Park Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Park Elementary School

327 E PALMETTO ST, Avon Park, FL 33825

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~pes/

Demographics

Principal: Robert Germaine

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically **Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Highlands 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.

Table of Contents

Park Elementary School

327 E PALMETTO ST, Avon Park, FL 33825

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~pes/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Park Elementary's mission statement is: "Purposely Empowering Success."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Park Elementary's vision statement is: "Go Near and Far Leading Wherever You Are."

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Germaine, Robert	Principal	
Harvard, Zachary	Assistant Principal	
Free, Stacie	Teacher, PreK	
Hendrick-Robles, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	
Barbour, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Jahna, Susan	Teacher, ESE	
Rodriguez, LaCae	Reading Coach	
Pantoja, Maricarmen	Math Coach	
McGee, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Robert Germaine

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school
542

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	111	73	79	79	70	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	7	22	20	28	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	116	18	25	16	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Course failure in Math	16	16	17	10	9	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	8	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	7	14	12	10	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	15	5	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	82	79	64	74	65	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	37	24	17	14	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	9	8	4	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	5	5	1	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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	6	7	2	7	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	13	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	82	79	64	74	65	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	37	24	17	14	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	9	8	4	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	5	5	1	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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	6	7	2	7	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	13	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	47%	56%				51%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	38%						61%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						53%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	58%	44%	50%				58%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						47%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						27%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	52%	59%				33%	45%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	50%	3%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	56%	17%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	43%	-8%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	35	38	30	16	8	19				
ELL	26	33		47	29		10				
BLK	30	29	30	42	29	19	25				
HSP	42	40	21	56	45	40	38				
WHT	67	48		78	60		69				
FRL	36	33	31	54	42	30	33				

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	21	33		40	17		50				
ELL	27	60		65	60						
BLK	21			41							
HSP	44	60		67	72		50				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	69	74		79	78		76				
FRL	38	54	50	58	61	40	54				

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	22	30	32	29	37	29	11				
ELL	40	40		65	47						
BLK	38	60		37	34	17	25				
HSP	49	58	56	58	47	29	30				
MUL	64			64	55						
WHT	56	62	50	68	56		39				
FRL	45	59	51	53	44	28	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	64
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

ELA overall proficiency has decreased from 49 % to 46 %.
SWD ELA proficiency is at 29%
ELL ELA proficiency is at 26%
BLK ELA proficiency 30%

Math overall proficiency has decreased from 64 % to 58 %.

Science overall proficiency has decreased from 63 % to 42 %.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning gains in ELA and Math.
Lowest 25% in ELA and Math
ESSA subgroups African American ELA Learning Gains

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

As a result of lower student population in fourth in fifth grade, PES was only allocated 3 teachers in each grade level. Two teachers taught across two grade levels in ELA and Math. Teachers began to be more concerned about small group instruction, and the fidelity of tier 1 instruction was compromised. Due to staffing shortages, the MTSS structure was often interrupted, impacting the fidelity of Tier 3 interventions.

For the 22-23 school year, fidelity of tier 1 instruction will need to be closely monitored. The internal structure of the reading block will need to be re-established and reviewed with teachers. In order to address proficiency concerns in grade levels where proficiency is below 50%, a core support plan will need to be established. This will be implemented outside of the core instruction time.

Administrators and instructional coaches will need to continue to be in the work with the PLC process to ensure lessons are planned to meet the rigor of the standards/benchmarks and that student tasks incorporated are in alignment. Classroom walk throughs will be conducted to monitor implementation, and to ensure that students are engaged in the work of the lesson.

More purposeful data-driven decision making by teachers using informal and formal assessments to monitor student learning for all sub-groups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Proficiency SWD went from 21% to 29%

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

Instructional coaches worked more closely with support facilitators to ensure their support was more targeted and purposeful.
PLC professional development will be done every 9 weeks to ensure we are strengthening Tier 1 instruction and we are accelerating the learning if possible.

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

In order to improve the health of the core, administrators and instructional coaches will be involved in the work of the PLC's. Through this process, instructional coaches will guide teachers in the effective planning of lessons around the the new benchmarks/standards and ensure student tasks are in alignment. The structure of the ELA and Math block will be established to help teachers maximize instructional time. A core support plan will be established, based on student data, to be implemented outside of Tier 1 instruction time to help address any gaps or lost learning in ELA and Math (if the data indicates this is necessary). Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be prescribed (targeted) based on student data, and through the MTSS process will be closely monitored. Due to staffing changes, the system for delivering Tier 3 interventions will have to be re-established. Through classroom walkthroughs administrators will consistently monitor the fidelity of all tiers of 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.

ELA teachers in grades 2 and 3, the reading coach, and administrators will participate in CRI-PD (Content Reading Instruction) delivered by the District Content Reading Specialist. This is a job embedded professional development based on the science of reading.
ELA teachers in grades 3-5 will participate in ELA BEST training
School leaders will participate in training provided by Amplify CKLA to identify "look fors" specifically around the elements of the curriculum. They will also provide training to help administrators understand the mClass system and analysis of DIBELS 8th data.
Fla Reveal will provide training to administrators and instructional coaches around the curriculum and data platform.
Because PES is a pilot school for Branching MInds, we will continue to receive training around the platform and elements of MTSS.

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

Continuous evaluations to measure the effectiveness of PLC, targeted interventions, MTSS review, progress monitoring, and instructional pedagogy to address these needs.

Ensure we are using the most effective research-based strategies to build the capacity of all stakeholders.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on school grade data our FSA ELA proficiency decreased overall from 2021 to 2022 (49% to 46%). ELA gains decreased from 65% to 38%. Math overall proficiency has decreased from 64 % to 58 %. Learning gains decreased from 67 % to 44 % Lowest 25 % decreased from 54 % to 26 % Our Science proficiency decreased from 63 % to 42 %
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	50% of the students will be proficient on ELA FAST Test by May 2023. 50% of the students will make learning gains on the ELA on the FAST by May 2023. Math proficiency increase from 58 % to 60% We want to increase our Science from 42 % to 50 %
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ELA- LaCae Rodriquez will monitor 1. Administrators and coaches will monitor the fidelity of all Tiers of instruction through classroom walk-throughs. 2. During weekly PLC's, formative assessment data will be monitored. 3. Aims Web 2 probes will be monitored during weekly MTSS meetings to ensure effectiveness of targeted interventions. 4. During quarterly progress monitoring meetings, administrators and coaches meet with each teacher to review individual student data. Math- Maricarmen Pantoja will monitor 1. FAST PM1-PM3 testing 2. PLC data review 3. Redbird supplemental math resource 4. MTSS Science- Zachary Harvard will Monitor 1. Bi-weekly PLCs 2. Baseline assessments 3. Informative and formative assessments 4. Standard-based instruction planning 5. STEM resource teacher
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Germaine (germainr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	ELA Weekly grade level professional learning communities facilitated by the reading coach. Explicit, systematic, and targeted small group instruction provided to students in need of intervention. Prescriptive core support plan for grade levels with low proficiency. Math Target intervention groups.

Data driven decision making using data from PM1-PM3 fast testing
Professional Learning Community to analyze data and improve staffs' capacity and pedagogy.

Science
Bi-weekly PLC to increase staff capacity for instruction.
Baseline assessments to identify gaps in science standard deficiencies.
Informative and formative assessments to measure student learning.
Standard-based instruction planning to ensure rigor and fidelity.
STEM resource teacher to support the greatest needs identify by baseline and formative assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Weekly PLC's guided by the reading coach builds teacher capacity around planning effective lessons that are grounded in the benchmarks. During this process, teachers also learn how to effectively check for understanding during the lesson and after the lesson through formative checks. Teachers learn to continuously monitor learning, adjust instruction, and plan for whatever follow up is necessary to extend learning or address deficiencies.
In order to address specific student deficiencies, it is important to target interventions and provide explicit and systematic instruction to close achievement gaps.
A Tier 1 core support plan will be established for grade levels in which more than 50% of the students are not proficient. When proficiency is this low, it is an indication that the core is not healthy and additional instruction must be prescribed outside of the core to address learning gaps.

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

1. Weekly instructional walks in ELA, Math, and Science
2. Purposeful feedback is given on a regular basis to teachers to guide instruction.
3. Data disaggregation with leadership team
4. PLCs are used to increase staff's capacity for instruction, benchmark aligned assessment, and data review
5. Baseline assessments to identify gaps in science standard deficiencies.
6. Common and formative assessments to measure student learning when applicable.
7. Standard/Benchmark-based instruction planning to ensure rigor and fidelity.
8. STEM resource teacher to support the greatest needs identify by baseline and formative assessments.
9. Weekly meeting with instructional coaches to provide support to the tier teachers.

