

School District of Osceola County, FL

Highlands Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Highlands Elementary School

800 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Magali Rassel

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2018

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Highlands Elementary School

800 W DONEGAN AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">93%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Highlands Elementary is to nurture, guide, and challenge all of our students to achieve their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Highlands Elementary School, in partnership with parents and community members, is committed to creating an environment of high academic expectations where all individuals through support, interventions and enrichment, grow to their greatest potential.

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
Cummins, Patricia	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. Mrs. Cummins will oversee SIP and StockTake process, ensuring the leadership team is utilizing resources for strategic thinking and problem solving in all areas of focus in the Highlands school improvement plan. Weekly check-ins with leadership team will monitor data for ELA, Math, and Science including growth and achievement for SWD and ELL subgroups. Classroom monitoring will focus on reading, writing, talking, and solving in all content areas. Mrs Cummins will conduct walkthroughs, evaluations, and provide continual feedback to improve instructional practices.
Bracco, Janine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal will be responsible for developing and facilitating StockTake plan. Mrs. Bracco will meet with point people to collect and review data, monitor ratings data, and plan agenda and topics for StockTake. AP will be responsible for updating principal on action step goals. AP will participate in PLC meetings, walkthroughs, and provide feedback.
Cruz Santiago, Duannieh	Instructional Coach	MTSS coach is responsible for maintaining data for reading, math, science, and behavior. Lead monthly data chats with teachers; Organize academic groups for iii interventions. Train staff and organize groups for Tier 2 and 3 interventions to support reading and math goals, as well as social emotional goals. Communicate with stakeholders about student intervention needs (parents, teachers, leadership team). Lead weekly problem-solving team meetings with leadership team, school psychologist.
Loew, Diann	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Loew is the math and science instructional coach. She will be responsible for ensuring grade level standards-based Tier 1 content is planned and delivered in all grades. The coach will provide resources to PLCs, support implementation of common assessments, and monitor progress. Math coach will communicate with assistant principal to provide updates on the state of math and science for monthly Stocktake meetings. Math coach will support classroom instruction by modeling and co-teaching lessons.
Wilson, Julia	Instructional Coach	Julie Wilson, literacy coach, will support improving literacy for all students through weekly PLC support, including standards-based lesson planning, creating common assessments, and providing grade appropriate resources for students. Mrs. Wilson will provide professional development on research-based reading and writing strategies to increase literacy. In addition, the literacy coach will model lessons using high yield strategies to increase teacher proficiency. Updates for reading and writing will be monitored by the coach and reported monthly to Assistant Principal; in turn, data will be used as a priority topic in all monthly Stocktake meetings.
	School Counselor	Mrs. Morgan, guidance counselor, is responsible for working primarily with grades 3-5 students. As part of her role, she will work to build social and emotional skills to increase amount of time students are in class. She will

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>participate in classroom lessons, small group, and 1:1 sessions to increase the amount of time students are engaged in grade level classroom content. Mrs. Morgan will participate in all weekly leadership team meetings and monthly Stocktake meetings. Mrs. Morgan will support post-secondary college and career awareness by leading schoolwide activities.</p>
Adorno, Ileana	School Counselor	<p>Mrs. Adorno, guidance counselor, is responsible for working primarily with grades K-2 students. As part of her role, she will work to build social and emotional skills to increase amount of time students are in class. She will participate in classroom lessons, small group, and 1:1 sessions to increase the amount of time students are engaged in grade level classroom content. Mrs. Adorno will participate in all weekly leadership team meetings and monthly Stocktake meetings. Mrs. Adorno will support post-secondary college and career awareness by leading schoolwide activities.</p>
Ruiz, Jessica	Other	<p>EES: As the education specialist for English language learners, Mrs. Ruiz is responsible for monitoring all second language learners. As the specialist for ELL students, Mrs. Ruiz will assess and monitor all LY students to ensure students are receiving appropriate supports in academic classes, as well as increasing academic proficiency. Mrs. Ruiz will provide professional development to paraprofessionals and teachers during PLC time in methods and strategies for ensuring equity of instruction for all English language learners. Progress will be monitored through ITP testing and Access 2.0 testing. Additionally, Mrs. Ruiz will collaborate with families to ensure accommodations and progress are being met. EES will report monthly updates and monitoring to assistant principal as data collection for Stocktake and problem solving meetings.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/1/2018, Magali Rassel

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	0	127	140	126	140	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	23	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	4	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	130	123	113	122	108	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	703
Attendance below 90 percent	29	12	9	12	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	7	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	5	7	4	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	130	123	113	122	108	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	703
Attendance below 90 percent	29	12	9	12	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	7	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	5	7	4	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	42%	53%	57%	49%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	47%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	51%	53%	52%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	37%	55%	63%	52%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	59%	62%	47%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	51%	38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	49%	53%	46%	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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	27%	54%	-27%	62%	-35%
	2018	32%	51%	-19%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	31%	53%	-22%	64%	-33%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	33%	48%	-15%	60%	-27%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	45%	-14%	53%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	23	25	22	26	32	28	29				
ELL	32	45	50	31	48	33	28				
BLK	37	53		24	53		55				
HSP	41	49	51	37	48	31	33				
WHT	43	53		38	47		27				
FRL	40	50	50	34	46	27	34				

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	20	45	41	28	39	25	20				
ELL	28	46	41	35	50	41	27				
BLK	53	67		47	62		50				
HSP	48	57	46	46	56	42	52				
WHT	55	56		65	76						
FRL	49	56	49	49	57	43	53				

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	16	19	23	19	31	23	30				
ELL	37	38	50	42	41	42	28				
BLK	60	73		57	36						
HSP	45	43	50	48	46	37	40				
WHT	58	54		67	63		100				
FRL	47	44	49	51	48	39	45				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
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	42
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.

ELA achievement for the students with disabilities subgroup was the lowest performing in school. ELL and ESE subgroups continue to fall below the 41% goal. SWD subgroup increased 4% on the 2019 achievement measures.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline at 36% achievement, down 19% from 2018. The measure does not compare students as the test is only administered in fifth grade, therefore common formative assessments and reading achievement data needs to be considered.

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.

Science achievement has the greatest gap from state data. This achievement level correlates to reading proficiency, specifically second language learners and SWD subgroups.

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

All areas are lower than previous year. SWD subgroup for math gains and science achievement increased. Targeted SWD support and accommodations, increasing support schedule to allow for teachers to provide more minutes of support in classroom.

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

SWD subgroup achievement and Reading gains are two areas of concern.

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

1. SWD subgroup gains.
2. ELL subgroup gains.
3. Reading -lowest quartile
4. Reading proficiency
5. Math proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of**

Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2019 school data, ELA proficiency was 42%, which is below the state average of 55%. The district average is 47%, however the goal is to increase to the state average of 55% while focusing on ELL and ESE student subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Highlands aims to achieve an increase in ELA proficiency by 10%; ELA learning gains will increase to 60% and ELA Lowest 25% will increase to 58% making gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julia Wilson (julia.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in leadership, teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including English language learners and students with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research indicates meaningful analysis of data by teachers and administrators leads to purposeful instruction and purposeful decision making, ultimately increasing student achievement (Institute of Education Sciences, 2020). Additionally, using collaborative process focused on common formative assessments and instructional practices will result in increased student achievement (DuFour, 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

1. NSGRA training for staff for progress monitoring reading progress and proficiency.
2. All staff training will include best practice strategies for increasing authentic student engagement.
3. Training and implementation of literacy strategies, including whole-group, small-group, and one-to-one to support all students.
4. Instructional staff will use standards-aligned district curriculum plans to guide collaborative planning and deliver of Tier 1 curriculum.
5. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy of all students, as evidence by targeted, tiered, interventions.
6. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student foundational reading and comprehension through classroom experiences and professional development.
7. Staff will use progress monitoring data and classroom observations to identify targeted student needs.

Person Responsible

Julia Wilson (julia.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

8. Leadership team will monitor student growth and achievement through formative assessment data, classroom walkthroughs, and MTSS problem-solving with collaborative teams.
9. Structured intervention time will be available to support struggling students.

Person Responsible

Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2019 school data, math proficiency was 37%. Learning gains, achievement, and the lowest 25% of students had a decrease based on the 2019 assessment data. Productive actions are necessary for ensuring high levels of mathematics achievement for all students. The goal is to increase student achievement to at least 50%, with a focus on ELL and ESE student subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase math proficiency by 13%; increase students making learning gains by 12%; increase lowest performing 25% by 13%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in leadership, teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including English language learners and students with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates meaningful analysis of data by teachers and administrators leads to purposeful instruction and purposeful decision making, ultimately increasing student achievement (Institute of Education Sciences, 2020). Additionally, using collaborative process focused on common formative assessments and instructional practices will result in increased student achievement (DuFour, 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional staff will use standards-aligned district curriculum unit plans/ICPs to guide collaborative planning.
2. All staff training will include best practice strategies for increasing authentic student engagement.
3. Staff training will focus on research-based instructional strategies, including whole-group, small-group, and one-to-one strategies, including but not limited to ELL and ESE subgroups.
4. Staff will use progress monitoring data and classroom observations to identify and plan for students' needs.
5. Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non proficient in mathematics based on a variety of assessments.

Person Responsible Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

6. Leadership team will monitor student growth and achievement through formative assessment data, classroom walkthroughs, and MTSS problem-solving with staff.
7. Collaborative teams will use common assessment data to determine instructional strategies for differentiation and multi-tiered support.
8. Structured intervention time will be available to support struggling students.

Person Responsible Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Given the 2018-2019 student data from the FSSSA, science achievement was 36%, which indicates a clear need for improvement to accomplish high levels of science achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase science achievement from 36% to 53%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in leadership, teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including English language learners and students with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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

1. Instructional staff will implement standards-aligned district curriculum unit plans to guide collaborative planning, instruction, and assessment.
2. All staff training will include best practice strategies for increasing authentic engagement and using data
3. Lesson planning and delivery will focus on every student engaging daily in reading, writing, talking, and solving.
4. District and PLC formative assessments will be used to frequently assess student progress. PLC will analyze data to make data-driven decisions.
5. Classroom walkthroughs will monitor implementation of science curriculum.

Person Responsible Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Although school crime continues to decline, the need for safety precautions still exists (Spring, 2018). The social setting of the school is a rapidly changing environment facing new technology, increased rigor and academic expectations, and continued inequities that educators struggle to overcome. One initiative gaining increased attention in the 21st Century is a focus on a positive school environment, with a targeted focus on social emotional learning. Dowling and Barry (2020) suggest schools place a focus on improving mental health and well-being of students to prepare students for social and academic success. Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is a comprehensive approach to preparing students for academic, social, and emotional success well beyond school.

Measurable Outcome: At least 80% of students will complete Panorama initial survey. Discipline referrals will decrease by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: If every child is to be successful, then schools must include opportunities to meet the needs of every child for individual growth. SEL curriculum leads to less disciplinary issues and improved classroom climate (Herrenkohl, Jones, Lea, & Malorni, 2020). Positive classroom atmospheres incite opportunities for students to focus on learning and peer collaboration. Further, systematic incorporation of social emotional skills supports specific teaching of 21st Century skills, such as “curiosity, initiative, persistence, adaptability, leadership and social and cultural awareness” (Garcia Alvarez, 2018, p. 154).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Consistency and quality of instructional programs tied to classroom instruction prove impactful in creating a safe and positive classroom and school environment. Teacher and staff training, school-wide programs and structures, and strategies for improving school climate lead to greater student impact. When a safe environment is present, academic and behavior improvements follow (CASEL, 2020).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement schoolwide PBIS for Tier 1 positive behavior and SEL goals.
2. Tier 1- Implement schoolwide Zones of Regulation- all teachers will conduct lesson plans during first quarter.
3. Provide teacher professional development refreshers for PBIS and Zones of Regulation.
4. Incorporate SEL strategies in all curriculum-based professional development (i.e. Sanford Harmony or Second Steps).
5. School counselors will push in classrooms to provide social emotional curriculum in whole class setting (i.e. Safer, Smarter Kids or Monique Burr- Child Safety Matters).
6. Tier 2 small groups

Person Responsible Ileana Adorno (ileana.adorno@osceolaschools.net)

7. Professional development for all staff for understanding discipline flowchart, writing minor infractions, and writing referrals.

