

School District of Osceola County, FL

Narcoossee Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

Narcoossee Elementary School

2690 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Scott Knoebel

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Narcoossee Elementary School's mission is:
"Learning and leading. Every one. Every day."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Narcoossee Elementary School's vision is:
"NCES-Where a foundation is built for a successful future."

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knoebel, Scott	Principal	The school principal is responsible for the management of the daily school operations and most importantly oversees the effectiveness of the academic programs and instructional practices of all staff. Determines the focus and vision of the team and school. The principal also monitors learning and instruction through classroom visits and observations as well as collection and disaggregation of student and school-wide data.
Bynum, Rachel	Assistant Principal	Meets with Principal weekly to discuss agenda items and to align the focus for the leadership team meeting. Create the agenda based on discussion with principal and facilitate the leadership meetings. Monitors learning and instruction through classroom walkthroughs and observations. Collection and desegregating of student and school-wide data.
Guin, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Supports instructional focus in Math and Science. Creates, conducts, and redelivers professional development aligned to school-wide needs and goals. Supports PLC teams and builds teacher capacity through modeling and co-teaching with classroom teachers. Conducts classroom walkthroughs to gather data and analyze school-wide trends to support focus.
Omer, Julia	Guidance Counselor	Supports the MTSS coach with data tracking and paperwork. Conducts meetings for 504 and Gifted students as needed. Supports proactive behavioral and the mental health aspects of the school with specific focus groups.
Staley, Kristen	Instructional Coach	Supports instructional focus in ELA. Creates, conducts, and redelivers professional development aligned to school-wide needs and goals. Supports PLC teams and builds teacher capacity through modeling and co-teaching with classroom teachers. Conducts classroom walkthroughs to gather data and analyze school-wide trends to support focus.
Winter, Mandi	Teacher, K-12	MTSS and Instructional Support Leads the MTSS process for grades K-5 in cooperation with school administration and school counselor. The MTSS Coach tracks student data within Tiers, and supports teachers with paperwork.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Whitehouse, Danielle	Other	Instructional Interventionist Conducts 4 day a week interventions for grades K-5. Analyzes school-wide data to determine intervention needs for students. Utilizes EIR and CR to provide research based interventions to low performing readers. Supervises 3 paraprofessionals on the curriculum EIR and CR as well as pre-teaching lessons. Organizes and collects data on lowest performing readers. Helps the MTSS coach with data and support for interventions.
Lowe, Ashley	Dean	Supports students and staff with proactive behavior support, conflict resolution, and restorative practice. Supports our school-wide PBIS and Leader in Me initiatives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/25/2021, Scott Knoebel

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

76

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,288

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	192	188	212	202	233	209	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1236
Attendance below 90 percent	53	52	48	47	44	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	289
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	19	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	16	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	43	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	10	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	9	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	184	171	185	175	187	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1122
Attendance below 90 percent	129	124	124	110	128	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	3	5	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	184	171	185	175	187	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1122
Attendance below 90 percent	129	124	124	110	128	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	3	5	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	48%	19%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	53%	17%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	48%	18%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	45%	19%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

