

School District of Osceola County, FL

East Lake Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

East Lake Elementary School

4001 BOGGY CREEK RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Beth Telemko

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	30

East Lake Elementary School

4001 BOGGY CREEK RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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.

East Lake Elementary will be the number one school in Osceola County for student achievement, integrity, and compassion, and culture.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Beth Telemko

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

2

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

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

893

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	125	119	131	130	147	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	14	13	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	18	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	34	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	50	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Wednesday 8/18/2021

2020-21 - 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	99	121	125	124	170	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	784
Attendance below 90 percent	66	72	67	98	68	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	7	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	99	121	125	124	170	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	784
Attendance below 90 percent	66	72	67	98	68	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	7	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	53%	57%	58%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	56%	58%	56%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	51%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	55%	63%	61%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	59%	62%	50%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	45%	51%	38%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	49%	53%	49%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	48%	8%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	53%	6%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	48%	14%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

K-5 Reading NWEA, K-5 Math NWEA, 5th Science-NWEA

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71/62%	53/49%	68/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/62%	25/46%	32/57%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	3/25%	2/15%
	English Language Learners	14/58%	7/28%	8/30%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80/70%	48/44%	73/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/68%	22/41%	32/57%
	Students With Disabilities	6/50%	1/8%	4/31%
	English Language Learners	14/58%	6/24%	14/52%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82/65%	65/53%	72/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/56%	19/35%	24/44%
	Students With Disabilities	2/33%	2/29%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	16/52%	10/30%	14/41%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/56%	53/43%	71/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/50%	15/28%	21/38%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	1/14%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	15/48%	10/30%	16/47%
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/56%	59/48%	59/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/39%	18/29%	19/28%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	1/6%	2/11%
	English Language Learners	17/41%	15/35%	15/32%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/48%	48/39%	53/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/41%	16/26%	18/27%
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	3/18%	1/6%
	English Language Learners	21/51%	13/30%	15/32%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	91/55%	78/49%	84/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/49%	37/45%	40/49%
	Students With Disabilities	6/29%	4/18%	2/9%
	English Language Learners	15/31%	16/33%	20/38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89/54%	80/50%	93/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40/49%	35/43%	38/46%
	Students With Disabilities	5/24%	6/27%	6/26%
	English Language Learners	23/47%	21/43%	27/52%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	87/59%	75/50%	80/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/44%	26/35%	30/38%
	Students With Disabilities	4/17%	3/13%	4/17%
	English Language Learners	32/43%	23/30%	30/39%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/48%	57/38%	66/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/35%	20/27%	27/35%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	0/0%	2/9%
	English Language Learners	25/33%	18/24%	26/34%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	89/61%	79/53%	92/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/45%	30/41%	38/49%
	Students With Disabilities	4/17%	4/17%	5/22%
	English Language Learners	35/47%	30/39%	37/48%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	25	25	17	36	29	25				
ELL	37	37	29	36	38	31	32				
ASN	83			89							
BLK	65	40		48	40		50				
HSP	40	37	28	38	33	27	39				
MUL	73			55							
WHT	61	52		51	32		70				
FRL	34	32	29	31	31	27	36				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	52	42	36	62	52	44				
ELL	42	52	44	55	61	42	36				
ASN	87	100		93	100						
BLK	58	52		71	61		50				
HSP	53	55	47	59	63	50	46				
MUL	42			67							
WHT	78	84		78	70		85				
FRL	47	58	48	57	64	56	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	44	50	15	31	29					
ELL	37	43	37	50	47	33	25				
ASN	85			100							
BLK	47	55		56	50		21				
HSP	56	52	39	59	49	33	55				
MUL	73			82							
WHT	63	57	42	61	51	38	38				
FRL	53	55	38	53	44	32	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

East Lake showed the lowest performance in the area of lowest quartile in both ELA and Math in both the 2019 and 2021 FSA. In fact the lowest quartile performance decreased even further between 2019 and 2021. In ELA the lowest quartile performance dropped by 21% and in math the lowest quartile dropped 31%. Students with Disabilities had the lowest levels of achievement on the NWEA progress monitoring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is in the area of Math. The overall achievement in Math on the FSA has dropped from 65% in 2019 to 43% in 2021. Additionally, the percent of learning gains in math has decreased from 66% in 2019 to 35% in 2021. Looking at the subgroup data on the progress monitoring Students with Disabilities had the lowest levels of proficiency across all subjects and grade levels. Only 19% of Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA and Math on the NWEA progress monitoring in the Spring of 2021.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

One area of concern that contributed to the decline in mathematical performance was a lack of access to consistent interventions in math and a difficulty tailoring instruction to individual student needs through out the various classroom models in the digital platform. We need to implement a consistent plan for math interventions, access to resources for these interventions, and for teachers to receive training in small group instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Fourth grade had an overall increase of the percent of proficient students on the NWEA progress monitoring. The overall percent proficient in the fall of 2020 was 54% and in the spring it was 57%. Additionally English Language Learners in fourth grade grew in Mathematics on the NWEA progress monitoring. 47% percent of 4th grade ELL students were proficient in the fall of 2020 and 52% of 4th grade ELL students were proficient in the spring of 2021.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The fourth grade team incorporated math into the MTSS model weekly intervention schedule. Targeted reteaching lessons were provided to face-to-face students in 4th grade two days a week during their essentials time.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Grade level teams need to plan common assessments and instructional decisions need to be data driven to promote learning gains. Differentiated small group instruction needs to occur across all subjects to meet the needs of our diverse learners across subgroups. IEP and ELL accommodations and scaffolds need to be provided with fidelity. Interventions need to be consistent and grade levels will need access to resources. Schoolwide extracurricular activities need to support ELA and Math. Teachers will receive prompt feedback and will have access to model lessons. Instructional coaches will be readily available to assist with common planning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be offered in differentiated small group instruction, thinking maps, the AVID framework, the Florida BEST standards, and the new reading curriculum. Additionally model lessons will be provided by teacher leaders or coaches throughout the year.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A mentor program will be put in place to support all new teachers throughout the year. Mentors will build a positive relationship to help new teachers feel safe to practice new skills and help them build confidence in their decision making. A coaching model will be in effect throughout weekly walkthroughs. Coaches will work with teachers to reflect on feedback and grow in their instructional practices. Peers and coaches will support one another.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 18-19 and 19-20 data, ELA proficiency in 21 decreased by 10%. Additionally, the ELA learning gains decreased by 20% and the lowest quartile learning gains decreased by 21%.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase ELA proficiency by 15%. Learning gains will increase by 23% and lowest quartile learning gains will increase by 23%. These increases will make up for the decline during the 20-21 year and provide room for growth in all ELA areas.
Monitoring:	NSGRA will be administered three times per year. ELA Map growth will be administered three times per year, as will as progress monitoring with NWEA fluency test monthly/bi-monthly. Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure reading block contains small group instruction and follows instruction follows the district curriculum unit plan. Formative assessments will be utilized to make instructional decisions to meet the diverse needs of our students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Hopkins (jamie.hopkins@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide guidance and support for small group Guided Reading instruction to maximize individualized student needs and support common assessment implementation. -100% integrity in utilizing Benchmark's high quality ELA instructional materials as evidenced in the curriculum unit plans. -Kindergarten Open Court implementation of print and book awareness, letter recognition, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding phonics, fluency, and vocabulary and language development. -First Grade Open Court Implementation of letter/book/print awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding phonics and inflectional endings, fluency rate and accuracy, and vocabulary and language development. -Second Grade Open Court Implementation of decoding phonics/ work analysis, fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody, and vocabulary and language development. -T1 and T2 students engage in 20 min on Lexia Core 5 1 day/week during station rotation. -T3 students engage in 20 mins on Lexia Core 5 2 days/week during station rotation. -RISE reading for T2 -Pre-Teaching strategies for T2
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows a connection between rigorous standards based curriculum and student achievement. Additionally, research indicates that formative assessment and collaborative planning increases achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development for B.E.S.T. standards in ELA and new Benchmark Curriculum.

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

Differentiated professional development for small group reading instruction.

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

Plan differentiated lessons to meet student needs that includes ELL and ESE accommodations and scaffolds.

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

Plan and develop common formative and summative assessment to monitor student achievement and plan for instruction.

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

Provide interventions as needed through the MTSS model to close learning gaps.

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

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

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Based on 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 data, Math proficiency in 2021 decreased by 18%.
Description and Rationale:	Additionally, the Math learning gains decreased by 31% and the lowest quartile achievement decreased by 15%.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase math proficiency by 20%. Learning gains will increase by 33% and lowest quartile learning gains will increase by 17%. These increases will make up for the decline during the 2020-2021 school year and provide room for growth in all Math areas.
Monitoring:	Math NWEA Map growth will be administered three times per year. Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that small group instruction is differentiated and follows instruction follows the district curriculum unit plan. Common formative assessments will be utilized to make instructional decisions to meet the diverse needs of our students. Additionally students will be monitored through the MTSS framework.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide guidance and support in implementing and maximizing differentiated learning through small group instruction to close learning gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to be able to close achievement gaps, teachers will need to provided targeted small group instruction based on student data and plan/implement common assessments to drive instruction. Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Staff will provide differentiate small group instruction based on needs identified in a variety of assessments. Students identified as not proficient should be given additional instruction and students who are proficient should be given extended learning opportunities.

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

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus	The leadership team keeps the school focused on the mission, "East Lake Elementary will be the number one school in Osceola County for student achievement, integrity, and compassion, and culture." The main priority of the leadership team is that teachers in our school feel confident in teaching students and that students are growing in all academic areas.
Description and Rationale:	Effective instructional leadership is a powerful force in a school capable of creating lasting changes in the school. These teams are made up of the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, and teacher leaders. This team can work together to transform a school. We found through the Insight Survey submitted by the teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.
Measurable Outcome:	Insight Survey 2020 Professional Development Section Response: "In the past six months, I have practiced teaching techniques with a peer or instructional expert outside my own classroom." will increase by 5% (from 35% to 40%).
Monitoring:	Teacher feedback after professional development, feedback after flipped faculty meetings where teacher leaders are asked to give PD, instructional coaches can log time spent on modeling lessons and collaborating with teachers, and end of year data from the Insight Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Giving teachers meaningful professional development opportunities where they can practice with a peer or coach will build their confidence. They will be more willing to share ideas and receive feedback. Teachers will develop confidence in their own abilities and they will gain a deeper appreciation for their colleagues. PLCs will become more cohesive and students will benefit from improved instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective teacher professional development has many important features including, "alignment with school goals, modeling of teaching strategies, opportunities for active learning of new teaching strategies, opportunities for teacher collaboration, and follow-up and continuous feedback. (Archibald et al. (2011) Ghamrawi 2013)

Action Steps to Implement

Create a professional development needs survey to solicit information from teacher's about their specific areas of need and differentiate PD. Utilize this data to provide targeted and differentiated PD throughout the year.

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

Utilize classroom walkthrough data to identify teachers that exhibit exemplary teaching to model for their peers. Also, identify teachers that would benefit from having a peer model a lesson with them.

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

Design flipped faculty meetings where teacher leaders identified through walkthroughs can deliver PD to the staff.

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

Develop a professional development feedback form to identify teachers who need more opportunities to practice a skill as well as identify teachers willing to model a strategy.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ensure high levels of achievement in Science and strive for each student to demonstrate a year and half growth in their learning. If we can increase growth in these areas and close academic gaps caused by the break in traditional learning, we can increase our school grade.

Based on 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 data, Science proficiency in 2021 decreased by 7%.

Measurable Outcome: Science proficiency will increase from 47% to 56%.

Monitoring: We will use the data from the NWEA Science Test administered 3 times per year. Additionally, we will use common formative assessments as well as district formatives throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stacey Poole (stacey.poole@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize collaborative planning to design lessons with high yield strategies to increase the students' science vocabulary knowledge, informational reading strategies and allow time for quality hands on science activities. Teachers will plan and implement common assessments to drive instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a collaborative team.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan and develop common formative and summative assessment to monitor student achievement and plan for instruction.

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

Professional development for B.E.S.T. standards in Science.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 that our school had no sub groups below the 41% mark. However, our students with disabilities was our lowest sub group at 48% and our English language learners were our second lowest sub group at 50%.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase our students with disabilities subgroup by 3% and our English Language Learner subgroup by 3%.
Monitoring:	We will utilize NWEA Map Growth Assessments, MTSS Progress Monitoring, Common Formative Assessments to measure student growth and classroom walkthrough data to ensure that classroom instruction is differentiated.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheri Knoebel (cheryl.knoebel@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasheen (jennifer.glasheen@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasheen (jennifer.glasheen@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include Thinking Maps training, and ESE support strategies.

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

The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the ESOL compliance specialist, RCS, and VE Teachers ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

Person Responsible Kathy Blades (katherine.blades@osceolaschools.net)

Students will participate in targeted interventions through the MTSS Framework. Interventions resources will be readily available to teachers and interventions will be provided with fidelity.

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

#6. Other specifically relating to Culture and Environment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the Panorama Survey in 2021 only 46% of our students scored a favorable percent in emotional regulation.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2022 Panorama Survey the percent of students who score a favorable percent in emotional regulation will increase by 5%.

Monitoring: We will use data from PBIS, discipline referral data, beginning of year and end of year Panorama data, MTSS behavior data, and observational data from guidance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nydia Torres (nydia.torres@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will receive instruction in Social and Emotional Learning. We will incorporate SEL into daily morning meetings, schoolwide morning announcements, daily mindfulness or calming techniques, and interventions in SEL will be provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research on SEL has found that social and emotional learning interventions increase academic performance as well as reduces discipline referrals. (Durlak et al., 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan daily instruction that builds a classroom community, positive learning environment, and a post secondary classroom culture.

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

Teachers will incorporate AVID collaborative frameworks in their lessons to promote post-secondary cultural and community building.

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

The Problem Solving Team will monitor T2 and T3 behavior interventions for fidelity and consistency.

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

The leadership team will review discipline referral data monthly and identify areas needing improvement.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

None applicable.

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.

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

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. In addition to culture we are also focusing on Social Emotional Learning. All classroom will be utilizing classroom meetings and teaching students the skills necessary for building and maintaining positive relationships.

We will build a positive school culture and environment by celebrating student culture and building relationships with the community and parents. We are focusing on being a school of culture and art. Our school has relevant art displayed throughout that is congruent to our students' culture. This gives students a sense of belonging. We also have an emphasis on celebrating the various cultures in our school through schoolwide events.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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, cultural competency, and management.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Culture and Environment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00