Date: 10/22/2020

School/Department: Osceola Magnet

Action Step (number and description): 1.5 Action Step: Ensure that School Improvement Plans for all schools specifically address how school resources are being allocated to address achievement gaps for African American students. Provide ongoing monitoring and support of each school's implementation of the School Improvement Plans.

Evidence of Progress Monitoring (Please include narrative/description of the action taken. Where applicable, please include all measurable data.) 9/29/20 The Leadership Team as well Grade Chairs reviewed the SIP and specifically looked at how school resources are being allocated to address achievement gaps for African American students. Our area of focus for 2020-2021 will be differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students. Based on 2019 student FSA sub group data, our SWD and Black students are performing significantly below our school averages.

Results of Action Taken: We were able to make minor changes needed to the SIP to ensure that the process lent itself to monitoring resources.

Reflection: Provide ongoing monitoring and support of each school's implementation of the School Improvement Plans.

School District of Indian River County

Osceola Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Osceola Magnet School

1110 18TH AVE SW, Vero Beach, FL 32962

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Tetreault

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * 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 Indian River 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.](http://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

We believe:
that children learn best through an integrated curriculum.
that learning is a process, not a product.
that each child learns best by doing developmentally appropriate activities.
that education fosters, encourages and nurtures creativity.
that each student is the central focus of all efforts.
that providing a safe and supportive environment enhances self esteem.
that learning is fun, enriching and stimulating.
that through the exploration of math, science, technology, and the arts children will be better able to meet the challenges of the future.

Provide the school's vision statement

Osceola Magnet School will be a model for the state in the area of engineering and math exploration through the integration of arts and literacy in an engaging and collaborative school community.

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
Bacon, Chadwick	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. The Principal develops standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Morrow, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Grade chair and Professional Development resource lead. Works with leadership to design and deliver PD to staff as related to Collaborative Planning and Differentiated Instruction. Serves to assist in communication between parents and faculty in regard to academic and social concerns that affect students.
	Instructional Coach	Heather Young: The instructional coach brings evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with teachers and other school leaders.The role of the coach is to support the principal's work to align staff development with school goals and improve instruction in every classroom and to Support classroom teachers in long and short-range planning (co-planning) for increased student achievement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/21/2020, Elizabeth Tetreault

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[Diane Leinenbach](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	87	92	83	87	93	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	7	3	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/1/2020

Prior Year - 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	88	88	86	91	83	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	5	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	88	88	86	91	83	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	5	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%	58%	57%	78%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	33%	49%	48%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	82%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	75%	60%	62%	67%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	51%	63%	52%	47%
Science Achievement	68%	54%	53%	71%	55%	55%

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
	Grade Level (prior year reported)						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	79%	60%	19%	58%	21%
	2018	86%	56%	30%	57%	29%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	61%	21%	58%	24%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison	9%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	64%	12%	62%	14%
	2018	86%	60%	26%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	64%	23%	64%	23%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					
Cohort Comparison	1%					
05	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	53%	15%	53%	15%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	42	50	48	37	61	47	29				
ELL	50			92							
BLK	56	50	50	46	50	41	30				
HSP	74	66		81	67		67				
MUL	93			87							
WHT	84	70	67	86	81	63	76				
FRL	67	63	45	67	66	38	58				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	47	41	40	56	59	53					
BLK	47	32	8	53	64	62	50				
HSP	78	65		83	60		60				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	85	56	33	89	73	72	79				
FRL	65	49	29	73	66	65	59				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	71
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	90
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	
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	75
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

2019 Data reflects math as the content area with lowest performance.
Teachers struggled with differentiating standards based instruction to meet the needs of a diverse population of learners. Subgroup data reveals our students with disabilities dropped in overall proficiency from 56% to 37% and our black students dropped from 53% to 46%.

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

Teachers struggled with differentiating instruction to deliver rigorous, standards based instruction.
Based on Spring 2019 Data:
Math Proficiency overall dropped from 82% to 79%.
Grade Level decline occurred at 3rd grade from 86% to 76%.
Based on subgroup data the following subgroups demonstrated a decline:
Overall proficiency: Black from 53% to 46%. Overall proficiency: SWD from 56% to 37%
Learning gains: Black from 64% to 50%. Learning gains: SWD from 59% to 61%

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

Overall state proficiency in Math = 63%
Black subgroup in Math = 46%

Overall state proficiency in Math = 63%

SWD subgroup in Math = 37%

Teachers need training and support to deliver small group/differentiated instruction

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

While proficiency remained consistent from 2018-2019 at 78%
ELA Learning gains overall increased from 55% to 66% in 2019
ELA Learning gains in BQ increased from 33% to 54%

RTI was scheduled and intentional.
Teachers implemented differentiated instruction through small groups.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

After reflecting on the EWS data the leadership team identified that the one potential area of concern that can be addressed is the current attendance issues.

