
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	14

Osceola Magnet School

1110 18TH AVE SW, Vero Beach, FL 32962

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Scott Simpson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

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 Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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.

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 science 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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCord, Janice	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader
Robb, Jill	Guidance Counselor	Behavior Intervention Specialist
Rollins, Theresa	Instructional Coach	ELA coach and intervention
Bruckner, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Grade chair grade 5
Morrow, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair grade 4
Cathcart, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair - grade 3
Osowski, Jill	Teacher, K-12	Grade chair - grade 2
Thomas, Marianne	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair - grade 1
Kipp, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair - kindergarten
Simpson, Scott	Principal	Instructional Leader

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	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	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	88 (0)	88 (0)	86 (0)	91 (0)	83 (0)	87 (0)	523 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	2 ()	5 ()	5 ()	2 ()	5 ()	19 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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 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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is SWD and BLK population in areas of ELA, Math and Science. Contributing factors are inconsistent small group instruction, aligning deficits with appropriate resources.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2018 is 3rd grade math. There was a decrease of 10% from 86% to 76%. The factors that contributed to this decline are inconsistent small group instruction and students acquiring fact fluency.

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

There was not a gap compared to the state average. The school scored above the average in ELA, Math and Science.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA growth of the lowest quartile gains. The lowest quartile grew from 31% to 54%. This gain is attributed to focusing on Tier 2 instruction by identifying specific learning gaps and providing the appropriate resources for intervention.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

An area of concern, based on EWS, is tardy arrivals. Students lose the opportunity to start the day with their peers, the SEL lesson, and possibly a portion of Tier 2 instruction.

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

1. Consistently provide targeted small group instruction during Tier 1 instruction in ELA and Math
2. Create Tier 2 intervention groups with specific skill deficiencies, provide adequate resources and monitor data closely at data meetings.
3. Regular data checks of Tiered instruction - specifically targeted subgroups.
4. Professional development for targeted small group instruction; including identifying baseline data sources and appropriate intervention materials (Leveled Literacy Instruction, Jan Richardson, Haggerty phonics inventory and phonemic awareness
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Small Group Instruction: Daily, Targeted, Monitored, Research Based Framework
Rationale	If we effectively increase tiered targeted small group instruction in the content areas, student proficiency will increase.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The identified sub groups of SWD and BLK will increase 5% in the areas of ELA, math and science SWD ELA 42% to 47% Math 37% to 42% Science 29% to 34% BLK ELA 56% to 61% Math 46% to 51% Science 30% to 35% Schoolwide goal: (3+) ELA 78% to 81% Math 79% to 82% Science 68% to 71%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Instructional practices will focus on targeted small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This evidence based strategy allows teachers to work more closely with each student. This type of instruction provides the opportunity to evaluate the students' learning strengths, locate gaps in the development of their reading, math or science skills and tailor lessons focused on specific objectives.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of LLI and use of "Next Steps Forward in Guided Reading" framework for small group instruction 2. Use of passage rate on iReady in both ELA and math to help inform instruction 3. Use of science unit assessments for targeted small group instruction 4. Continuing professional development, by administration and literacy coach, into practice for small group instruction; including, small group framework, appropriate baseline data choices and identification of gaps in learning, options for intervention and progress monitoring in content areas 5. Regularly held data review and problem solving sessions
Person Responsible	Janice McCord (janice.mccord@indianriverschools.org)

#2

Title	Social Emotional Learning - Establishing an Environment of Caring and Resiliency
Rationale	If we increase social emotional targeted instruction, overall student social emotional well being will increase.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Targeted areas based on spring 2019 Panorama: Grit: 57% to 62% Self-Efficacy: 62% to 67% Anxiety: 54% to 60% Office Discipline Referrals: Reduce number from 133 to 120 (10%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jill Robb (jill.robbs@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Social emotional education will focus on strategies/lessons from Panorama, PBIS, Sanford Harmony, Collaborative and Pro-Active Solutions and Second Step through tiered instruction (individual, small group, whole group, hourly, daily, weekly, monthly).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence based practices are delivered as a result of observed student behaviors (ODRs), Panorama survey results and group discussion. The use of this data will allow for targeted skill instruction. The implementation will allow adults to help increase the social emotional well being of students; improving self-efficacy, grit and lessened anxiety.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement school wide PBIS 2. Sanford Harmony daily in every classroom 3. Tier 2 Social Skills based on survey results 4. Panorama and Collaborative Pro-Active Solutions targeted lessons as needed 5. Professional development monthly on social emotional learning/resources/Trauma Informed Care/Youth Mental Health First Aid
Person Responsible	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Small Group Instruction: Daily, Targeted, Monitored, Research Based Framework				\$6,155.98
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0051 - Osceola Magnet School	School Improvement Funds		\$5,984.00
			<i>Notes: Greenwood Publishing - Heinemann LLI - Leveled Literacy Instruction</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0051 - Osceola Magnet School	General Fund		\$171.98
			0051 - Osceola Magnet School			\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning - Establishing an Environment of Caring and Resiliency				\$164.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0051 - Osceola Magnet School	General Fund		\$164.80
			<i>Notes: PBIS Posters from Print Shop</i>			
					Total:	\$6,320.78