School District of Osceola County, FL

Harmony Community School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Sandra Davenport

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2017

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)	43%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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

Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

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	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

Harmony Community School: A community that teaches, inspires, respects, and celebrates, everybody every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Harmony Community School: Where everyone leads by example through personal responsibility, contribution, and hard work.

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
Davenport, Sandra	Principal	Running daily operations of the school. Instructional leader. Progress monitoring of school wide initiatives to support school improvement.
Micale, Dorota	Assistant Principal	Running daily operations of the school. Instructional leader. Progress monitoring of school wide initiatives to support school improvement. Stocktake. SIP monitoring. Feedback to teachers and staff. Monthly report monitoring.
Osborne, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Support school wide improvement through literacy initiatives as well as providing professional development, modeling effective/best practices,supporting new teachers and AVID coordination
	Instructional Media	Support school wide improvement through school wide literacy initiatives.
Williams, Alissa	Instructional Coach	Support school wide improvement through literacy initiatives as well as providing professional development, modeling effective/best practices,supporting new teachers and AVID coordination
Andriaccio, Emily	School Counselor	Support school wide improvement through MTSS, iReady, career planning, and promoting a positive culture using the 7 Habits.
Hudson, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with math and science planning and resources. Being a part of the leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/16/2017, Sandra Davenport

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.*
14

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)	43%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	107	143	151	140	135	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	10	29	16	18	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	104	143	142	135	131	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	808
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	35	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	104	143	142	135	131	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	808
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	35	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	74%	53%	57%	70%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	56%	58%	64%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	51%	53%	40%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	55%	63%	70%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	59%	62%	69%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	45%	51%	60%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	49%	53%	69%	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	64%	51%	13%	58%	6%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	51%	28%	58%	21%
	2018	72%	48%	24%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	69%	48%	21%	56%	13%
	2018	62%	50%	12%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	67%	51%	16%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	53%	25%	64%	14%
	2018	72%	53%	19%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	69%	48%	21%	60%	9%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	45%	22%	53%	14%
	2018	63%	49%	14%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	27	59	59	27	59	52	15				
ELL	57	65	69	57	68						
BLK	67	71		67	79						
HSP	73	74	76	72	78	69	55	87			
MUL	87	91		73	73						
WHT	74	70	60	76	75	55	77	83	98		
FRL	60	70	62	60	66	48	54	63	93		

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	30	56	50	23	44	45	47				
ELL	39	54	64	50	69						
BLK	57	45		57	55						
HSP	65	73	59	66	66	57	71	78	91		
WHT	72	68	53	73	67	54	73	95	75		
FRL	59	64	54	54	59	52	66	85	71		

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	28	41	29	29	51	50	32				
ELL	50			42							
BLK	64			38							
HSP	63	61	36	69	72	63	68				
MUL	64			55							
WHT	71	65	42	71	69	61	71	86	78		
FRL	51	53	33	55	61	45	49	71			

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	73
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	725
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	62
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	
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	71
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	81
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	74
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	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The Lowest Quartile in ELA and Math is the data component that showed the lowest performance, as well as science achievement.This data includes ESE and ELL students. Contributing factors included PLC strength across grade levels. Flexibly grouping to attend to specific targeted student needs and lack of movement within tier 2 student groups.

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

The greatest decline was specifically with our Science Achievement which dropped from 74% to 72%. The lowest achievement was in Math Lowest quartile at 59%, however it was still an improvement from 55%. While achievement continues to increase, the strategies with ESE and T2 and T3 support need to increase in fidelit.

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.

All areas within the school outperformed the District as well as the State Average. This was true to all categories and sub-categories. Science is by far the area which needs support, specifically with SWD students. The contributing factor is loss of MS students in the overall achievement score.

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

Data which had the largest gains was in Math Learning gains improved from 67 to 75%. Lowest quartile in math also improved from 55 to 59%. ELA learning gains increased from 65 to 71% while the lowest quartile went up from 55 to 64%.

