School District of Osceola County, FL

East Lake Elementary School

2020-21 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: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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 be the number one school in Osceola County for student achievement, integrity, and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement.

East Lake Elementary School will work together with the school community to reach or go beyond grade-level expectations in academic and social-emotional skills.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hennessy, William	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 math/science coach is the onsite professional developer for math and science. The coach supports all teachers in the area of math and science in planning, lesson observation and reviewing data.
Glasheen, Jennifer	Instructional Media	The media specialist ensures that students have reading material and works with teachers on how to incorporate literacy and technology throughout content areas.
MacMillan, Michelle	Other	As the ESOL compliance specialist, Ms. MacMillan supports both teachers in lesson development as well as oversees our Dual Language Program and MTSS for our ESOL students.
Blades, Kathy	Other	Katherine Blades is the Staffing Specialist and oversees and supports our Exceptional 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 of the school supports the principal with everything happening at the school on a daily basis, ranging from the evaluation of teachers, student safety, to building maintenance.
Torres, Nydia	School Counselor	Provides mental health services, SEL support and positive behavior strategies to all students ensuring a safe and healthy school environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Beth Telemko

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
58

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	99	121	125	124	170	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	784
Attendance below 90 percent	66	72	67	98	68	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	2	7	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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		
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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
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%	0
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%	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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
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	55

Hispanic Students	
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	79
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	56
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.

East Lake showed the lowest performance in the area of lowest quartile in both ELA and Math. The main factor contributing to this is lack of focus on student individual needs, lack of student interventions, access to resources for these interventions.

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 was in 3rd grade ELA achievement, which dropped from 60% to 52%. The main factor contributing to this was a lack of structure and consistency to student interventions and ineffective collaborative planning with data driven decisions.

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 data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the ELA lowest quartile. The main contributing factor was lack of focus on individual student learning needs.

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 5th grade math achievement with an increase from 44% to 62% with a 18% gain. There was a renewed focus on data driven PLC processes, as well as an increase in small group differentiation and intervention to meet student needs based on data driven decisions.

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

A potential area of concern based on the EWS data is student attendance. Three grades K, 1, and 3 had 15% or higher with attendance below 90%. This will make closing achievement gaps or general gaps in learning more difficult as students move to the next grade level.

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

1. High levels of achievement in ELA
2. Increase Math Achievements in Lowest 25th percentile students
3. Increase ELA Achievements in Lowest 25th percentile students
4. Increase ELL student achievements in science achievement
5. Strengthen School-Wide Post Secondary culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high levels of achievement in ELA and strive for each student to demonstrate a year and half growth in their learning. In looking at our data, our ELA lowest quartile component was previously 48% and our 3rd grade ELA achievement data dropped from 60% to 52%. Additionally, students missed a good portion of traditional learning this prior year due to COVID-19. If we can increase growth in these areas and close academic gaps caused by the break in traditional learning, we can increase our school grade.
Measurable Outcome:	East Lake will improve the percentage of proficiency from 58% to 63% overall, 42% to 45% with ELL students and from 31% to 34% for SWD. The percentage of students showing learning gains will increase from 62% to 65% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Hopkins (jamie.hopkins@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide guidance and support for small group Guided Reading instruction to maximize individualized student needs and support common assessment implementation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to close achievement gaps, teachers will need to provide targeted small group Guided Reading instruction based on student data. Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable,rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented,can effectively double the speed of learning. (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional support and monitoring in guided small group instruction using student data driven decision making.

Person Responsible	Jamie Hopkins (jamie.hopkins@osceolaschools.net)

Provide feedback on lessons to ensure standards are taught and assessed to the depth of the standard.

Person Responsible	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Utilize the ELL compliance specialist to monitor progress of ELL students and provide professional development to ensure ELL strategies are infused into all lessons at all times.

Person Responsible	Michelle MacMillan (michelle.macmillan@osceolaschools.net)

Enhance reading instruction by supporting teachers teams who will meet each month during early release Wednesdays and on two individual planning periods per month, for the purposes of assessing, analyzing, and reflecting and revising plans to meet individual student's needs.

Person Responsible	Jamie Hopkins (jamie.hopkins@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high levels of achievement in Math and strive for each student to demonstrate a year and half growth in their learning. Additionally, students missed a good portion of traditional learning this prior year due to COVID-19. If we can increase growth in these areas and close academic gaps caused by the break in traditional learning, we can increase our school grade.
Measurable Outcome:	We will strive to increase math gains from 66% to 69% and improve achievement from 65% to 68%. We will focus to improve each subgroup with 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 guidance and support in implementing and maximizing differentiated learning through small group instruction to close learning gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to be able to close achievement gaps, teachers will need to provided targeted small group instruction based on student data and plan/implement common assessments to drive instruction.Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional support and monitoring in: implementing differentiated instruction in small group instruction using student data driven decision making.

Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

Enhance teachers' mathematical instruction by expanding the implementation of standards based lesson planning to ensure that lessons meet the depth of the standards by the math coach supporting instructional teams weekly by attending common planning sessions twice a month.

Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

Provide feedback on lessons to ensure standards are taught and assessed to the intended depth as observed through weekly classroom walk-throughs with administration using a monitoring tool that mirrors the goals on the school improvement plan.Feedback to be sent by the end of the day by the leadership team.

Person Responsible	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Continue to utilize the ESOL Compliance Specialist to monitor progress of ELL students through weekly walk-throughs and provide professional development in selecting appropriate ELL strategies for essential standards.

Person Responsible	Michelle MacMillan (michelle.macmillan@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high levels of achievement in Science and strive for each student to demonstrate a year and half growth in their learning. Additionally, students missed a good portion of traditional learning this prior year due to COVID-19. If we can increase growth in these areas and close academic gaps caused by the break in traditional learning, we can increase our school grade.
Measurable Outcome:	Science proficiency will increase from 54% to 58%. and a strong focus on moving ELL students from 36% to 40%.
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. Teachers will plan and implement common assessments to drive instruction.
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. Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

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	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will teach students to determine the meaning of unknown words in content areas.

Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will increase the use of hands on science learning by planning for hands on experiences and demonstrations at least once a week.

Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will review and preview science content Fair Game Standards to support science content knowledge on the NGSS Science Assessment.

Person Responsible	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 that our school had no sub groups below the 41% mark. However, our students with disabilities was our lowest sub group at 48% and our English language learners were our second lowest sub group at 50%.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, we would like to increase our students with disabilities ESSA data will increase three points to 51% and our English language learner ESSA data will increase three points to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle MacMillan (michelle.macmillan@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
2. PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include ELLEVATION training, and ESE support strategies.
5. T he ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2,& 3.

Person Responsible	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will provide a supportive, regulated, and fulfilling environment with conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the highest needs of all students. Safety is priority. Staff will understand and effectively demonstrate the five CASEL SEL competencies to model and transfer the skills to their students. These include the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, demonstrate empathy and social awareness. Increase ability to develop decision making skills that lead to positive and safe choice, self-regulation skills and relationship skills. SEL competencies will improve student rigor, self-esteem and achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	According to data collected from the spring, 2020 administration of the Panorama Survey taken by 469 students in grades 3-5, the major area of growth at East Lake was safety. Fifty eight percent of the students expressed concerns regarding emotional regulation, particularly in provoking situation. Fifty six percent of the students expressed concerns about self-management, particularly the ability to remain calm when agitated.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nydia Torres (nydia.torres@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School will utilize findings from Panorama to inform strategies to improve school safety, including fostering respect among students and teaching self-regulation skills to improve self-management and emotional regulation. Specific students who scored in the at-risk zone in this area will be provided with more intense intervention. Updated data on student SEL will be collected through the Panorama program. School counselors and social worker will continue to implement Safer Smarter Kids, Child Safety Matters, Too Good for Drugs programs to all students as Tier 1 strategies to improve decision-making skills, respect, and self-management per district plan. Other programs to be used for Tier 2 include small group through Second Step curriculum and strategies provided by Panorama. For Tier 3 students, additional services will include individualized behavior intervention plans developed by MTSS Team, calming strategies, and mental health referrals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above strategies will meet the needs of students at all levels of social development. Interventions and programs are data driven and research based. They address the specific areas of need obtained from the Panorama data. Commitment to schoolwide SEL is a long-term process in which all members of the school community internalize the critical place of SEL in each student's education and build a shared understanding of their role in fostering SEL (Hall & Hord, 2015). Once assembled, the SEL team can create opportunities for key stakeholders to gain foundational knowledge of SEL.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on
students' individual assets and, passions.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence.self
efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.

7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching - collaborative learning.

8. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.

9. Surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and school wide plan will be developed.

Person Responsible   Nydia Torres (nydia.torres@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to School wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of post secondary education for all students-not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals.Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.
Measurable Outcome:	As of 2020, East Lake Elementary lacks a culture of promoting college and career readiness. We would like to see an increase of 50% of our classrooms participating in college and career culture and activities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing post secondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons and students alone.{Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college
and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate ill an articulated set of grade-level sequence activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a post secondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and meta cognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities ttiat will practice 21st-century life skills.
5. Administration and the Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater
voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.

Person Responsible	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement.
Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership
teams. Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams
typically include the prin principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school
leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school engage families, students. and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently
communicate high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate
how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:
•Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
• Student work is displayed throughout school
A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been
created.Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school
suspension.and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups
within a school and What needs to be done. Such as, Establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing
disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training
and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers

have

resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively

make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master

schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The

school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher.

Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to

students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests

and experiences of students.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC

council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking

input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We

also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate

(schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for

the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, The school provides all teachers with

training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0961 - East Lake Elementary School	Other Federal		$2,000.00
			Notes: Training and professional development for ELA teachers.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students	$0.00
		Total:	$2,000.00