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

1. Math - differentiate instruction while maintaining rigor
2. Math - differentiate support through MTSS process to address sub group needs
3. Math - collaborative planning with instructional coaches, teachers and admin to create differentiated plans that align with the rigor of the standard

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 56% of our African American students scored a level 3 or higher on ELA and 46% of our African American students scored a level 3 or higher on mathematics, as evidenced in the Florida Standards Assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of culturally relevant teachings and differentiated Instruction teaching strategies being implemented. If differentiated Instructional teaching strategies are implemented paired with culturally relevant lessons we would bring both Math and ELA to 70% proficiency for African American students.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of black students demonstrating proficiency in English Language Arts will increase from 56% of students scoring level 3 or higher to 70% proficient, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment. The percent of black students demonstrating proficiency in Mathematics will increase from 46% of students scoring level 3 or higher to 70% proficient, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for the teachers to meet the needs of all students and address the diverse community of learners, we will focus on developing differentiated instruction across all content areas. Prior to collaborative planning, teachers will factor student's individual learning styles and levels of readiness to create rigorous standards based lessons with intensive small group support. A school-wide commitment to PBIS training and implementation for fair and equitable disciplinary practices for all. By providing rigorous and engaging instruction through culturally relevant teaching strategies and curriculum, we will increase the academic outcomes of Black students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on a meta cognitive research study (Allan & Tomlinson, 2000; Rock, Gregg, Ellis & Gable, 2008), differentiated instruction consistently yielded positive results across a wide variety of student populations, especially when delivered in small groups with targeted instruction (McQuarrie, McRae, & Stack-Cutler, 2008).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deliver PD to teachers to support the process of implementing PBIS schoolwide, Differentiated Instruction into their classroom routines, and infusing culturally relevant teaching strategies.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

2. Implement the process of using Differentiated Instruction to provide all students within their diverse classroom community of learners a range of different avenues for understanding new information.

Person Responsible Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

3. Monitor for Implementation of Differentiated Instruction and collect raw data that reflects the extent of implementation.

Person Responsible Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

4. Examine data collected, reflect on barriers, and adjust accordingly to push towards desired results.

Person Responsible Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

5. Re-Implement the process with changes necessary based on data input for those teachers not meeting desired results and provide necessary support mechanisms to address barriers.

Person Responsible Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

6. Repeat steps 3-4-5 and continue cycle until desired outcome is achieved and then support Differentiated Instruction to ensure sustainability.

Person Responsible Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will focus our school improvement on Tier I instructional methodology with focus on problem solving, emphasizing computational skills to deepen conceptual understanding using the CPA approach (Concrete, Representational, Abstract). Based on 2019 student FSA data, 79% of 3rd through 5th grade students were proficient in Math. By providing a consistent model of instruction K-5 that aligns standards based instruction with differentiated small group instruction, all students will have daily opportunities for enrichment, application of skills and differentiated support. Based on 2019 student FSA sub group data, our SWD and Black students are performing significantly below our school average in the area of Math. When teachers implement the CPA instructional methodology consistently to deliver standards focused lessons, they cultivate and facilitate educational experiences that promote a conceptual understanding that develops connections from concrete experiences to abstract. Students will make connections over time from concrete experiences to abstract thinking, developing their cognitive processing skills. MATH SWD - Overall proficiency = 37% BLACK = Overall proficiency = 46% ALL students overall prof. = 79% SWD - Learning gains = 61% BLACK = Learning Gains = 50% ALL students Learning Gains = 75%
Measureable Outcome:	Teachers K-5 will deliver standards based math instruction using the CPA method to support all students in developing cognitive processes that will enable them to acquire computational skills with focus on conceptual understanding. K-2: The performance indicators will be observable through student proficiency on formative/summative assessments as well as iReady growth towards the identified targeted Typical Growth indicator. 3-5: The performance indicators will be observable through student proficiency on formative/summative assessments, iReady growth towards the identified targeted Typical Growth indicator, and Unit Assessment Performance. Unit assessments will be consistently monitored for both Math to determine the student level of Predicted Proficiency at any given point in time. In monitoring these predicted proficiency levels proactive measures will be able to be taken. The Predicted proficiency levels for Math are as follows: MATH: Overall - 212 students out of 265 will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 80% SWD - 30 students out of 51 students will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment - 59%

