School District of Osceola County, FL

East Lake Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

East Lake Elementary School

4001 BOGGY CREEK RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Beth Telemko   Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

East Lake Elementary School

4001 BOGGY CREEK RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

East Lake Elementary will provide a welcoming, supportive environment that ensures high levels of learning for all individuals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

East Lake Elementary will work in partnership with families and the community to ensure all learners develop the essential knowledge and skills to strengthen our thriving 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
DeLuca, Hilary	Principal	The principal of the school oversees everything happening at the school on a daily basis, ranging from the evaluation of teachers, student safety, to building maintenance.
Hopkins, Jamie	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach is the onsite professional developer for ELA. The literacy coach supports all teachers in the area of ELA in planning, lesson observation and reviewing data.
Poole, Stacey	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach is the onsite professional developer for math and science. The literacy coach supports all teachers in the area of math and science in planning, lesson observation and reviewing data.
Glasheen, Jennifer	Instructional Media	As our Media Specialist, Jennifer Glasheen supports teachers and students with books and other media resources. She also communicates to families through all social media platforms.
MacMillan, Michelle	Other	Michelle MacMillian is our English Speakers of Other Languages resource at East Lake Elementary. She supports both teachers in lesson development, oversees our Dual Language Program and MTSS for our ESOL students.
Herring, Kristy	Other	Kristy Herring is the Staffing Specialist and oversees and supports our Exeptional Student Education program. She meets with parents and ensures all aspects of ESE are in compliance and students' needs are met.
Knoebel, Cheri	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal in all areas. In addition, the assistant principal oversees discipline.

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	121	132	128	169	148	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	879
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	12	16	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	42	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	

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	2	3	6	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	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

Thursday 7/18/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	24	18	25	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	12	41	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	54	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	5	36	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	23	24	18	25	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	12	41	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	54	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	5	36	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	58%	53%	57%	58%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	53%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	51%	53%	41%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	55%	63%	65%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	59%	62%	63%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	45%	51%	63%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	49%	53%	53%	54%	51%

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	121 (0)	132 (0)	128 (0)	169 (0)	148 (0)	181 (0)	879 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (23)	6 (24)	12 (18)	16 (25)	7 (19)	9 (22)	60 (131)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (5)	0 (7)	0 (18)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (12)	0 (41)	0 (16)	0 (12)	0 (81)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (43)	42 (54)	48 (60)	93 (157)

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	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	59%	54%	5%	62%	-3%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	53%	6%	64%	-5%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	62%	48%	14%	60%	2%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	31	52	42	36	62	52	44				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	42	52	44	55	61	42	36				
ASN	87	100		93	100						
BLK	58	52		71	61		50				
HSP	53	55	47	59	63	50	46				
MUL	42			67							
WHT	78	84		78	70		85				
FRL	47	58	48	57	64	56	49				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	44	50	15	31	29					
ELL	37	43	37	50	47	33	25				
ASN	85			100							
BLK	47	55		56	50		21				
HSP	56	52	39	59	49	33	55				
MUL	73			82							
WHT	63	57	42	61	51	38	38				
FRL	53	55	38	53	44	32	41				

2017 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	7	26	26	17	48	56					
ELL	42	43	40	55	62	67	35				
ASN	81	69		94	77		80				
BLK	47	43		63	74		45				
HSP	56	54	42	63	62	67	51				
MUL	63	27		63	30						
WHT	64	55	27	69	66	54	56				
FRL	51	50	43	59	62	67	46				

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	59
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Last year, East Lake showed the lowest performance in the area of lowest quartile learning gains, both in reading and mathematics. The main factor contributing to this is a lack of structure to student interventions, access to resources for these interventions, and a lack of understanding of specific targets/skills students were lacking.

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

While in the majority of categories, East Lake showed growth, lowest quartile learning gains in ELA for students with disabilities (SWD) was the category with the greatest decline. The main factor contributing to this is a lack of structure to student interventions, access to resources for these interventions, and a lack of understanding of specific targets/skills students were lacking.

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.

The only categories East Lake did not surpass the state average was with lowest quartile learning gains, both in reading and in mathematics. he main factor contributing to this is a lack of structure to student interventions, access to resources for these interventions, and a lack of understanding of specific targets/skills students were lacking.

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

Math learning gains increased sixteen points this year. There was a renewed focus on PLC processes across grade levels, in which there was a heightened focus on standard-assessment alignment and student discourse.

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

A potential area of concern at this point in the school year is with primary grade level (KG-2nd) attendance. The number of students that have missed 10% of the school year is alarming, as this will make closing achievement gaps or general gaps in learning more difficult as students move into the intermediate level.

