Sports Leadership Arts Management (Slam) School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sports Leadership Arts Management (Slam)

611 LINE DR, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.slamosceola.com

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 mission of SLAM is to provide an innovative and in-depth secondary educational program that produces college-bound students through emphasis on sports-related majors and post-secondary preparation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school philosophy is the mechanism through which the mission will be achieved. Our vision is to position students for future success in a global market, equipping them with the skills to pursue their passions, and developing their character to make a positive impact on society.

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
Lewis, Arnise	Principal	1. Student Performance • Set and enforce rigorous standards for student achievement that are in line with the goals of SLAM! Osceola. • Ensure the academic program meets or exceeds yearly student outcome goals as defined by the state of Florida accountability requirements. 2. Organizational Leadership • Develop organizational goals and objectives consistent with the vision, mission and values of SLAM! Osceola. • Maintain active involvement in the school improvement planning process with the School Advisory Councils (SAC) by providing resources for decision-making and priority setting. • Lead teachers and Instructional TEAM Leaders in developing a healthy school culture aligned with the vision, mission and values of the school and the region. • Create a culture of excellence, teamwork and collaboration amongst the staff, teachers, students and families. • Foster a school climate that supports both student and staff success and promotes respect and appreciation. for all students, staff and parents. • Oversee all programs, services, and activities to ensure that program objectives are met. • Ensure compliance with all local, state and federal funding sources. • Manage student enrollment process to ensure that the school achieves its targeted enrollment projections. • Ensure the safety and security of all students, staff, visitors, and public and property. • Ensure an orderly learning environment. • Ensure appropriate standards of student behavior, performance, and attendance. • Ensure that all disciplinary issues are addressed fairly and immediately. 3. Instructional Leadership • Work with teachers to constantly assess and improve student achievement results. • Ensure use of effective, research-based teaching methodologies and practices. • Implement data-driven instructional practices and lead discussions about student performance. • Work with teachers to improve their teaching practice through coaching, professional development, modeling, and collaborative planning. • Keep abreast of successful instructional methodologies and practices. • Provide high quality curricular training and resources to staff. • Ensure consistencies in instruction and practice among team of teachers. • Foster culture of professionalism among teachers and staff. • Ensure learning environment and classroom instruction maximizes student learning. • Monitor progress of all students. • Supervise and mentor all teachers.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		4. Operational Leadership • Implement the budget development process to meet targeted requirements. • Oversee routine facilities maintenance. • Oversee management of school records and resources as necessary. • Ensure compliance of local, state, and federal laws and regulations. 5. Personnel • Recruit, select, and hire school staff, including teachers and school-based support staff. • Continually monitor progress on all measures of school and staff performance. • Administer SLAM! Osceola approved personnel policies and procedures. • Ensure legal hiring and termination procedures in collaboration with Human Resources staff. • Oversee any and all disciplinary actions. • Provide for adequate supervision, training, and evaluation of all staff and volunteers. • Communicate the vision that supports the school's goals and values. • Create an effective TEAM of people jointly responsible for the attainment of school goals and committed to achieving excellence. 6. Community Relations • Serve as liaison between teachers, parents, and the community. • Exhibit a high degree of professionalism in all elements of this position, while serving as a contributing member of the Community and a dedicated role model for other employees.
Cabrera, Jeffrey	Science Coach	The Science Instructional Coach will provide instructional support and coaching to the Science teacher as they work to ensure that each student is able to reach his or her academic potential. The primary role is to work with science teachers to support best practices in using data, provide analysis of school-wide trends in instruction, and make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need. Responsibilities: • Provide comprehensive instructional coaching in science: o Observe science teacher and provide specific strategies for improved instructional delivery o Work with science teacher, school leaders, to create and improve aligned science curriculum resources o Support science teacher by providing feedback on lessons and assessments that align with college readiness standards.
Narvaez, Karely	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Narvaez, mentors and supports teachers with instructional strategies, data, analysis, and fluid instructional grouping based on iReady and Achieve3000 data. In addition, she serves as the ELL coordinator, and Testing Coordinator. The leadership team meets weekly to review data and make decisions. impacting all students. By applying the process, the leadership