Person Responsible Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Post Secondary Culture for All

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectations of post-secondary education for all students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students achieving their goals. Students who have parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for students from one or more of the following groups: low achievement, low income levels, underrepresented minorities, students with disabilities, and families without prior college experience. The American Institutes for Research recommend a strong early foundation is essential for ensuring students are prepared for the rigor of secondary and post-secondary coursework (English, Cushing, Therriault, & Rasmussen, 2017).
Measurable Outcome:	100% of classrooms will implement Read, Write, Talk, Solve by mid-year (December 2020) in all lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janine Bracco (janine.bracco@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A guaranteed and viable curriculum is supported by teacher planning through the professional learning community (Marzano, 2003), as well as planned instructional strategies for reading, writing, talking, and solving. Lesson planning is aligned to the district curriculum unit plans and delivered to support the needs of all learners. These strategies, when implemented daily, ensure students are provided with social, emotional, and cognitive learning in every lesson, every day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Acceleration of student achievement and closing the achievement gap, especially among low-performing student groups, requires instructional supports that prepare students for the rigor of academic standards (Kufeld & Tarasawa, 2020). When students reach proficiency, they are better prepared for post-secondary education. Reading, writing, talking, and solving will provide daily opportunities for students to engage with critical content and support high levels of learning in the elementary school classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC planning using CUPs
2. Include Reading, Writing, Talking, and Solving strategies in every lesson.
3. Engagement strategies built into every lesson.

Person Responsible Julia Wilson (julia.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

4. College and Career Pipeline- awareness of choices through schoolwide college & career days.

Person Responsible Ileana Adorno (ileana.adorno@osceolaschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus	2018-2019 ESSA data showed Highlands Elementary had two subgroups below the 41% ESSA goal. This impacted the proficiency and achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. Highlands is classified as TS&I status.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA data for SWD and ELL subgroups were below 41% for reading and math on 2018-2019 assessments. In 2020-2021, both subgroups will increase to above 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately rigorous learning experiences for all students. ESE teachers and Paraprofessionals will provide additional classroom supports to make grade level curriculum accessible to all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of effective differentiation will ensure closing the gap and give all students an opportunity to reach achievement goals (TNTP, 2018). Students need access to key resources: Grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers who hold high expectations. An effective differentiated classroom provides different ways to help students acquire knowledge, process and make sense of new learning, and create products that demonstrate effective learning (Tomlinson, 2017).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedules will allow for VE teachers to plan collaboratively with content teachers.
2. ESE support in the classroom will occur through collaboration with RCS ensuring all students are supported and receive appropriate ESE accommodations and strategies from general education and VE teachers to access lesson content.

Person Responsible Jennifer Stubbs (jennifer.stubbs@osceolaschools.net)

1. EES will monitor achievement of all LY students and communicate progress between teachers and families.
2. Professional development in research-based ELL strategies, using ELLevation will be conducted throughout the school year.
3. The ELL support in the classroom will occur through collaboration of EES ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL instructional strategies to teachers and paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible Jessica Ruiz (jessica.ruiz@osceolaschools.net)

4. Teachers will engage in collaborative planning as a PLC that will focus on standards-based lesson planning, instructional learning targets for supporting all learners, and common assessments allowing for deeper analysis of individual student achievement.
5. Students will participate in targeted intervention for Tiers 1, 2, and 3.

Person Responsible Duannieh Cruz Santiago (duannieh.cruzsantiago@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All priority areas addressed in areas of focus. Leadership team will utilize data from NWEA, DIBELS, NSGRA to plan daily Tier 1 instruction and interventions for stated priorities. Data will be analyzed by instructional coaches and delivered to grade level PLC. Teams will dissect individual class data to determine specific needs for every student. Data will be used to guide instruction and interventions aligned to the needs of acceleration and closing the achievement gap for struggling learners. Data and implementation will be monitored and supported weekly by the leadership team through classroom walkthroughs, weekly feedback, coaching support, and ongoing professional development targeted toward outcomes for ESSA subgroups.

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 engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, as well as hold staff responsible for implementing changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based on 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/out 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 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. 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). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (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				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$33,788.32
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	0071 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,788.32
<i>Notes: Math Coach (LRS)</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$33,788.32
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	0071 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,788.32
<i>Notes: Instructional Coach (LRS)</i>						
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	0071 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
<i>Notes: Counselor</i>						
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Post Secondary Culture for All				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$69,275.29
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	0071 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$69,275.29
<i>Notes: LRS focusing on Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional groups and coaching support.</i>						
					Total:	\$136,851.93