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

Students who scored a level 1 on the statewide assessment was listed at 49 students. The monitoring of these students through the MTSS process and intenstive intervention support is needed to support this group of students. We had 9 students with multiple suspensions. Monitoring of the T 2 and 3 behavior systems is needed for this population of students.

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

1. Our lowest quartile of students in math and ELA
2. 100% learning gains
3. PLC strength
4. Science Achievement
5. Tier 2 social emotional interventions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	64% Lowest Quartile made learning gains in ELA compared to the overall population at 71%. Students with Disabilities decreased in their ELA achievement by 3 points. subgroup data for ELA learning gains which can be attribute to inconsistency with planning and data analysis of our Professional Learning Communities. Lowest Quartile student attendance contributed to lack of instructional time. There is a need for professional development in specific areas and implementation of strategies for the subgroups incorporated in the Lowest Quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect 70-100% of students in the Lowest Quartile to achieve learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deanna Osborne (deanna.osborne@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring through NSGRA and MAPS Assessments. Research shows that data analysis of student assessments are critical and instructional decision making and meeting the needs of diverse students. Collaborating to analyze data of assessments are needed to improve on instructional practices to enhance student learning gains. Strategic interventions in the MTSS process with flexible grouping has a positive effect on closing the achievement gap. The use of common formative assessments allows for grade level collaboration in developing differentiated instruction in the small group setting using flexible grouping.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that the reliability and validity in the NWEA MAPS and NSGRA assessment provide strategic areas of intervention for student achievement. This data can be correlated into flexible intervention groups and analyzed through PLCs within grade levels and during the Leadership Stocktake meeting to determine student progress. (Abrams, et. al, 2016) (Cast, 2018)

Action Steps to Implement

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. Teacher teams will track every student by standard using a tracker, on the
spot formative assessments, common formative assessments, and summative assessments to track the progression of standards mastery.
3. Students will be provided Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards
and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis. Teachers will provide Tier 3 instruction based on gaps in literacy foundations: phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency.

Person Responsible Deanna Osborne (deanna.osborne@osceolaschools.net)

4. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of highly effective ELA instruction. Tier 1 Core Instruction will be strengthened by the provision of ongoing professional development provided by the District for all grades K-5.
5. The Literacy Coach will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Learning Cycle Visits.

6. All students will be monitored using the NWEA MAPS Assessment as a Universal Screener at the beginning of the year, Osceola Writes three times a year, Next Steps to Guided Reading Assessment three times a year, and district formative assessments quarterly.

Person Responsible Deanna Osborne (deanna.osborne@osceolaschools.net)

7. Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

Person Responsible Deanna Osborne (deanna.osborne@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	59% of students in the Lowest Quartile made gains in Math compared to the overall population that made 75% learning gains. Professional Learning Communities lacked progress monitoring data and tools to analyze and determine student need. There was a 7 point decrease in our SWD subgroup data for Math learning gains which can be attribute to inconsistency with planning and data analysis of our Professional Learning Communities. Lowest Quartile student attendance contributed to lack of instructional time. There is a need for professional development in specific areas and implementation of strategies for the subgroups incorporated in the Lowest Quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect 80-100% students in the Lowest Quartile to achieve learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring through SAVVAS Success Maker and NWEA MAPS Assessments. Research shows that data analysis of student assessments are critical and instructional decision making and meeting the needs of diverse students. Collaborating to analyze data of assessments are needed to improve on instructional practices to enhance student learning gains. Strategic interventions in the MTSS process with flexible grouping has a positive effect on closing the achievement gap. The use of common formative assessments allows for grade level collaboration in developing differentiated instruction in the small group setting using flexible grouping.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that the reliability and validity in the NWEA MAPS assessment and SAVVAS Success Maker intervention program provide strategic areas of intervention for student achievement. This data can be correlated into flexible intervention groups and analyzed through PLCs within grade levels and during the Leadership Stocktake meeting to determine student progress. (Cast, 2018)

Action Steps to Implement

1.Teachers will track student data by Standard - After a district provided formative, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Once scores are analyzed, teachers will determine individual student needs based on errors made. Students will then receive interventions based on those errors to clarify any misconceptions about a particular strategy used.
2. Monitor and Support - During PLC's teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs.
3. Students will track their own learning through a universal tracker provided by math coach. Teachers will provide individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with subsequent data chats.