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		team will monitor and tweak SIP strategies, on a monthly basis, as needed to ensure SLAM! Osceola is progressing towards the intended outcomes, as outlined in the areas of focus of Part III of the SIP.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school recognizes the importance of working closely with parents/guardians, students, stakeholders, and staff to enable all the children to excel in their academic accomplishments.
-Parents are invited both verbally and in writing to aid in the development of the School Improvement Plan.
-The school will schedule monthly parent universities to equip parents with the technical support necessary
to access/support their children via the various computer-assisted instruction programs, used at the school.
Additional monthly topics will include: FOCUS grade book access, FAST/EOC testing, ESE, ELL, Dual Enrollment, etc.
-Parent climate surveys and needs assessments will be utilized to determine parent needs.
-All content will be provided in both English/Spanish

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))

1. All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy. Content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one instruction to meet the individual needs of all students.
2. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students. Staff will use progress. monitoring data, classroom observations, and scoring rubrics to identify individual needs. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.
3. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student understanding of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.
4. The Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and student achievement results on formative assessment.
5. ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in ELA courses.
6. Administration will meet regularly to discuss the effectiveness of the plan and make adjustment accordingly.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	Yes
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: D 2018-19: 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
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	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
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	

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	

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	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	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	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*	76	41	49	72	44	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				65			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63			79		
Math Achievement*	86	46	56	85	35	36	57		
Math Learning Gains				81			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				87			56		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	90	47	49	85	44	53	54		
Social Studies Achievement*	81	64	68	100	54	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	63	79	73	76	51	49	67		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress		41	40		81	76	73		

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	714
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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%
2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD				
ELL	79			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	80			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	86			
FRL	79			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD				
ELL	83			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	80			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
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	76			86			90	81	63			
SWD												
ELL	72			82			88	88	65		5	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	77			86			92	81	63		5	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78			94							2	
FRL	77			85			90	83	61		5	

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	72	65	63	85	81	87	85	100	76			
SWD												
ELL	76	65	79	82	81	92	89	100				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	73	69	70	86	81	83	86	100	75			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	44		88	88							
FRL	71	66	52	86	84	90	84	100	74			

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	55	70	79	57	61	56	54	83	67			73
SWD												
ELL	39	78	95	58	77	70	45	86				73

					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**
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	55	71	89	56	62	64	51	84	67			75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	55	69	81	61	65	48	61	83	67			76

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**
07	2023 - Spring	75%	39%	36%	47%	28%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	40%	36%	47%	29%
06	2023 - Spring	69%	39%	30%	47%	22%

			MATH			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2023 - Spring	90%	40%	50%	54%	36%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	39%	41%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	48%	47%	55%	40%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2023 - Spring	85%	35%	50%	44%	41%

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	*	36%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	65%	31%	63%	33%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	63%	37%	66%	34%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Overall, our lowest performing component was ELA lowest 25th percentile at 63%. In 2021 lowest 25% was at 79% this is a difference of 16%. Factors that contributed to the low performance included teacher turnover, experience level, and academic issues brought forth by the needs that come with children of poverty.

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

The greatest decline was our lowest 25% in ELA. which was at 63% , In 2021 lowest 25% was at 79% this is a difference of 16%. Factors that contributed to the low performance included teacher turnover, experience level, and academic issues brought forth by the needs that come with children of poverty.

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 our lowest 25 % went down by 16% from 2021. It was also the greatest gap compared to the state. We were at 63% and the state was at 38%. So even though we went down we still out performed the state by 25%.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST data Math showed the greatest improvement. From 2021 to 2022 achievement went up 28%, math learning gains went up 20%, and math lowest 25 went up 31%. This is due to our teachers meeting the students where they were and building foundational knowledge in an effort to meet grade-level standards.

