

School District of Osceola County, FL

Canoe Creek K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Canoe Creek K 8

3600 CANOE CREEK ROAD, St. Cloud, FL 34772

<https://www.osceolaschools.net/cck8>

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.

Canoe Creek K-8 will engage students with a rigorous and innovative environmental STEM education while providing the instructional building blocks to develop 21st century global citizens. Through hands-on investigation and problem solving, students will become critical thinkers who are empowered to build sustainable and informed communities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Canoe Creek K-8 is a student-centered organization delivering excellence in education. We are committed to cultivating tomorrow's innovators where academics, well-being, and experiences combine to prepare students for success today and in the future.

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
Noyes, David	Principal	
Miller, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Woollet, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Grayek, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Math & Science Coach
Petrangeli, Kodie	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Perez, Danisha	Other	Resource Compliance Specialist
Fernanda Perez , Maria	School Counselor	
Murphy, Keri	School Counselor	
Jarquín, Toni	Instructional Coach	
Mendez Plumey, Sylmari	School Counselor	

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.

A team of school leadership and teachers originally gathered to form the SIP plan. Then the plan was presented to our school advisory council for their input (both parents and students were encouraged to

attend and provide feedback). Additionally, the entire staff was given an opportunity to review the plan and add suggestions.

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))

Our plan will be monitored monthly via our Stocktake process. Our focus will include intense monitoring of the lowest quartile students and our ESSA groups. Action steps will be added as needed when data changes to continue to close the achievement gap.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
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	18	27	25	22	19	17	15	10	9	162	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	2	2	5	9	8	31	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	24	19	33	28	29	147	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	24	28	20	34	114	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	4	11	14	24	19	33	28	29	166	

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	5	10	10	10	11	46

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	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	24	17	23	19	14	18	5	11	17	148	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	7	4	5	9	13	43	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	5	23	40	
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	29	23	11	19	32	138	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	23	15	30	15	30	143	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	24	29	23	11	19	32	138	

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	3	34	64	113	53	42	40	349

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	4	3	1	3	10	6	4	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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	24	17	23	19	14	18	5	11	17	148
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	7	4	5	9	13	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	5	23	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	29	23	11	19	32	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	23	15	30	15	30	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	24	29	23	11	19	32	138

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	3	34	64	113	53	42	40	349

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	4	3	1	3	10	6	4	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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*	63	48	53	59	50	55	61		
ELA Learning Gains				57			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			53		
Math Achievement*	70	47	55	59	42	42	63		
Math Learning Gains				55			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			54		
Science Achievement*	72	46	52	61	45	54	75		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	67	68	79	53	59			
Middle School Acceleration	94	75	70	79	45	51			
Graduation Rate		77	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		59	53		67	70			
ELP Progress	59	53	55	69	73	70	53		

* 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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	72			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	68			

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	59			

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%
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	56			

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	63			70			72	84	94			59
SWD	27			27			23	20			6	58
ELL	50			62			56	78	95		7	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			64			58				3	
HSP	61			67			69	84	95		7	61
MUL	63			83							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			75			81	86	91		6	
FRL	56			62			63	81	92		7	61

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	59	57	44	59	55	49	61	79	79			69
SWD	17	35	32	26	37	41	17	27				
ELL	48	56	47	42	50	48	49	65	100			69
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	50	50	27	48	52	42	50	80				
HSP	57	57	43	53	54	51	57	73	78			71
MUL	71	60		72	82							
PAC												
WHT	64	59	52	70	57	45	71	100	88			
FRL	51	52	47	50	53	50	54	71	73			61

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	61	72	53	63	64	54	75					53
SWD	18	63	65	30	47	40						
ELL	56	70	54	59	64	64	67					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			20								
HSP	64	72	50	63	57	50	69					53
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	74		68	77		84					
FRL	58	73	55	59	59	47	72					45

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	67%	44%	23%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	39%	22%	47%	14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	60%	40%	20%	47%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	49%	20%	58%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	39%	16%	47%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	44%	21%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	40%	20%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	39%	16%	48%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	88%	49%	39%	59%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	48%	20%	61%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	48%	28%	55%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	41%	25%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	35%	26%	44%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	40%	33%	51%	22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	40%	56%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	36%	59%	48%	47%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	63%	17%	66%	14%

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 students with disabilities (SWD): (ELA- 27%, Math- 33%, Science- 24%)

Contributing factors: Ineffective use of the VE teacher, master schedule for SWD, and lack of urgency with MTSS.

