year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All students identified as Tier 3 for Reading and/or Mathematics will increase their scale score by 8 points or more for the 2023-3024 PM3 Administration.

Monitoring:

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

Results of progress monitoring assessments administered through Live Lessons in ELA and Mathematics will be disaggregated by benchmark to drive the structure and content of weekly hour-long interventions for Tier 3 Reading and Mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeriel Ortiz (jeriel.ortiz@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.)

Small group instruction, $d = 0.46$ (Hattie, 2023)

Teach specific skills, $d = 0.73$ (Hattie, 2023)

Direct and/or guided instruction, $d = 0.56$ (Hattie, 2023)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All MTSS Tier 3 Reading and Mathematics students will be provided small group instruction ($d = 0.46$) based on results of progress monitoring assessments and provide tutoring opportunities during which they will teach specific skills ($d = 0.73$) through direct and/or guided instruction ($d = 0.59$) to fill in gaps in understanding.

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.

All students who performed below grade level in PM3 for ELA and Mathematics will receive 1 hour/week of intensive small group interventions.

Person Responsible: Jeriel Ortiz (jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 1, 2023.

All MTSS Tier 3 intervention students will participate in Renaissance STAR progress monitoring assessments which will drive Tier 3 interventions in Reading and Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Marta Calderon (marta.calderon@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 20, 2023.

All students will be given the opportunity twice per week to come to campus for individualized support through Progress Lab from subject area teachers.

Person Responsible: Jeriel Ortiz (jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning August 30, 2023 through end of April 2024.

#3. 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.

Building Community in a virtual setting is a major area of focus in developing positive culture in our virtual environment. We plan to increase family involvement by adding additional on campus opportunities for the 2023-24 school year. This year families will have access to an Art Club each quarter and grade level meetings for next step opportunities which will include in-depth orientation with individualized plans.

Measurable Outcome:

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

OVS will purposefully increase the number of opportunities for parents, students, and community members to participate in events on campus by 50% totaling a minimum of 8 on-campus events for parents and students for the 2023-2024 academic year.

Monitoring:

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

Guidance department will conduct the Panorama survey, monitor Family participation, and solicit Feedback from event participants to ensure we are communicating and encouraging all students and parents to participate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Arrington (christopher.arrington@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.)

School Climate, $d = 0.53$ (Hattie, 2023)

School Effects, $d = 0.48$ (Hattie, 2023)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School climate is directly correlated to student performance. Students, parents, and community members who are engaged in school activities improve school climate and therefore have positive effect on student achievement.

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.

Mr. Arrington will administer Panorama survey twice yearly for each grade level and disaggregate responses to share with administrative team.

Person Responsible: Christopher Arrington (christopher.arrington@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Fall, Winter, and Spring Administrations by grade level beginning September 11th, 2023.

OVS will host Paint Night each semester led by Ms. Heidi Schlichter wherein parents and students will come to campus to participate in creating their own works of art.

Person Responsible: Marcia Clevenger (marcia.clevenger@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 30th, 2023.

OVS Art Teacher will host a quarterly daytime Art Club for students of all grade levels to help students explore their creativity and build community and positive culture in the virtual environment.

Person Responsible: Marcia Clevenger (marcia.clevenger@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning September 20th, 2023.

OVS Guidance counselors will host Junior and Senior meetings, FAFSA help sessions, grade level orientations K-12, Osceola Scholars meetings with selected OVS students, and Homeroom meetings through Zoom.

Person Responsible: Christopher Arrington (christopher.arrington@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning August 2023 and continuing through Spring 2024.

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

The only grade level where ELA proficiency is below 51% is 2nd grade ELA. Second grade ELA proficiency for the 2022-2023 academic year was at 50%.

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

Not applicable.

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

ELA proficiency for 2nd grade will increase by 5% for the 2023-2024 academic year, rising from 50% proficiency to 55% proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Not applicable.

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.

All students scoring below grade-level will be moved to Tier 3 in the MTSS process. Each student will receive a minimum of 1 hour per week of intensive small group intervention with a Reading Endorsed ELA teacher. Each student will be formatively assessed every 5 weeks using School City assessments and data from these assessments will be used to drive MTSS interventions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Laser, Sabine, sabine.laser@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?

All students who scored below a Level 3 on PM3 during the 2023 Spring Administration will receive a minimum of 1 hour per week of intensive small group intervention targeting specific skills using direct and/or guided instruction:

Small group instruction, $d = 0.46$ (Hattie, 2023)

Teach specific skills, $d = 0.73$ (Hattie, 2023)

Direct and/or guided instruction, $d = 0.56$ (Hattie, 2023)

Teachers will use data gathered from ongoing formative assessment in School City to target the specific ELA standards for each student, meeting the needs of each student individually.

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?

By targeting the specific areas of need for each student individually, we will ensure that each students' needs/deficiencies are being met using the evidence-based strategies listed above.

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
Each student scoring below a Level 3 on the Spring PM3 for ELA will receive a minimum of 1 hour per week of intensive intervention.	Ortiz, Jeriel, jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net
Each student scoring below a Level 3 on Spring PM3 ELA will participate in ongoing formative assessments in School City every 5 weeks. Data from these assessments will be used to inform weekly ELA interventions.	Ortiz, Jeriel, jeriel.ortiz@osceolaschools.net