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

ELA lowest 25% and ELA learning gains are the areas of concern. We must focus more time and attention on interventions to ensure they receive the support that is necessary to allow them the opportunity to make learning gains and reach proficiency. Tiered instruction will be addressed in all core subject areas to aid the process.

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

ELA lowest 25%
ELA learning gains

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

Develop and continue effective Professional Learning Communities across each content area. Teachers will produce a shared vision for improving student learning outcomes, create engaging lessons which involve high yield strategies, and best instructional practices. School level instructional development, ensuring that teachers meet regularly with other teachers teaching the same content and share instructional strategies and are trained on new district implementations such as new standards, non-evaluative tools, best strategies for student in Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction. Teachers will disaggregate and analyze data, share content knowledge, discuss student achievement, BEST standards, discuss classroom interventions, examine student performance as it relates to MTSS, determine information to be shared for academic intervention and the extended learning opportunities, all in an effort to increase student academic achievement.
It is imperative to utilize the PLC process to ensure appropriate planning, adherence to standards, overall instructional integrity and analysis of data.

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

Maintain and or increase ELA proficiency in all grade level by 3%.
Maintain and or increase MATH proficiency in all grade level by 3%.
Improve Science proficiency to 3%across all grade levels, including subgroups

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

1.Administration and Leadership Team will conduct classroom observations.
2.Leadership Team to monitor and provide support to ensure data analysis of student work and from formative, summative, and district assessments occurs for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.
3. Teachers will produce a shared vision for improving student learning outcomes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arnise Lewis (arnise.lewis@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 analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. All teachers will closely monitor progress in mathematics using iReady
diagnostic and progress monitoring data. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. In between diagnostic and progress monitoring sessions, we will hold data chats with teachers to analyze student scores and determine which students are in need of interventions to allow for differentiated instruction. The differentiated, small group instruction will be based upon the information gained from the iReady diagnostic assessment, which indicates the specific domain area in math to target

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

Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Formative use of common assessment is one of the most potent learning strategies for the classroom.(Marzano & Kendall, 2007)

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Schools PLC's teams will meet 2x times a month during early release and this dedicated PLC time will be spent focused on working together as a team for student success purposes.
2. Collaborative teaming PD will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes through the PLC facilitator and PLC administrator.
3. Current Data will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.
5. Mentoring will be conducted by the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team focused on the work.
6. Each content area team will have an embedded leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process.
7. .Current Data will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.

Person Responsible: Karely Narvaez (knarvaez@slamosceola.com)

By When: By the end of the academic school year.

#2. 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.

Based on the 2021-2022 scores the area we will focus on is ELA lowest 25%. This area went down 16% from 2020-2021.

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

The outcome for 2023-2024 is to increase ELA lowest 25% by at least 8%.

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

1. Administration, and the Instructional Mentors will each monitor the PLC to ensure that time is being used wisely, data is being used to drive instruction, research based instructional
strategies are being used, and that district resources are being utilized.
2. Administration, and Instructional
Mentors will conduct classroom observations and walkthroughs to ensure.
that rigorous instruction is delivered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arnise Lewis (arnise.lewis@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.)

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher
decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Teachers will
closely monitor progress in ELA using iReady diagnostic and progress monitoring data.
Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust
instruction produces signififcant learning gains for all students, including those with
disabilities. In between diagnostic sessions, we will hold data chats with teachers to
analyze student scores and determine which students are in need of interventions to allow
for differentiated instruction. The differentiated and small group instruction will be based
upon the information gained from the iReady diagnostic and progress monitoring
assessments, which indicate which specific domain area in reading to target.

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

Reseach illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an
ahcieveable rigorous and alligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize
common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common
formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of
learning. Formative use of common assessment is one of the most potent learning
strategies for the classroom. (Marzano & Kendall, 2007)

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

1. All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy. Content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one instruction to meeth the individual needs of all students.
2. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students. Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and scoring rubrics to identify individual needs. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.
3. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student understanding of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.
4. The Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and student achievement results on formative assessment.
5. ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in ELA courses.

Person Responsible: Arnise Lewis (arnise.lewis@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By the end of the academic school year.