Black - 26 students out of 46 students will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment - 53%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CPA "Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract" methodology will support all students in developing cognitive processes that will enable them to acquire computational skills with focus on conceptual understanding.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on a research study "Influence of Conrete-Pictorial-Abstract Approach Towards the Enhancement of Mathematical Connection Ability of Elementary School Students" (Putri, Sapitini 2018) when teachers deliver math instruction through the CPA model, students develop the ability to make mathematical connections that yield conceptual understanding and how to problem solve using multiple methods.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deliver PD to teachers to support the process of implementing CPA via Think Math into their classroom routines.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

2. Implement the process of using CPA to provide all students with a focus on problem solving, emphasizing computational skills to deepen conceptual understanding using the CPA approach.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

3. Monitor for Implementation of the CPA method and collect raw data that reflects the extent of implementation.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

4. Examine data collected, reflect on barriers, and adjust accordingly to push towards desired results.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

5. Re-Implement the process with changes necessary based on data input for those teachers not meeting desired results and provide necessary support mechanisms to address barriers.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

6. Repeat steps 3-4-5 and continue cycle until desired outcome is achieved and then support CPA to ensure sustainability.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our area of focus for 2020-2021 will be small group targeted instruction across all content areas. In order to maintain high levels of achievement while providing support for under performing subgroups, teachers will need to collaboratively plan to ensure instruction is rigorous and aligned with the standards to ensure that intensive small group support impacts student proficiency. Based on 2019 student FSA sub group data, our SWD and Black students are performing significantly below our school average. When teachers explicitly collaboratively plan with standards focused lessons, they cultivate and facilitate rich, rigorous, and relevant educational experiences that result in increased engagement and achieve maximum growth for the learners. MATH SWD - Overall proficiency = 37% BLACK = Overall proficiency = 46% ALL students overall prof. = 79% SWD - Learning gains = 61% BLACK = Learning Gains = 50% ALL students Learning Gains = 75% ELA SWD - Overall proficiency = 42% BLACK = Overall proficiency = 56% ALL students Overall Prof = 78% SWD - Learning gains = 50% BLACK = Learning gains = 50% ALL students Learning Gains =66%
Measureable Outcome:	With focused attention on the implementation of collaborative planning and ongoing progress monitoring we have established the following expected measurable outcomes: K-2: The performance indicators will be observable through student proficiency on formative/summative assessments as well as iReady growth towards the identified targeted Typical Growth indicator. 3-5: The performance indicators will be observable through student proficiency on formative/summative assessments, iReady growth towards the identified targeted Typical Growth indicator, and Unit Assessment Performance. Unit assessments will be consistently monitored for both Math and ELA to determine the student level of Predicted Proficiency at any given point in time. In monitoring these predicted proficiency levels proactive measures will be able to be taken. The Predicted proficiency levels for Math and ELA are as follows: MATH: Overall - 212 students out of 265 will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 80% SWD - 30 students out of 51 students will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 59%

Black - 26 students out of 46 students will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 53%

ELA:
Overall - 212 students out of 265 will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 80%
SWD - 26 students out of 51 students will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 51%
Black - 28 students out of 46 students will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 61%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for the teachers to meet the needs of all students and address diverse communities of learners, we will focus on collaborative planning across all content areas. Prior to collaborative planning, teachers will factor student's individual learning styles and levels of readiness to create rigorous standards based lessons with intensive small group support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on a meta cognitive research study (Allan & Tomlinson, 2000; Rock, Gregg, Ellis & Gable, 2008), differentiated instruction consistently yielded positive results across a wide variety of student populations, especially when delivered in small groups with targeted instruction (McQuarrie, McRae, & Stack-Cutler, 2008).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deliver PD to teachers to support the process of implementing Collaborative Planning into their classroom routines to benefit Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

2. Implement the process of using Collaborative Planning to provide small group targeted instruction across all content areas.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

3. Monitor for Implementation of Collaborative Planning and collect raw data that reflects the extent of implementation as related to Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

4. Examine data collected, reflect on barriers, and adjust accordingly to push towards desired results.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

5. Re-Implement the process with changes necessary based on data input for those teachers not meeting desired results and provide necessary support mechanisms to address barriers.