NWEA data was used to complete the tables below.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	116/66%	96/53%	119/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/56%	27/42%	36/54%
	Students With Disabilities	8/47%	2/26%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	8/42%	3/14%	6/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	115/66%	86/48%	117/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/61%	20/31%	29/43%
	Students With Disabilities	6/35%	5/26%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	9/47%	2/9%	6/24%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	115/69%	115/68%	124/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/55%	28/51%	32/52%
	Students With Disabilities	7/28%	4/17%	6/24%
	English Language Learners	16/55%	16/48%	14/39%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	104/63%	92/54%	108/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/47%	21/38%	23/39%
	Students With Disabilities	5/20%	5/21%	2/9%
	English Language Learners	17/59%	10/30%	14/39%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	120/67%	135/70%	139/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/51%	31/55%	31/54%
	Students With Disabilities	7/25%	10/29%	14/40%
	English Language Learners	10/56%	13/50%	16/55%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	108/60%	113/59%	134/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/45%	25/45%	29/50%
	Students With Disabilities	7/23%	8/24%	16/46%
	English Language Learners	8/40%	11/44%	14/48%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	114/67%	116/66%	125/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/58%	32/55%	33/52%
	Students With Disabilities	8/27%	9/29%	12/33%
	English Language Learners	10/38%	14/48%	11/35%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	104/61%	103/58%	120/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/46%	23/40%	34/54%
	Students With Disabilities	7/23%	6/19%	13/36%
	English Language Learners	10/40%	9/32%	13/42%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	126/69%	129/68%	130/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/57%	36/62%	34/55%
	Students With Disabilities	11/31%	9/27%	10/29%
	English Language Learners	14/56%	17/59%	14/44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	93/51%	96/51%	99/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/40%	19/33%	23/37%
	Students With Disabilities	5/14%	4/12%	3/9%
	English Language Learners	10/42%	13/46%	10/31%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	131/72%	128/67%	132/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/57%	32/55%	36/58%
	Students With Disabilities	10/29%	11/33%	6/18%
	English Language Learners	11/44%	11/38%	14/44%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	25	38	29	21	23	24	19				
ELL	39	50	40	39	42	40	42				
ASN	89			78							
BLK	72			56			70				
HSP	60	55	38	49	27	23	43				
MUL	76			50							
WHT	70	51		65	39	30	65				
FRL	51	50	32	42	27	19	44				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	52	45	29	49	53	42				
ELL	48	59	42	47	63	61	48				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	66	65	55	66	74	58	53				
HSP	63	64	33	60	67	50	59				
MUL	89	46		89	92						
WHT	79	70	45	73	66	57	69				
FRL	65	66	48	61	64	58	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	57	48	38	47	33	39				
ELL	40	64	56	42	59	58	40				
BLK	61	59	67	58	50	43					
HSP	65	65	57	64	63	46	63				
MUL	77	64		76	60						
WHT	72	63	36	75	66	45	77				
FRL	62	62	53	59	57	38	60				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In almost every grade level, utilizing NWEA data from the 2020-2021 school year in ELA and math, our students with disabilities and our ELL students are performing the lowest in proficiency. In fifth grade science this trend is shown as well. Additionally, this is consistent with subgroup data from 2018 and 2019 FSA results.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our students with disabilities performed lowest or second lowest in 6 of the 7 school grade categories and our ELL students performed lowest or second lowest in 5 of the 7 school grade categories out of all the subgroups based on the 2019 FSA results. Learning gains and achievement for these students is our greatest need for improvement. Based on the 2021 FSA "all curriculum group" data, no grade or subject area showed improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A possible factor contributing to this decline may be that students identified ESE received more time accessing ELA interventions than math. EBD students had limited access to our VE support teachers during iii.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In 2019 our ELL ELA achievement data and math lowest quartile data was most improved by 8% in each area.

Based on the 2021 FSA "all curriculum group" data, no grade or subject area showed improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

During the 2018-2019 year in ELA our ELL para used Corrective Reading as a structured program. Overall the school used ELlevation, ELL accommodations training, and differentiated instruction training for staff. In math, coaches in 4th and 5th were given the opportunity to intervene with lowest quartile students during iii and core instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our grade levels will need to return back to flexible group during our iii time and utilize common formative assessments to drive instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The leadership team and academic coaches will push-in to PLC meetings to support each team with their area of need. The MTSS coach will support students through data discussions with teachers to support our lowest level learners.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Our student interventionist will continue to pull our most severe Tier 2 and Tier 3 students during iii using Corrective Reading and Early Interventions in Reading as the support curriculum for these students. AS our school receives SAI funds we will devise a plan for additional during and after school supports for these students in both reading and math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 school data, our ELA lowest quartile learning gains score is 41%, which is below the district and state averages. The goal is to increase our learning gains to 51% while focusing on our SWD, ELL, and Free/Reduced Lunch students. In 2021 our students in all curriculum groups who were proficient scored accordingly: 3rd - 64%, 4th - 67%, 5th - 64% which is a drop in each grade from prior years.

Measureable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase ELA lowest quartile learning gains by 10% from the 2019 scores to 51% on the 2022 FSA scores.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through NWEA, NSGRA, and NEST teacher walkthroughs. Data will be discussed with the leadership team and used to support grade level PLC in planning for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize flexible grouping during our iii time to meet the needs of our lowest learners as well as use guided reading in grades K-3 to assist during core instruction. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize AVID strategies during learning. The leadership team will conduct focused NEST walkthroughs and support PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement. Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize prior year/current data to build lowest quartile groups for interventionist and 3 paraprofessionals. The interventionist groups will utilize Corrective Reading and Early Interventions in Reading to support our Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading students. These programs are research-based and use placement assessments to specifically place students in groups according to their academic need of support in the area of literacy. Intervention data will be monitored throughout the year to determine the program's effectiveness for each individual student.

Person Responsible: Danielle Whitehouse (danielle.whitehouse@osceolaschools.net)

Meet bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy support for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. The leadership team and grade level teachers will use this data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 foundational instructional practices and determine the level of rigor, expectations, and engagement across all grade levels in reading and writing.

Person Responsible: Mandi Winter (mandi.winter@osceolaschools.net)

Utilize flexible grouping during iii time and guided reading during core instruction in grades K-3. Teachers will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following the analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency for all students, as evidenced by targeted tiered interventions.

Person Responsible Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect trend data using the NEST observation tool. This data collected along with student progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and meeting with teams during MTSS and PLC meetings will assist in improving student achievement on formative and summative assessments, including FSA. The data collected will help to support the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction and the need for any additional professional development or instructional coaching that could be supported individually or with teams through collaborative planning during PLC groups.

Person Responsible Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Our school will continue to implement AVID ensuring that students understand the importance of college and career readiness. AVID will be implemented in grades K-5 and teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize AVID strategies during learning.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

The literacy coach will push-in to classrooms to support instruction and assist teachers in helping students to establish and track reading goals based on beginning of the year reading assessment data, including NWEA/NSGRA.

Person Responsible Kristen Staley (kristen.staley@osceolaschools.net)

Classroom teachers were provided information on pre-teaching strategies and lessons. Teachers in grades 1-5 will utilize this information to teach select Tier 2 learners in ELA during iii time.

Person Responsible Mandi Winter (mandi.winter@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 school data, our math lowest quartile learning gains score is 54%, which is above the district and state averages. Our goal is to increase our learning gains to 64% while focusing on our SWD, ELL, and Free/Reduced Lunch students. In 2021 our students in all curriculum groups who were proficient scored accordingly: 3rd - 58%, 4th - 60%, 5th - 45% which is a drop in each grade from prior years.

Measureable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase math lowest quartile learning gains by 10% from the 2019 scores to 64% on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through NWEA and NEST teacher walkthroughs. Data will be discussed with the leadership team and used to support grade level PLC in planning for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize flexible grouping during our iii time to meet the needs of our lowest quartile students' needs as well as use the standards for mathematical practice during core instruction. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize AVID strategies during learning. The leadership team will conduct NEST walkthroughs and support PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal of the Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

Action Steps to Implement

Meet bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of math support for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. The leadership team and grade level teachers will use this data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 foundational instructional practices and determine the level of rigor, expectations, and engagement across all grade levels in math.

Person Responsible Mandi Winter (mandi.winter@osceolaschools.net)

Utilize flexible grouping during iii time and small group work to support the needs of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 learners. Teachers will differentiate instruction with varied, multiple problem solving strategies, high order thinking concepts, high quality questions and discussion techniques, visual representations of student work, and quality feedback practices..

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect trend data using the NEST observation tool. This data collected along with student progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and meeting with teams during MTSS and PLC meetings will assist in improving student achievement on formative and summative assessments, including FSA. The data collected will help to support the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction

and the need for any additional professional development or instructional coaching that could be supported individually or with teams through collaborative planning during PLC groups.

Person Responsible Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

The SuccessMaker program will be utilized for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 math students daily to support their individualized academic needs. Additionally, Tier 3 math students will utilize the SAVAAS mathematics diagnostic intervention system to target specific needs of each student. Do the Math will also be utilized during our iii time to support Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

The math coach will push-in to math classrooms to support instruction and assist teachers in helping students to establish and track math goals based on beginning of the year math assessment data, including NWEA.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Our school will continue to implement AVID ensuring that students understand the importance of college and career readiness. AVID will be implemented in grades K-5 and teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize AVID strategies during learning.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 school data, our science achievement score is 65%, which is above the district and state averages. Even though our students are scoring above the district and state, our goal is to increase our achievement to 70% while focusing on our SWD, and Free/Reduced Lunch students. In 2021 our students in 5th grade all curriculum groups scored 52%.

Measureable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase science achievement by 5% from the 2019 scores to 70% on the 2022 state assessment.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through NWEA and NEST teacher walkthroughs. Data will be discussed with the leadership team and used to support grade level PLC in planning for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students and teachers will utilize learning goals, targets, scales, and interactive notebooks (when applicable) to monitor learning. Teachers will plan with WICOR in mind and utilize AVID strategies during learning. The leadership team will conduct NEST walkthroughs and work with PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook. (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting the needs of each individual student will help fill in the gaps of learning to ensure students are able to successfully meet grade level standards. Ensuring that students are tracking their own progress and monitoring their learning will improve understanding and achievement. Research shows that 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, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to collect trend data using the NEST observation tool. This data collected along with student progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and meeting with teams during PLC meetings will assist in improving student achievement on formative and summative assessments, including FSA. The data collected will help to support the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction and the need for any additional professional development or instructional coaching that could be supported individually or with teams through collaborative planning during PLC groups.

Person Responsible: Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will utilize common collaborative planning during the PLC process to ensure content, pacing, and re-teaching of standards. During this time teachers will determine the need for content differentiation based on student need through their common assessments lesson observation.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies during science instruction to elevate the rigor of the lesson content and engage student learning of the grade level standards.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

Utilize the Generation Genius online support program in grades K-5 to enhance the current science curriculum. This program provides lesson plans, videos, activities/experiments, to support daily science instruction.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of**

Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 ESSA data, our school did not have any subgroups score below the ESSA level of 41%, although our students with disabilities scored at 45%. This can have a significant impact on our learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains.

Measureable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase our lowest quartile learning gains to 50% in ELA and 55% in math.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through NWEA, NSGRA, and NEST teacher walkthroughs. Data will be discussed with the leadership team and used to support grade level PLC in planning for instruction. Additionally, bi-monthly MTSS meetings with grade level teams will take place to target students in need and provide them with the necessary supports to show learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandi Winter (mandi.winter@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all students. Students will also receive specific services related to their IEPs. During iii students in Tier 3 will receive intensive intervention in reading utilizing Corrective Reading and Early Interventions in Reading..

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum:
 Content- the information and skills that students need to learn
 Process -how students make sense of the content being taught
 Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned
 Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

Meet bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for our Tier 3 and students with disabilities. The leadership team and grade level teachers will use this data to determine the effectiveness of tiered and differentiated instructional practices and determine the level of rigor, expectations, and engagement across all grade levels in reading, writing, and math to determine if changes need to be made and added supports need to be put in place for our lowest level learners.

Person Responsible

Mandi Winter (mandi.winter@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with our instructional coaches and VE teachers to support our students with disabilities both during core instruction and iii time.

Person Responsible

Rachel Bynum (rachel.bynum@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for students with disabilities. As grade level teachers plan, VE teachers will plan alongside them to incorporate these strategies as they push-in to the class to support or when they pull students out