Person Responsible Dorota Micale (dorota.micale@osceolaschools.net)

4. The Math Coach will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Learning Cycle Visits.
5. Teachers will provide Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis. Teachers will utilize an evidence-based Tier 3 curriculum to address gaps in mathematics contents.

Person Responsible	Dorota Micale (dorota.micale@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement dropped 2 points overall, however was significantly lower in all subgroups. Specifically with SWD, ELL, white and free and reduced lunch students. A large contributor, is that we lost our MS population of students and the comparisons are not available. This can be attribute to inconsistency with planning and data analysis of our Professional Learning Communities. Lowest Quartile student attendance contributed to lack of instructional time. There is a need for professional development in specific areas and implementation of strategies for the subgroups incorporated in the Lowest Quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	80% of students will achieve proficiency in Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that data analysis of student assessments are critical in instructional decision making and meeting the needs of diverse students. Collaborating to analyze data of assessments is needed to improve on instructional practices to enhance student learning gains. The use of common formative assessments allows for grade level collaboration in developing differentiated instruction in the classroom instructional time with strategies and supports to meet student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that the reliability and validity in the NWEA MAPS assessment provides strategic areas of intervention for student achievement. This data can be correlated into differentiated instruction, strategies for ELL and SWD studten subgrounbs and analyzed through PLCs within grade levels and during the Leadership Stocktake meeting to determine student progress. (Cast, 2018) (Pietrantoni, et. al, 2015).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data Tracking Student by Standard - Teachers will tracker essential standards. After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and
reassess students to monitor their learning.
2. Teachers will track student data by Standard - After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning.
3. During PLC's teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs.

Person Responsible Dorota Micale (dorota.micale@osceolaschools.net)

4. Students will track their own learning through teacher provided success criteria. Teachers will provide individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with subsequent data chats.
5. The Science Coach will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development
sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, Coaching for Implementation and Rigor Walks and District Learning Cycle Visits.

Person Responsible Dorota Micale (dorota.micale@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will be assessed and monitored for social emotional wherewithal. 68 discipline referrals were written last year and 45 bus referrals were administered. Based on 2019-2020 Panorama Surveys students will be provided differentiated social emotional learning interventions to increase social emotional awareness and decrease notable behavior referrals. Ultimately, this will increase face to face instructional time.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of 3rd - 5th Grade students will participate in the Panorama Survey twice per year. Due to the increase in social emotional curriculum and access to interventions based on survey data, discipline referrrals will decrease from 112 to 100 or fewer referrals this year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emily Andriaccio (emily.andriaccio@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Panorama Survey will be given in all 3rd - 5th grade class homerooms on a digital platform. Survey data will be collected and analyzed by the mental health school based team and reported to the Stocktake Leadership meetings. Student interventions at the levels of tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 will be specifically designated by the survey data and student need. Progression through the tiers will be determinant upon student success with interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research supports the positive correlation between social emotional learning interventions and student success in the areas of academics, behavior, and attendance. The utilization of the Panorama Survey data collection and analysis along with tier 1 interventions in the classroom and tier 2 and tier 3 supports with the school mental health team, student will increase efficacy in the classroom along with increase responsibility for behaviors and attendance. This strategy directly supports the academic objectives for this School Improvement Plan while meeting individual student social emotional needs. (Hansen, et. al., 2014).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will participate in the Panorama survey at the beginning and end of the 2020-2021 school year.
2. Data will be analyzed by MTSS team to determine severity of student need for social emotional intervention.
3. Implement small group sessions for progress monitoring with school counselors and social worker to meet specific student needs from Panorama data.
4. Student progress will be tracked with MTSS team and Threat Assessment team, as needed, to ensure student growth and development.
5. All students Pre-K - 5th grade will have access to social emotional curriculum as provided by the county.

Person Responsible	Emily Andriaccio (emily.andriaccio@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The school wide expectation is for students to have instruction and implementation Post Secondary Culture through the utilization of AVID Strategies and Kuder Galaxy Career Exploration Lessons. Exposure to career information, AVID Strategies, and teacher professional development will increase student goal setting which was not previously prioritized in the primary grade levels. Research supports the correlation between post secondary culture in elementary school, increased graduation rates, increase college attendance, and career satisfaction. A school-wide program will increase student organizational skills and college and career readiness increasing academic and career success.
Measurable Outcome:	100% grade level participation in AVID Program and Kuder Galaxy Career Exploration Lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Pociask (jessica.pociask@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School Counselor will provide in class Kuder Galaxy lessons to all grade levels for career exploration. The program identifies specific careers and pathways for students at their developmental level. Automatically engaging students in career exploration and post-secondary exposure. The School Counselor can then implement the College week and career lessons based on student interests and future goal setting.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student smart goals, career aspirations, and college readiness should be supported daily in the classroom with AVID strategies and college/career readiness. Kuder Galaxy will support students through career exploration and the unknown areas of employment. Building a school culture of post-secondary expectation based on AVID and the Leader in Me, will support students through middle school and high school. At the same time it will increase the graduation rate, college attendance and employment achievements. (Covey, 2019).

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID as a school-wide framework will support our initiatives in ELA,
Mathematics, and Science. We will create an AVID site team with representatives from each grade level, which will meet every 3rd Wednesday at 2:40 pm. During this meeting, the team will plan and develop PD and activities for our school-wide AVID PLC held once a month. These PD's will focus on WICOR and strategies to increase rigor.
2. All teachers will incorporate WICOR into lesson planning with focus on impacting student achievement. We will increase the use of WICOR strategies in the classroom with support from our AVID Designee. Teachers will Utilize WICOR checklist as provided by the AVID Coordinator, to help with their planning.
3. The AVID PLC will be led by an AVID site team with representatives from the school. The AVID site team coordinator will be responsible.

Person Responsible	Jessica Pociask (jessica.pociask@osceolaschools.net)

4. The school will host family involvement events where teachers model the implementation of AVID in their classrooms with an emphasis on WICOR. Grade levels will take turns showcasing their classrooms at these parent nights. There will be one involvement parent night per semester.
5. Administration will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor the implementation of AVID and WICOR strategies in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Jessica Pociask (jessica.pociask@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The leadership teams works together to identify and progress towards annual SMART goals. Working collaboratively to strive towards the school's vision and mission while address each area of focus in the School Improvement Plan, and meeting weekly and monthly to track student and teacher progress. Analyzing the data to determine the needs of both students and teachers in order to provide best practices for instruction and professional development meeting the needs of both students and teachers. The team includes the principal, assistant principal, academic and instructional coaches, school counselors, and other school leaders to strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	All ELA, Reading, Math, Science PLCs will be at least a Stage 5 on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric by the end of the first Semester 2020-2021 assessed by the Principal using the Seven Stage Rubric and format data. All PLCs will be at least a stage 5 or above on the PLC Seven Stage Rubric assessed by the Principal by May 2021. ELA, Math, proficiency and gains will increase to 70% in all subgroups. Students will achieve 80% Science proficiency in all subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dorota Micale (dorota.micale@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 - School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 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:	When teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, they are directly responsible for produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices. Teacher collaborative teams and PLCs are responsible for monitoring the progress to guide the instruction. Monitoring will happen in the classroom, through data chats, monthly stocktake leadership meetings and bimonthly MTSS meetings. With a schoolwide collaborative process and PLC monitoring of data then student achievement will increase. (Lewis, et. al, 2019).

Action Steps to Implement

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 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. District formative assessments will be given every four and a half weeks in all accountability areas.

Person Responsible Sandra Davenport (sandra.davenport@osceolaschools.net)

6. Principals will present within their schoolwide PLC a State of Education on a quarterly period to their staff (August 2020, November 2020, January 2021, and March 2021).
7. 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.
8. 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, Social Studies, and Science PLCs.

Person Responsible Sandra Davenport (sandra.davenport@osceolaschools.net)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA Subgroups data showed as being 38% of the overall school population. Within the subgroups; the SWD were identified as the subgroup which required the most support based on achievement in all school grade categories. 27% ELA Ach. as well as 15% Science Ach. being two of the lowest performing areas. All other subgroups increased from 2018 to 2019 and were at or above the 55% of Achievement and/ or learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	We hope to increase the performance by no less than 4 percentage points in every category. ELA Achievement from 27 to 31, ELA Learning Gains from 59 to 63, Lowest 25% of SWD from 59 to 63, Math Achievement from 27 to 31, Math Learning Gains from 59 to 63, Math lowest 25% of SWD from 52 to 56 and Science from 15 to 20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dorota Micale (dorota.micale@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We plan to support this subgroup of students through individualized interventions using the MTSS process and the district approved Decision Tree. We will also implement scaffolds through schoolwide interventions using the Pre-teaching strategies provided by the district. Utilization of support facilitation instruction with ESE teachers. Differentiation of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The MTSS process is a Federal mandate which supports students through fluid interventions. Florida Department of Education supports schools regarding policy and implementation. There is accountability and tracking for student growth or lack thereof, which is systematic. Harmony Community utilizes this framework for identifying and implementing interventions for students. This is an area of focus for the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly meeting with the MTSS team for progress monitoring.
Quarterly data chats with MTSS Team and teacher.
Intensive interventions within the classroom.
Data collected for progress.
Annual IEP meeting to create goals and track progress.
ESE support facilitation for SWD students - collaboration with the gen ed teacher.
PLC's within the ESE team as well as vertical collaboration with gen ed teachers.

Person Responsible	Emily Andriaccio (emily.andriaccio@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address schoolwide improvement priorities through a monthly Stocktake meeting. This system requires collaboration, data sharing and accountability on all members of the team. We also meet weekly to keep abreast of all workings of the school and to collaborate.

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.

Our school, A Leader in Me school, follow the 7 habits of highly effective students. As a Leader in Me school, our students follow, practice, and learn the 7 Habits by Stephen Covey to increase academic, social emotional, and overall success in responsibility, relationships, and awareness.
The habits in order are as follows:
1. Be proactive
2. Begin with the end in mind
3. Put first things first
4. Think Win-Win
5. Seek first to understand
6. Synergize
7. Sharpen the Saw

These 7 habits are specifically taught in the first two weeks of school to students of all grade levels and classes. They are further emphasized through individual student leadership notebooks, student led conferences, and Monthly Leadership club activities.
A clear code of conduct is developed, identified, and implemented in classroom through posted expectations and classroom rules, school rules and expectations are communicated through the Principal's message and classroom meetings, professional developments, and newsletters. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to examine and analyze grade level data including but not limited to common assessment data, universal screener data, Referral and attendance data.
Harmony Community school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan. Harmony Community School includes parents and teachers in their PTO and SAC committees that work together to determine and meet school needs.

(Ali & Siddiqui, 2016).

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**	**$1,750.00**

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3373	500-Materials and Supplies	0011 - Harmony Community School	General Fund		$750.00
			Notes: Literacy impacts all content areas of student learning. By focusing school wide resources on this area, student achievement will be positively impacted.			
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	0011 - Harmony Community School	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: Substitute Teachers			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$1,502.09**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	0011 - Harmony Community School	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: Substitute Teachers			
	3373	100-Salaries	0011 - Harmony Community School	General Fund		$502.09
			Notes: After review of school wide data, math gain overall continue to be low.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All Students**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$3,252.09**