

School District of Osceola County, FL

Pleasant Hill 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 | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

Pleasant Hill Elementary School

1801 JACK CALHOUN DR, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Shelby Pagan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 (41%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| 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 | 26 |

Pleasant Hill Elementary School

1801 JACK CALHOUN DR, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

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.

Pleasant Hill Elementary School will provide a safe learning environment and challenging curriculum that enables students to obtain their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to cultivate a safe and caring learning environment that enables all students to become college and career ready through a rigorous curriculum that challenges students at all levels.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Pagan, Shelby | Principal | The principal works with students, parents, and staff to maintain an atmosphere focusing on performance through a culture of shared excellence and reaching college and career goals. The principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP, and receive monthly reports and give feedback. The principal oversees all student data, tier levels and instruction. |
| Hayes, Elise | Instructional Coach | The math and science coach provides support for math/science instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in math and science. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. |
| Pearson, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | The literacy coach provides support for ELA (reading and writing) instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in reading and writing. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. |
| Adams, Katie | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal works directly with staff in the area of scheduling students and handles extended learning opportunities. The assistant principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The assistant principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback. |
| Serrano, Maria | Other | The ESOL compliance specialist provides support for ELL instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESOL students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. |
| Hague, Brittany | Other | The MTSS and AVID coach provides support for all instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------------|-------|---|
| | | enrichment strategies. She will provide support, modeling, and professional development in the use of WICOR in AVID as well. |
| Severance, Jeri-Lynne | Other | The ESE compliance specialist provides support for ESE instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESE students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, Shelby Pagan

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.*

0

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.*

6

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) | 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 (41%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 52 | 44 | 51 | 48 | 71 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| 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 | 2 | 20 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 | |

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 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/25/2020

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 | 112 | 119 | 106 | 97 | 138 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 711 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 57 | 57 | 70 | 60 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 356 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 33 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 6 | 3 | 20 | 23 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |

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 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 112 | 119 | 106 | 97 | 138 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 711 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 57 | 57 | 70 | 60 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 356 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 33 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 6 | 3 | 20 | 23 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |

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 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 43% | 53% | 57% | 46% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 44% | 56% | 58% | 49% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 51% | 53% | 45% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 46% | 55% | 63% | 47% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 44% | 59% | 62% | 52% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 27% | 45% | 51% | 46% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 42% | 49% | 53% | 64% | 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 | 45% | 51% | -6% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 51% | -12% | 57% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 37% | 51% | -14% | 58% | -21% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 56% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 48% | -13% | 56% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 50% | -11% | 55% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 49% | 54% | -5% | 62% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 51% | -13% | 62% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 37% | 53% | -16% | 64% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 62% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 48% | -13% | 60% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 52% | 2% | 61% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -14% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 45% | -5% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 49% | -2% | 55% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 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 | 28 | 38 | 21 | 37 | 51 | 30 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 49 | 41 | 43 | 44 | 28 | 34 | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 49 | | 51 | 41 | | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 46 | 44 | 46 | 46 | 32 | 43 | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 30 | 30 | 39 | 39 | 29 | 48 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 42 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 30 | 35 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 25 | 47 | 57 | 28 | 50 | 38 | 24 | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 39 | 52 | 37 | 57 | 40 | 27 | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 39 | 36 | 41 | 52 | 30 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 62 | 41 | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 47 | 42 | 53 | 60 | 46 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 44 | 45 | 38 | 55 | 41 | 42 | | | | |
| 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 | 3 | 27 | 35 | 12 | 35 | 41 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 34 | 35 | 25 | 42 | 39 | 39 | | | | |
| ASN | 85 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 57 | 60 | 43 | 41 | | 81 | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 45 | 45 | 40 | 46 | 39 | 56 | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 52 | 40 | 58 | 68 | 69 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 43 | 46 | 40 | 51 | 48 | 59 | | | | |

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 |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 63 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 351 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 42 |
| 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 | 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 37 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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.

Our lowest performing are was our students with disabilities at 34% proficient. They are also are largest gain. We feel that the following were contributing factors: 1. Several of the students acted out behaviorally due to frustration when the academics get difficult. 2. They need stronger scaffolding during tier 2 instruction. We have increased the rigor and fidelity of our Tier 1 and have seen a difference.

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

Math gain showed the greatest decline.

The factors that contributed to the decline include:

1. new series
- 2, new teachers (A lot of turnover, so different levels of experience and training.)
3. students have a lack of number sense

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.

Math BQ

We only had 27% make growth

The factors that contributed to the decline include:

1. new series
- 2, new teachers (A lot of turnover, so different levels of experience and training.)
3. students have a lack of number sense

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

ELA ESE went from 4% proficient to 16%

We feel that the tightening of Tier 1 instruction and a commitment to a guaranteed and viable curriculum with the same high expectations for all was the action that made the biggest difference.

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

Attendance

Levels of our ESE students

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

1. ELA
2. Math
3. Science
4. College and Career Ready: AVID
5. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Given the 2018-2020 school data findings that only 46% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for the 2020-2021 school year is to increase math proficiency by 9%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves as 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 (2002), Reeves (2010), Dutour, et al (2010).

Action Steps to Implement

Staff will teach problem solving strategies and higher order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.

Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representation in their work.

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. In addition, advanced students will be offered extension activities to extend their learning.

Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of learning.

Students will cognitively be engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques supported by feedback and the ability to self-assess progress related to the learning outcome.

Teachers will utilize formative assessment to monitor and provide feedback for student learning.

Person Responsible: Elise Hayes (elise.hayes@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school data, ELA proficiency 43%, which is below the state average of 55%. The district average is 47%. However, our goal is to increase to the state average of 55%, while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, White, and FRL students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome of 2020-2021 is to increase ELA proficiency by 12%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that 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 assessment to adjust instruction procedures lead to significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS Model along with differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning. (William, 2007) (Marzano, 200)

Action Steps to Implement

All staff will be trained in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.

training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be provided.

Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered interventions.

Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.

Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 the school had two sub groups below the ESSA level of 41%. The affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.

Measurable Outcome: ESSA data for 2018 - 2019 ESE 39% and White 37% will be increased in 2020-2021 for all subgroups to be at or above 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for their students.

Tomlinso and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Content - The information and skills that students need to learn
 Process - how students make sense of the content being taught
 Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned
 Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.

PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.

Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.

Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses on instructional strategies that scaffold content for ESE and White subgroups. Professional development will include AVID/WICOR instructional strategies, Ellevation training and ESE support strategies.

The ESE and white support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the RCS, MTSS/AVID Coach, Literacy Coach and Math/Science Coach ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

Students will participate in targeted intervention through the MTSS process in Tier 1, 2, and 3.

Person Responsible: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on students achievement improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams.

Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making changes in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders that can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities.

It was found through the insight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.

Measurable Outcome:

Insight Survey Retention Section Responses 2019 2020 Opportunities to pursue leadership roles was 10% our goal for 20 - 21 is 15%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increase teacher leadership roles within the school leadership. These roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their abilities as well as teaching them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to further improved self-confidence, increased knowledge and an improved attitude to teaching among our teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Great leaders understand that teacher know what their students and they themselves need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on the data that inform how they continuously improve their schools. Leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school -- improving student learning outcomes. Living the mindset that we only get better as we learn, unlearn and relearn. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas. This practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation) 2019.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down, instead moving towards conducting experiences (such as small, 30-day projects) using pattern recognition and execution by the whole.
2. The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period of intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project is not working.
3. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day towards goals.
4. Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and innovators. Both are equally valuable and necessary especially with leadership teams.

Person Responsible

Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to s:AVID a schoolwide post secondary culture**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A college-going culture builds the expectation of post secondary education for all students - not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goal. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups:

- low achievers,
- middle to low-income levels,
- underrepresented minorities,
- disabled youth, and
- families where no one has attended college previously in their family.

Measurable Outcome:

In 2019-2020 the grade distribution at the end of the year was as follows:

A- 9.6% B- 11.85% C 9% D 4.17% F 1.65 %

In 2020-2021 there will be an increase of 5% in the amount of students earning an A, B, or C.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Hague (brittany.hague@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing post-secondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone. {Poliner & Lieber 2004}

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequenced activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a post-secondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills.

Person Responsible

Brittany Hague (brittany.hague@osceolaschools.net)

5. Administration, AVID Coach and the Guidance department will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.
6. The school will create a plan that creates an environment that develops greater bonds with peers, cutting across the exclusionary social groups.

Person Responsible Brittany Hague (brittany.hague@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.

Measurable Outcome: In 2018-2019 science achievement was 42% In 2020-2021 science achievement will increase by 13%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elise Hayes (elise.hayes@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that are relevant and matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)

Action Steps to Implement

1 Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning PLC.

2 Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards

3 Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.

4 Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.

5 ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL. compliance specialist

and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses

6 Teachers will provide individual student data chats

7 The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises.

8 Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level standards, data, student tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis

Person Responsible Elise Hayes (elise.hayes@osceolaschools.net)

#7. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams.

Area of Focus Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams

Description and Rationale: typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders,. and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities. It was found through the Insight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership. leadership.

Measurable Outcome: Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2019-2020
Opportunities to pursue leadership roles 10% 2020-2021 20%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katie Adams (katie.adams@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase teachers leadership roles within the school leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students-and what at they themselves-need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school - improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas. This team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019).

Action Steps to Implement

- 1 Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down-and towards conducting experiments (such as small, 30-day projects), using pattern recognition, and execution by the whole.
- 2 The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period is intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project is not 'working'.

3. Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day toward goals.
4. Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrators. Both are equally valuable and necessary, especially with leaderships teams

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will focus on the following areas:

1. ELA
2. Math
3. Science
4. College and Career Ready: AVID
5. Social Emotional Learning
6. Instructional Leadership Team

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The school engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently

communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate

how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, Establishing specific strategies, but

attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically underserved students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, The school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|--|-----------------|-----|--------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$58,120.95 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0811 - Pleasant Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$58,120.95 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | | | | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$42,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0811 - Pleasant Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$42,000.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: s:AVID a schoolwide post secondary culture | | | | \$48,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2110 | 100-Salaries | 0811 - Pleasant Hill Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$48,000.00 |
| | | | 0811 - Pleasant Hill Elementary School | | | \$0.00 |

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------------|
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$148,120.95 |