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

1. High levels of achievement in ELA
2. High levels of achievement in math
3. High levels of achievement in science
4. Strengthen our collaborative process
5. Strengthen school-wide post-secondary culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy.
Rationale	If we cultivate our teachers' understanding of what balanced literacy instruction and its components look like, then literacy instruction will improve across all content areas and meet the instructional needs of all students. This will increase achievement and learning gains for all students in literacy.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the FSA, East Lake will improve the percentage of proficiency from 58% to 62% overall, 42% to 45% with ELL students, and from 31% to 34% for SWD. The percentage of students showing learning gains will go from 62% to 65% overall and from 52%-55% for both ELL and SWD.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Effectively implement Guided Reading and appropriate ESE and ELL scaffolds/ supports as part of the Balanced Literacy approach to literacy instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students in the lowest quartile, ELL, and ESE students are not making as much progress in ELA as other areas. By utilizing explicit, differentiated instruction teachers will fill the gaps in ELA achievement and learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	1. The following professional development courses will take place throughout the year: Core Connections, Reading Endorsement training, model and train about differentiation. 2. Increase rigor in small group instruction by providing training and follow up by monitoring implementation. 3. Increase instructional rigor through the authentic use of learning goals and scales. 4. Provide feedback on lessons to ensure standards are taught and assessed to the depth of the standard. 5. Continue to utilize the ELL task force to monitor progress of ELL students. and provide professional development to ensure ELL strategies are infused into all lessons at all times. 6. Teacher teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a collaborative team.
Person Responsible	Jamie Hopkins (jamie.hopkins@osceolaschools.net)

#2	
Title	Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.
Rationale	If we cultivate our teachers' understanding of what mathematics content and instruction looks like then math instruction will improve across all content areas and meet the instructional needs of all students. This will increase achievement for all students in mathematics.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We intend to increase math gains from 66% to 69% and improve achievement from 65% to 68%. We will work to improve each subgroup with the lowest quartile from 48% to 51%, ELL from 34% to 45% and ESE from 23% to 26% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide cooperative learning strategies to enhance problem solving ability and higher order thinking.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for students to be able to think critically and reach the depth of the standards, they need to be exposed to quality tasks and quality instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide professional development in: math standard strategies aligned to the Marzano Instructional Framework to enhance the use of effective instructional strategies, math discourse, mathematical shifts, use of SMP's, understanding the DOK and how to teach to the depth of the standard, standards based lesson planning, and cooperative learning strategies. 2. Enhance teachers' mathematical instructional by expanding the implementation of targeted math tasks by supporting instructional teams weekly as supported by the math coach attending common planning sessions twice a month. 3. Increase level of rigor through authentic use of topic goals and scales as supported by the math coach during common planning sessions twice a month. 4. Provide feedback on lessons to ensure standards are taught and assessed to the intended depth as observed through weekly classroom walkthroughs with administration using a monitoring tool similiar to the district monitoring tool. Feedback is sent by the end of the day from the Leadership Team. 5. Continue to utilize the ELL Task Force to monitor progress of ELL students through weekly walk-throughs and the ESOL Compliance Specialist will provide professional development in selecting appropriate ELL strategies for essential standards.
Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

#3	
Title	Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students.
Rationale	If we cultivate our teachers' understanding of what science content and instruction looks like then science instruction will improve and meet the instructional needs of all students. This will increase achievement for all students in science.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science proficiency will increase from 54% to 58%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize high yield strategies to increase the students' science vocabulary knowledge, informational reading strategies and allow time for quality hands on science activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Science achievement is closely connected to non-fiction and technical reading. Students will need to understand vocabulary and use informational text reading strategies in order to be successful with the content.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teacher teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a collaborative team. 2. Teachers will teach students how to determine the meaning of unknown words in content areas. 3. Teachers will increase the use of hands on science learning by taking students to the science labs. 4. Teachers will review and preview science content Fair Game questions to support science content knowledge on the NGSS Science Assessment.
Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

#4	
Title	Strengthen collaborative process to ensure learning needs of all students are met.
Rationale	The data shows that PLCs are not operating consistently at a high level on the Seven Stages Rubric and formative assessment data throughout the year. This impacts student achievement as there are inconsistencies within delivering the curriculum in each subject area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All ELA, Reading, Math, and Science collaborative teams will be at Stage 5 on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric by the end of Semester 1 2019-2020, assessed by the Principal using the Seven Stage Rubric and format data. All collaborative teams will be at stage 5 or above on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric, assessed by the Principal by May 2020. ELA proficiency will increase by 3% in all subgroups.. Math proficiency will increase at minimum of 3% in all subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research states PLCs entail whole-staff involvement in a process of intensive reflection upon instructional practices and desired student benchmarks, as well as monitoring of outcomes to ensure success. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Monitoring - 1. Administration, PLC Lead, and PLC Guided Coalition will meet to discuss all accountability area collaborative teams, to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams by the Principal. With the addition of formative assessment scores for Math, ELA, and Science PLCs. 3. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 4. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Step 6 - If teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction, then student achievement will increase.
Action Step	
Description	1.Schools PLC's teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team. 2. Principal and assistant principal (s) will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure they are progressing through the PLC Seven Stages Rubric of an effective PLC. 3.Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes. 4. School City will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs. Professional development will be conducted to train staff on the School City platform. 5. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be

given so they become an effective collaborative team.
6. A PLC Guiding Coalition will be formed to oversee the process.
7. District formative assessments will be given every four and a half weeks in all accountability areas.
8. Principals will present within their schoolwide PLC a State of Education on a quarterly period to their staff (August 2019, November 2019, January 2020, and March 2020).

Person Responsible	Jennifer Glasheen (jennifer.glasheen@osceolaschools.net)

#5	
Title	Strengthen school wide post secondary culture. Principal will share and update the Chieft of Staff and the Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in, on the progress of the Areas of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.
Rationale	If we expose students to the post high school career options, ranging from college to technical training, and trade school, they will be more likely to choose one of these paths.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students at East Lake will participate in 3 school or district activities that promote post-secondary options.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will learn more about college and careers after high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As students gain more knowledge about the availability of careers and the steps needed to obtain the careers, they can ensure they take the needed steps to attain those goals.
Action Step	
Description	1. Plan a career day for students to learn more about the career choices available to them. 2. Showcase the trade school option at O-Tech and Paths High school. 3. Fifth grade students attend field trip at Valencia Community College. 4. Students participate in College/Career Week, promoting post-secondary options
Person Responsible	Nydia Torres (nydia.torres@osceolaschools.net)

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 IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title 1 programs and our Parent and Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of required plan through flyers, school marquee, social media, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and training provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school district has added 13 district social worker positions and 2 psychologist positions to support the socio-emotional needs of students. Second Step intervention kits were distributed to all elementary and K-8 schools for support social-emotional learning environments.

Our district has a one-step referral system for mental health concerns. Through Title IV funding, students are screened by Panorama to determine needs for socio-emotional needs. Middle School Counselors receive training in Suicide Awareness. High School presentations are done to recognize signs of chronic absence and mental illness.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To support the transition of elementary to middle, middle school counselors are scheduled prior to the end of the school year to visit the elementary feeder schools. During the visit, the guidance counselor(s) share information about course offerings, school clubs/organizations, and expectations for the students as they transition from elementary to middle school.

To support the transition of middle to high school, each comprehensive high school has a College/Career Specialist paid through a grant with Valencia College to support students in their pursuit of opportunities post-high school. Naviance software is used at the high schools to give students the opportunity to explore career options and interests.

A DJJ Commitment Specialist is employed to support students entering/leaving the juvenile justice program and a transition plan is created to help any students leaving DJJ and returning to their home-zoned school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Title I, Part A
Funds may be used to support extended learning and remediation materials and/or professional development and academic coaches.

Title I, Part D
When Neglected and/or Delinquent children enroll, we will coordinate efforts with the Alternative Programs Department to ensure that all student needs are met.

Title II
Focused professional learning opportunities are offered in: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Instructional Pipeline and Framework Design, Standards Based Instruction, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Title III
The Multicultural Department assists in the identification of at-risk Limited English Proficiency (LEP), immigrant, and Native American students. Research-based, comprehensive educational programs help reduce barriers that result from cultural and linguistic needs.

IDEA provides support for students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP), students identified through the Preschool Education Evaluation Program (PEEP), and students identified through gifted screening of all second grade Title I students.

Title IV
The Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) program is intended to help to:
1. Provide a well-rounded education,
2. Improve safe and healthy school conditions and
3. Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. (ESEA section 4101).

Title IX
To help eliminate education barriers the District Liaison works with the school to help homeless students to enroll, attend, and succeed in our public schools. For students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act, the Liaison provides health/academic referrals and resource vouchers.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Supplemental district guidance counselors, paid through Title IV funds, to support elementary implementation of Project Lead the Way, and course acceleration and college and career achievement at the secondary levels. Naviance software is used at the high schools to give students the opportunity to explore career options and interests. Campus tours of Valencia College and Osceola Technical College (oTech) are offered for students in seventh and eleventh grades to learn about career options and potential areas of study.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy.				$2,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			0961 - East Lake Elementary School	Other Federal			$2,000.00
			Notes: Training cost for Core Connections (substitute teachers)				
			0961 - East Lake Elementary School	General Fund			$200.00
			Notes: Facilitator pay for reading endorsement training				
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.**					**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students.**					**$0.00**
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Strengthen collaborative process to ensure learning needs of all students are met.**					**$0.00**
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Strengthen school wide post secondary culture. Principal will share and update the Chieft of Staff and the Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in, on the progress of the Areas of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.**					**$0.00**
						Total:	**$2,200.00**