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

We did not decline in any area from the previous year.

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.

We were above the state average in all categories, however, in ELA, we were closest to the state average. The state average is 50% and our average is 63%.

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

Our math data in 3rd grade went from 62% proficient to 88%. New actions CCK8 took were change in placement of instructional personnel, increased data chats with teachers, and increased support from instructional coaches and mentoring.

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

1. Attendance
2. Level 1's for ELA and Math in 4th to 8th grade

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

Our focus will be on Students with Disabilities.

1. We will strategically place our SWD into smaller class if possible and ensure they have a highly effective teacher.
2. We will provide specific training to our VE and Gen Ed teachers on different co-teach models.
3. We will provide common planning time for teachers to collaborate together.
4. We will monitor student data, look for trends, and provide feedback to teachers.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The 2022- 2023 school data indicated that our students with disabilities ESSA group did not meet the minimum expectation of 41% proficient. (ELA - 27%, Math- 33%, and Science- 24%). Based on these findings, action is necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of achievement for all students, especially those identified as a SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ESSA Category, Students with Disabilities, will increase to a 42% or higher proficiency in ELA and Math.

Monitoring:

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

1. Administration, leadership team, and academic coaches will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place monthly and the academic coaches will report progress to the principal on the area of focus.
3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement and proficiency based on the data from the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.
4. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement and proficiency based on the data from the STAR Renaissance Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Grayek (nicole.grayek@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 learning needs of students differ. For our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, our interventions vary also. For ELA: Open Court, EIR, Benchmark, UFLI Foundations, Magnetic Reading, Literacy Footprints, Focused Reading, HD Word, and Achieve 3000. For Math: The Numeracy Project, Focused Math, and Hand2Mind.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research illustrates that providing interventions for students should incorporate several approaches. First, student decoding skills need to be built so they can read complex words. Second, students need purposeful fluency-building activities to read effortlessly. Third, students need to routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to make sense of the text. Fourth, students need opportunities to practice making sense of challenging texts. (What Works Clearinghouse, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/ReferenceResources/WWC-MasterSlideDeck-PracticeGuide-ReadingInterventions4-9.pdf>) Regarding mathematics, students need several different types of intervention also. First, providing systematic instruction during intervention helps students' understanding of mathematical ideas. Second, teaching clear and concise mathematical language and supporting students' use of it helps students effectively communicate their understanding. Third, using a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations help support students' learning of concepts and procedures. Additionally, students need intentional deliberate instruction on word problems to deepen students' understanding and support their capacity to apply mathematical ideas. (What Works Clearinghouse, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/26>)

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.

Ensure that SWD and lowest quartile students are placed with high impact teachers.

Person Responsible: Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Monitor Tier 1 instruction by conducting weekly classroom walkthroughs and providing immediate actionable feedback to individual teachers.

Person Responsible: Nicole Grayek (nicole.grayek@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly, 2023- 2024 school year

Differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve proficiency of all students including our SWD and our lowest quartile students.

Person Responsible: Toni Jarquin (toni.jarquin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On-going, 2023- 2024 school year

Meet monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic support for Tier 1, 2, & 3 students.

Person Responsible: Toni Jarquin (toni.jarquin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly, 2023- 2024 school year

Conduct collaborative Professional Development between VE Inclusion teachers and ESE Teachers.