Person Responsible	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

6. Repeat steps 3-4-5 and continue cycle until desired outcome is achieved and then support Collaborative Planning to ensure sustainability.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
	Based on 2019 student FSA data, 79% of 3rd through 5th grade students were proficient in Math. However, based on 2019 student FSA data, 68% of 5th grade students were proficient in Science.
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is to incorporate Engineering into the instructional practice of science. The concepts of math, science, and technology will be used to design and construct products, systems, and environments, to solve problems that people might encounter daily. Standards-based, and engineering concepts will be integrated throughout the curriculum at all grade levels. Engineering design challenges will be done to integrate, support, and reinforce core curriculum objectives.
Measureable Outcome:	Unit assessments will be consistently monitored for Science to determine the student level of Predicted Proficiency at any given point in time. In monitoring these predicted proficiency levels proactive measures will be able to be taken. The Predicted proficiency levels for Science for 5th Grade are as follows: Science 5th – 69.2 MATH: Overall - 212 students out of 265 will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 80% SCIENCE: Overall- 66 students out of 88 5th graders will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessments or 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	5 E Model (Bybee, 2006) Engage to help students reflect on what they already know and ask questions about what they don't yet understand. Explore to have students themselves unpack the problem, develop a model, and gather data. Explain to dig deeply into where the question has been answered or the problem solved using evidence to support claims. Elaborate to forge the incredibly valuable concept-to-self, concept-to-concept and concept-to-world connections that help tie anchor and investigative phenomena together. Evaluate to reflect critically on the investigative process, the hypothesis, and the anchor phenomena.
Rationale for Evidence-	5E is a set of interrelated processes by which scientists and students pose questions about the natural world and investigate phenomena; in doing so, students acquire knowledge and develop a rich understanding of concepts, principles, models, and theories. Inquiry is a critical component of a Science,

based Strategy:	Engineering, and Mathematics program at all grade levels. By taking the 5E approach we are ensuring that content, as well as the teaching and assessment strategies, reflect the acquisition of understanding through inquiry. Students then will learn Science/Engineering/Mathematics in a way that reflects its function in real-world practice.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deliver PD to teachers to support the process of implementing the 5E Model into their classroom routines to benefit Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

2. Implement the process of using 5E Model to provide students the understanding to acquire knowledge and develop a rich understanding of concepts, principles, models, and theories.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

3. Monitor for Implementation of the 5E Model and collect raw data that reflects the extent of implementation as related to Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

4. Examine data collected, reflect on barriers, and adjust accordingly to push towards desired results.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

5. Re-Implement the process with changes necessary based on data input for those teachers not meeting desired results and provide necessary support mechanisms to address barriers.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

6. Repeat steps 3-4-5 and continue cycle until desired outcome is achieved and then support 5E Model implementation to ensure sustainability.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will address the instructional needs through the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model, including consistent ongoing data analysis, collaborative planning, and implementation of high yield, research based instructional methodology.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Osceola Magnet Elementary has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0051 - Osceola Magnet School	Other		$5,000.00
			Notes: Money used to pay a consultant from Think Math to perform a 2 day PD with the entire school on Tier I instructional methodology with focus on problem solving, emphasizing computational skills to deepen conceptual understanding using the CPA approach (Concrete, Representational, Abstract). The consultant will also train the teachers on using the digital interactive components of Think Math as well as Math Journaling techniques.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$9,914.35
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0051 - Osceola Magnet School	Other		$9,914.35
			Notes: Construction of a Fab Lab to allow school wide design challenges to take place in an innovative state of the art environment. The space will allow for students to collaborate on projects of their choosing and investigate using tools that will allow creative thinking and innovation. Items such as 3D printers, iPads, and building kits will open a new world of possibilities for students. Students will have access to the Fab Lab during school and in an after-school clubs. The direct results of these efforts will be: MATH: Overall - 212 students out of 265 will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessment or 80% SCIENCE: Overall- 66			

	students out of 88 5th graders will achieve a level 3 or higher on state assessments or 75%
Total:	**$14,914.35**