for intensive interventions. It's imperative that there is equity of instructional practices for all students, including those with disabilities.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Guin (elizabeth.guin@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>From Pre-K through high school and beyond, social-emotional development helps people acquire and apply knowledge, attitudes, and skills to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.</p> <p>Our school implements Leader in Me which is a CASEL-endorsed SEL process where students learn personal and interpersonal effectiveness by applying The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People to their academic and personal goals. CASEL or the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning is the leading authority in the advancement of SEL in education. Through their collaborative work with researchers and educators, CASEL has identified five core Social-Emotional Learning competencies that have been embraced by programs and organizations across the U.S. and abroad. The competencies are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. While Leader in Me and CASEL have different competency names, their underlying outcomes are so closely related that as LiM students develop leadership competencies, they are also developing CASEL's competencies. This aligned development provides students with the skills needed to be lifelong learners and Life-Ready Leaders.</p> <p>We collected SEL data using the Panorama Survey and Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment. According to the 2020-2021 Panorama Survey, 66% of students who completed the survey responded "favorable" to the school-climate topic which includes their perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school. According to the Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment, 56% of students who completed the survey scored as "needs improvement" in the Student Empowerment subcategory within the Supportive Environment category of the Culture section, showing a need for growth.</p>
Measureable Outcome:	70% of students will score "favorable" in the school-climate section of the end-of-year Panorama Survey and 70% of the students will score "moderately effective" on the end-of-year MRA survey.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored through the use of the Panorama and MRA surveys.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct SEL and proactive 7 Habits lessons with students and classes.

Person Responsible Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

Conduct SEL and proactive 7 Habits lessons with students and classes.

Person Responsible Ashley Lowe (ashley.lowe@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will create an environment of belonging and team development within their classrooms.

Person Responsible Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will increase student voice through DEAL time, class meetings, and student clubs.

Person Responsible Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Students will be involved in shared-leadership through a Student Lighthouse Team and teacher Action Teams.

Person Responsible Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness. This will include the teaching of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, school counselors SEL lessons, and implementation of PBIS.

Person Responsible Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.

Person Responsible Ashley Lowe (ashley.lowe@osceolaschools.net)

The school will provide students with the opportunity to complete the Panorama Survey and LIM Measurable Results Assessment to determine effectiveness of programs and processes supporting SEL.

Person Responsible Julia Omer (julia.omer@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The leadership team works to maintain a cohesive mission and vision across the school revolving around student achievement and leadership. Improvement in this area will positively impact both instruction and culture which will impact learning and increased student achievement.

Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful forces for making positive, impactful change in schools. Our team includes the principal, assistant principal, dean of students, instructional coaches, student interventionist, MTSS coach, and school counselor.

It was found through the January 2021 Insight Survey that growth in the area of Observation and Feedback was needed. 49% of teacher reported that they regularly discuss feedback about their teaching with an instructional leader at school.

Measureable Outcome: On the 2022 Insight Survey, 60% of teachers will report that they regularly discuss feedback about their teaching with an instructional leader at school.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through scoring on the 2022 Insight survey and comments provided by instructional staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Administrators will utilize the Marzano and NEST observational tools to provide feedback on specific teacher instructional practices and trends across grade levels and the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ensuring the learner, whether student or teacher, is successful depends on the strategies put in place. Feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement when done properly. According to John Hattie's research, feedback has an effect size of 0.70 which indicates that it has the potential to considerably accelerate student achievement (Hattie, 2017).

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will provide specific targeted feedback through writing and/or conversation after a classroom walkthrough or focused/formal observation. Instructional coaches will provide like feedback when asked to support teachers with specific instructional strategies and programs being implemented within the school. Administrators will utilize the Marzano observational tool in iObservation along with the NEST data collection tool for school-wide trends.

Person Responsible Scott Knoebel (scott.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our school is rated "very low" for reported incidents per 100 students when compared to all elementary school statewide. Our incidents of crime, violence, and disruptive behaviors has been scored as "very low" compared to all schools across the state. We will continue to implement Leader in Me, SEL lessons, and begin PBIS this year to maintain and monitor school culture and environment. Additionally, we have hired a dean of students who will work to support behaviors in a proactive manner to maintain on-task behavior within the classroom.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school engages families, students, and staff in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students and staff and the school leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building climate and culture. For example; collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in data, student work is displayed throughout school, and specific site-based programs are in place like AVID, PBIS, and Leader in Me. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look trends among student groups. This data along with information like discipline referrals, attendance, and more support discussions of the progress for particular groups within the school along with next steps.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers, students, and parents to assume leadership roles. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. Our SEL lessons, teaching of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, and PBIS processes work to support this.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making School Advisory Council and climate surveys. Seeking input from families on how the school can support

students is a critical component to the school's success. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students and ensure equity for all.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00