Person Responsible   Robert Germaine (germainr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to School Culture	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	PBIS leadership team wants to increase our capcity using the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Implementation Blueprint to "guide the leadership team in the assessment, development, and execution of action plans that have as an outcome the systemic capacity for sustainable, culturally and contextually relevant, and high fidelity implementation of multi-tiered practices and systems of support." We have an increase in discipline and new staff members not familiar with the PBIS model. For this reason, we want to raise our school culture amongst all stakeholders, utilizing the PBIS model to reduce discipline, increase intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, increase social skills, and raise student achievement.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase the number of students meeting the school's weekly, monthly, and quarterly PBIS goals. Decrease the number of referrals from 156 to 130. Decrease misconducts and time students spend in the office. Increase postive school culture among all stakeholders. Increase parent involvement.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Our PBIS committee and leadership team will actively monitor progress. We will meet monthly to monitor discipline data, to plan incentives for students that demonstrate positive behavior and meet school's expectations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nikki McGee (mcgeen@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Continuously evaluating our practice and systems in place to ensure successful implementation. Consistent communication among all stakeholders of school's expectations using the PBIS model. Having rewards and activities in place to extrinsically and intrinsically motivate students. Implement restorative practice to create and maintain postive relationships among stakeholders.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These strategies have proven to be effective and time efficient in identifying, creating, or remediating school cultural shifts. We will use the PBIS guidelines and restorative practices to make progress toward our goals. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed.

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

Follow the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Implementation Blueprint for guidance.
Monthly leadership team meetings to monitor progress.
We will decrease time spent in the office/ISS. Zachary Harvard will monitor this. Zachary is the main
contact for teachers with discipline concerns.

Person Responsible   Nikki McGee (mcgeen@highlands.k12.fl.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will monitor the fidelity of Tier 1 instruction in K-2 taking a heavy focus on the Foundational Skills. Grade levels will continue to focus on having a productive Professional Learning Community once a week with the reading coach and Admin. They will plan effective/engaging lessons and will bring back data to share with the group. After looking at the data we will determine the next steps.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will be using High Impact Tutoring (groups of 2-4) in an effort to close the gap in reading deficiencies.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In grades K-2 STAR Early Literacy and STAR reading students will be at 65% proficient as measured by the end of year progress monitoring test.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase ELA proficiency from 46% to 50% on the FAST test

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

ELA
1. Administrators and coaches will monitor the fidelity of all Tiers of instruction through classroom walk-throughs.
2. During weekly PLC's, formative assessment data will be monitored.
3. Aims Web 2 probes will be monitored during weekly MTSS meetings to ensure effectiveness of targeted interventions.
4. During quarterly progress monitoring meetings, administrators and coaches meet with each teacher to review individual student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rodriguez, LaCae, rodrigul1@highlands.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

ELA
Weekly grade level professional learning communities facilitated by the reading coach.
Explicit, systematic, and targeted small group instruction provided to students in need of intervention.
Prescriptive core support plan for grade levels with low proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Weekly PLC's guided by the reading coach builds teacher capacity around planning effective lessons that are grounded in the benchmarks. During this process, teachers also learn how to effectively check for understanding during the lesson and after the lesson through formative checks. Teachers learn to continuously monitor learning, adjust instruction, and plan for whatever follow up is necessary to extend learning or address deficiencies.
In order to address specific student deficiencies, it is important to target interventions and provide explicit and systematic instruction to close achievement gaps.
A Tier 1 core support plan will be established for grade levels in which more than 50% of the students are not proficient. When proficiency is this low, it is an indication that the core is not healthy and additional instruction must be prescribed outside of the core to address learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching: Extra pay for teachers and academic coaches. Additional 30 minutes daily for PLCs to collaborate among grade levels, progress monitor, and align BEST standards to curriculum content.	Germaine, Robert, germainr@highlands.k12.fl.us
Salary and benefits for intervention teacher providing in-school tutoring during the school day. Salary and benefits for intervention teacher providing after school tutoring.	Harvard, Zachary, harvardz@highlands.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Park is a Bronze status PBIS school. We have been utilizing the PBIS model for 6 years.
School wide expectations are taught and practiced in every classroom. A PBIS Team meets
monthly to monitor discipline data, to plan incentives for students that demonstrate positive
behaviors, and to share strategies that reinforce positive behaviors

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

PES is focused on building and sustaining meaningful relationships with students. Every classroom
develops a "Relationship Agreement"
which is a social compact that is established through student and teacher collaboration.
Teachers and students decide how they want to be treated and how they will treat others. This
is signed by all students in the class and is an expression of the class' values.
Another way teachers work to build relationships with students is through the "relationship building"
circle. This is a tool that helps the students and the teacher learn about one another,
and it increases levels of empathy and understanding.