Person Responsible: Kodie Petrangeli (kodie.petrangeli@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Use of formative assessments and other data to drive instructional decisions as evidenced through the PLT process.

Person Responsible: Amy Miller (amy.miller@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On-going (end May 2023)

Universal design professional development for all K-8 teachers.

Person Responsible: Nicole Grayek (nicole.grayek@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 2024

#2. 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.

Conversations about social and emotional learning (SEL) focus on what students bring to the table and how they can increase their SEL skills. However, SEL is just one of many factors that affect students' social, emotional, and academic well-being. When we emphasize only students' capacities and characteristics, we may overlook the equally important influences of school climate; sense of belonging; and adults' attitudes, actions, and behavior. Like the current of a stream, school climate shapes how adults and students engage in the school community. A positive climate in which everyone feels safe, valued, and respected can help increase each student's sense of belonging in school. And when all students feel like they belong, they are more engaged, more motivated, and healthier and they achieve more. (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northwest/pdf/social-emotional-learning.pdf>)

Measurable Outcome:

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

Sense of belonging as measured by various surveys will increase from 39% to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

1. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive culture and sense of belonging within the school.
2. The leadership team will review PBIS, behavior and attendance data for subgroups, monthly, during Stocktake. Interventions will be developed as required.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sylmari Mendez Plumey (sylmari.mendezplumey@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.)

Students will participate in character education and SEL lessons throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Character education is designed to promote elementary and middle school students' knowledge about core character education values and shape children's positive behaviors and support academic success. (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/InterventionReport/270>) K–12 students who receive SEL instruction have better short- and long-term outcomes than students who do not. They show an 11% gain in academic achievement. They have better SEL skills, positive attitudes, positive behaviors, and better academic performance with lower emotional distress and behavioral problems. (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northwest/pdf/b-building-sel-into-mtss-slides.pdf>)

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 a national honor society for students to give them a voice and to increase student involvement.

Person Responsible: Sylmari Mendez Plumey (sylvamari.mendezplumey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On-going, April 2024

Using these specific moves (Balloon Conversations, Everyone's Welcome, Post-its for Positivity, Culture Boxes, Class Conversation Cards, Respect Agreements, Star Student, Good News, Art-Based Student Voice

Classroom Venn Diagrams, The Newsfeed, In This Together, D.N.A., Bridges of Belonging, Culture Collage, Words to Live By, Tootle Notes, Culture Wall, Five-Minute Chats, and I Belong: The Four B's) from the Panorama Playbook teachers will increase the sense of belonging within our classrooms and within our school.

Person Responsible: Maria Fernanda Perez (maria.fernandaperez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly, May 2024

Bee Club, Math Club, Kindness Crew, grade appropriate book clubs, SSRYA Club, color wars, pep rallies, teacher vs. student games, grade level competitions, fieldtrips, Student of the Month awards, and Honor Roll Celebrations will be utilized to build sense of community schoolwide.

Person Responsible: Keri Murphy (keri.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On-going, May 2024

SOARing Eagle of the Month Celebration based on character traits.

Person Responsible: Keri Murphy (keri.murphy@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly, May 2024

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).

Our school is provided a literacy coach. She provides professional development on the major reading components based on an analysis of student performance data; administration and analysis of instructional assessments; and differentiated instruction and intensive interventions. The literacy coach models effective instructional strategies for teachers in whole and small group instruction. She collects and uses data on instructional practices to inform and implement professional learning activities. She trains teachers to administer assessments, analyze data, and use data to differentiate instruction. She coaches and mentors teachers daily. Additionally, she works with teachers to ensure that evidence-based reading strategies and programs grounded in the science of reading are implemented with fidelity. She participates in literacy leadership teams. The literacy coach also continues to grow professionally to increase her knowledge of and ability to apply effective pedagogy and andragogy. She prioritizes time to teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading; and works with the school principal to plan and implement a consistent program of improving reading achievement using evidence-based strategies that demonstrate a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes.