
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	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Sandra Davenport

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)	43%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (67%)
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	27

Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

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	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davenport, Sandra	Principal	<p>Principal duties and responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a common vision and language for the continued use of data-based decision making • Provide needed resources and materials to ensure optimum levels of program success • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor fidelity of interventions in use • Communicate consistent and clear message to parents and staff regarding MTSS plans and procedures at the site
Telemko, Beth	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a common vision and language for the continued use of data-based decision making • Provide needed resources and materials to ensure optimum levels of program success • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor fidelity of interventions in use • Communicate consistent and clear message to parents and staff regarding MTSS plans and procedures at the site
Osborne, Deanna	Reading Coach	<p>Literacy Coach responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coach teachers in Tier 1 instructional strategies • Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students • Attend MTSS Team meetings • Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction • Coach teachers in appropriate Tier 2 & 3 interventions • Participate in decisions regarding student placement in MTSS programs and levels of intervention
Hudson, Elizabeth	Math Coach	<p>Math/Science Coach responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coach teachers in Tier 1 instructional strategies • Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students • Attend MTSS Team meetings • Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction • Coach teachers in appropriate Tier 2 & 3 interventions • Participate in decisions regarding student placement in MTSS programs and levels of intervention
Tracey, Emily	School Counselor	<p>School Counselor/MTSS Coach Responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings • Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process • Send parent invites • Complete necessary MTSS forms

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested • Participate in decisions regarding student placement in MTSS programs and levels of intervention • Keep progress monitoring notes & evidence of implemented interventions • Provide social and emotional support to students
Pociask, Jessica	School Counselor	School Counselor responsibilities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide social and emotional supports to students

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Sandra Davenport

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

9

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

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

899

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.

14

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	135	124	131	146	157	163	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	856
Attendance below 90 percent	14	8	8	10	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	29	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	107	143	151	140	135	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	10	29	16	18	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	107	143	151	140	135	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	10	29	16	18	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				74%	53%	57%	71%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	56%	58%	69%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	51%	53%	55%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	55%	63%	71%	54%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	59%	62%	67%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	45%	51%	55%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				72%	49%	53%	74%	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	64%	51%	13%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	51%	28%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	48%	21%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	53%	25%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	48%	21%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	67%	45%	22%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The NWEA was used to progress monitor all students in Kindergarten through 5th grade.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	58	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	51	31
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	25
	English Language Learners	83	71	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66	53	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	50	58
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	50
	English Language Learners	83	83	38
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60	69	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	25	61
	Students With Disabilities	6	13	40
	English Language Learners	78	92	82
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	49	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	25	61
	Students With Disabilities	6	13	40
	English Language Learners	67	50	64

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71	70	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	60	69
	Students With Disabilities	12	29	69
	English Language Learners	50	38	70
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49	58	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	49	69
	Students With Disabilities	17	18	41
	English Language Learners	38	38	80

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	70	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	53	55
	Students With Disabilities	36	36	39
	English Language Learners	40	20	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	62	57	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	45	56
	Students With Disabilities	23	18	26
	English Language Learners	40	40	60

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	73	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	63	55
	Students With Disabilities	17	23	25
	English Language Learners	60	60	64
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	63	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	55	52
	Students With Disabilities	13	18	17
	English Language Learners	40	60	64
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	73	69	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	60	73
	Students With Disabilities	39	36	42
	English Language Learners	40	50	73

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	30	36	32	34	36	38	30				
ELL	50	60		55	50		30				
HSP	60	55		67	52		48				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	67	53	38	71	59	41	65				
FRL	50	47	23	60	47	36	48				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	59	59	27	59	52	15				
ELL	57	65	69	57	68						
BLK	67	71		67	79						
HSP	73	74	76	72	78	69	55	87			

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
MUL	87	91		73	73						
WHT	74	70	60	76	75	55	77	83	98		
FRL	60	70	62	60	66	48	54	63	93		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	30	56	50	23	44	45	47				
ELL	39	54	64	50	69						
BLK	57	45		57	55						
HSP	65	73	59	66	66	57	71	78	91		
WHT	72	68	53	73	67	54	73	95	75		
FRL	59	64	54	54	59	52	66	85	71		

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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	56
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Based on 2021 FSA data, 33% of our students with disabilities were proficient in ELA and 28% were proficient in math.

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

Based off of NWEA progress monitoring data, the greatest need of improvement is within ELA.

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

Contributing factors include students switching between digital and face-to-face instruction. Actions steps to address this need include consistent progress monitoring of students not proficient, additional supports put in place for students falling into Tier 2 and Tier 3.

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

Based on NWEA progress monitoring data, students with disabilities showed 20% ELA growth.

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

Providing our students with disabilities with tiered support utilizing pre-teaching strategies.

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

Continue to provided guided reading instruction and to review and improve on our Tier 1 instruction, continue with pre-teaching strategies.

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.

Provide additional training for the various levels of guided reading instruction.

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

Additional services to be implemented include additional Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 supports for our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. 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 levels for making change in schools.

Description and

These teams 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.

Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

According to the 2019-2020 retention section of the Insight survey, 15% responded favorably to having opportunities to pursue leadership. Our goal is to increase the number of favorable responses to 20%.

Monitoring:

This will be monitored for the desired outcome through the 2021-2022 Insight Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@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 student, and what 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 students learning outcomes. It also boosts teacher moral, 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

Special Teams PLC provide each grade level teacher an opportunity to engage in leadership roles and decision making process for areas important to school improvement.

Person Responsible

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

Grade level PLC leads meet monthly to discuss trends and problem solve collaboratively.

Person Responsible

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

Admin will utilize the NEST tool to analyze curriculum instruction in order to provide effective teacher feedback.

Person Responsible

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 FSA data, ELA proficiency was 62%, which is above the state average of 52% and the district average is 45%. However, only 32% of our lowest quartile showed a learning gain.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase our ELA lowest quartile's learning gains to 60%.

ELA will be monitored using NWEA for progress monitoring. The MTSS team will use the data to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Monitoring: The leadership team will also utilize the NEST tool to monitor classroom ELA instruction. Grade level PLCs will also analyze common assessment data to determine Tier 1 interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deanna Osborne (deanna.osborne@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 data is used to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research 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, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach will model, provide professional development, support, and monitor teacher implementation of Tier 1 instruction of BEST standards,

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

Literacy Coach and MTSS Problem Solving team will support and monitor grade levels as they analyze data with fidelity for tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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

Literacy Coach will support, provide professional development, monitor teachers for implementation of conducting small group guided reading instruction.

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

Literacy Coach will support, provide professional development, and monitor for fidelity teacher implementation0. to ensure Tier 1 foundational skills are taught using Open Court with fidelity.

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

Literacy Coach will provide additional supports and monitor the 3rd grade PLC to ensure portfolios are completed with fidelity.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of**

Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 FSA data, Math proficiency was 69%, which is above the state average of 52% and the district average is 42%. However, only 43% of our lowest quartile showed a learning gain.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase our Math lowest quartile's learning gains to 60%.

Math will be monitored using NWEA for progress monitoring. The MTSS team will use the data to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Monitoring: The leadership team will also utilize the NEST tool to monitor classroom Math instruction. Grade level PLCs will also analyze common assessment data to determine Tier 1 interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@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, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriate has a great effect on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Action Steps to Implement

Math/Science Coach will provide modeling, professional development, support, and monitor teachers implementation of Tier 1 Math instruction using the BEST standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Math/Science Coach will provide modeling, support, and monitor the second and fourth grade teachers as they pilot the Osceola Numeracy Project as a Tier 2 math intervention with fidelity.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Math/Science coach will provide professional development, support, and monitor teachers on the fidelity of Success Maker implementation with our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Math/Science coach will model, support, and monitor classroom teachers to ensure whole group and small group differentiation is done with fidelity.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Math/Science Coach will provide supports and monitor grade level PLCs in their collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 FSA data, Science proficiency was 59%, which is above the state average of 47% and the district average is 38%.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase our Science proficiency to 65%.

Monitoring: Science will be monitored using NWEA for progress monitoring. The leadership team will also utilize the NEST tool to monitor classroom Science instruction. Grade level PLCs will also analyze common assessment data to determine Tier 1 interventions. Leadership will monitor PENDA data in order to provide supports for the fifth grade PLC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that 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 (Lunch & Zenchak, 2002).

Action Steps to Implement

Math/Science Coach will continue to provide professional development, support, and monitor Tier 1 Science instruction for fidelity.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Math/Science Coach will provide professional development, support, and monitor teachers for increased participation in the science inquiry labs related to our NGSSS standards,

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Math/Science will support and monitor 5th grade level PLCs in targeting specific standards for continuous improvement model using PENDA with fidelity.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 Panorama survey data 77% responded favorably in the categories of Social Awareness, 72% in Self-management, 52% emotional regulation. The district comparison was 47% emotional regulation, 67% Self-management, and 68% Social awareness. However, the category of self management dropped 3 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome: The 3 areas (social awareness, self-management, and emotional regulation) will increase 5% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Panorama data will be used to monitor SEL twice a year.
The MTSS team will monitor SEL through the tiered data.

Monitoring: School mental health team will monitor student success and progress in small group counseling sessions.

Leadership team will analyze Early Warning Signs Data.
Leadership team will monitor parent climate surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983)

Action Steps to Implement

School mental health team will organize students in grade k-2 based on social emotional learning needs and provide small group counseling sessions.

Person Responsible Emily Tracey (emily.tracey@osceolaschools.net)

School mental health team will organize students in grade 3-5 based on social emotional learning needs determined from Panorama Survey data and provide small group counseling sessions.

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

MTSS team will analyze early warning signs data and implement interventions while progress monitoring monthly.

Person Responsible Emily Tracey (emily.tracey@osceolaschools.net)

Students will partake in Leader in Me lessons that focus on leadership skills that support the school vision and mission.

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

The implementation of schoolwide PBIS including an action plan and a site based PBIS Special Team to help promote the three areas of focus on the Panorama Survey.

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

Teachers will provide WICOR strategies during instruction to promote a schoolwide post secondary culture for all students.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hudson (elizabeth.hudson@osceolaschools.net)

Administration will utilize Remind, school website, and social media to ensure community and parents are informed.

Person Responsible Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the 2018-2019 ESSA data our school does not have any subgroups below the ESSA level of 41%. However, the federal index for students with disabilities was 43%.

Measurable Outcome: Our SWD ESSA subgroup data will increase in 2021-2022 to a federal index of 50%.

Monitoring: Leadership will monitor SWD students using NWEA for progress monitoring. The MTSS team will use the data to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The leadership team will also utilize the NEST tool to monitor classroom instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@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 the 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

NWEA data in ELA, Math and Science will be analyzed to determine projected proficiency, academic area deficiency, and necessary interventions.

Person Responsible Emily Tracey (emily.tracey@osceolaschools.net)

All students identified with academic deficiencies will be provided academic interventions during MTSS time.

Person Responsible Emily Tracey (emily.tracey@osceolaschools.net)

Academic interventions provided by teachers and staff will be monitored for fidelity by the MTSS problem solving team using progress monitoring data, teacher data chats, and classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Emily Tracey (emily.tracey@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.

N/A

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 engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations, high quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. If frequently communicates high expectations for all students.

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

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based on disaggregated data.
- Student work is displayed throughout school.
- All students are engaged in WICOR strategies through all curriculum areas.

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-school 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, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to

exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and providing 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 makes 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.

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

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 under served 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.

Part V: Budget

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

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