

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Pleasant Hill Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

## 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

## 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

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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 teachers 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 practice 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.

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