

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Harmony Community School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Sandra Davenport

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2017

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 43%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (58%)<br>2018-19: A (74%)<br>2017-18: A (70%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

[www.osceolaschools.net](http://www.osceolaschools.net)

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 43%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 40%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       |         | 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**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name              | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Davenport, Sandra | Principal           | Principal duties and responsibilities include:<br>-provide a common vision and language for the continued use of data-based decision making<br>-provide needed resources and materials to ensure optimum levels of program success<br>-provide and coordinate valuable and continuous professional development<br>-attend MTSS team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process<br>-conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of interventions in use<br>-communicate consistent and clear message to parents and staff regarding MTSS plans and procedures at the site |
| Telemko, Beth     | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal responsibilities include:<br>-provide a common vision and language for the continued use of data-based decision making<br>-provide needed resources and materials to ensure optimum levels of program success<br>-provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development<br>-attend MTSS team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process<br>-conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of interventions in use<br>-communicate consistent and clear message to parent and staff regarding MTSS plans and procedures at the site    |
| Osborne, Deanna   | Reading Coach       | Literacy Coach responsibilities include:<br>-model and coach teachers in Tier 1 instructional strategies<br>-collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk students<br>-attend MTSS team meetings<br>-train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction<br>-coach teacher in appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions<br>-participate in decisions regarding student placement in MTSS programs and levels of intervention   |
| Costa, Jill       | Math Coach          | Math/Science Coach responsibilities include:<br>-model and coach teachers in Tier 1 instructional strategies<br>-collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk students<br>-attend MTSS team meetings<br>-train teachers' interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction<br>-coach teachers in appropriate Tie 2 and Tier 3 interventions<br>-participate in decisions regarding student placement in MTSS programs and levels of intervention   |
| Pociask, Jessica  | School Counselor    | School Counselor responsibilities include:<br>-provide social and emotional supports to students<br>-provide career counseling to students  |

| Name              | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| Kuster, Erin      | Dean           | Dean responsibilities include:<br>-model and coach students on Tier 1: Leader in Me expectations<br>-provide behavioral supports to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students  |
| Kowalski, Melissa | Other          | Testing Coordinator/MTSS Coach responsibilities include:<br>-schedule and manage various testing schedules<br>-schedule and attend MTSS team meetings<br>-maintain a log of all students involved in the MTSS process<br>-complete necessary MTSS forms<br>-participate in decisions regarding student placement in MTSS programs and levels of intervention<br>-keep progress monitoring notes and evidence of implemented interventions |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 8/10/2017, Sandra Davenport

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

66

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

992

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

14

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

6

#### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 134         | 165 | 143 | 151 | 166 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 946   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 29  | 15  | 20  | 24  | 19  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 1   | 7   | 0   | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 1   | 0   | 9   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 19  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 20  | 22  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6           | 5   | 1   | 2   | 19  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 6           | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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                              | 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  |       |

#### 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                              | 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  |       |

**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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 68%    | 48%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 74%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 68%    | 56%      | 61%   |        |          |       | 71%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 57%    | 47%      | 52%   |        |          |       | 64%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 65%    | 47%      | 60%   |        |          |       | 75%    | 55%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 55%    | 55%      | 64%   |        |          |       | 75%    | 59%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40%    | 46%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 59%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 54%    | 43%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 72%    | 49%      | 53%   |

**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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 51%      | 13%                        | 58%   | 6%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 51%      | 28%                        | 58%   | 21%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 48%      | 21%                        | 56%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -79%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 54%      | 15%                        | 62%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 53%      | 25%                        | 64%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -69%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 48%      | 21%                        | 60%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -78%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 67%    | 45%      | 22%                        | 53%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 29       | 74     | 70          | 32        | 47      | 27           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 58       | 76     | 91          | 48        | 52      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 71     | 55          | 57        | 54      | 43           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 69       |        |             | 54        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 67     | 58          | 68        | 56      | 38           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 67     | 56          | 51        | 51      | 30           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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      |           |                   |                     |
| 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        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 59   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 472  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 44   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 63   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 56  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 62  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 59  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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 the 2022 data, 27% of our students with disabilities were proficient in ELA and 30% were proficient in Math.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off the FSA data, the greatest need for improvement is students with disabilities in the areas of ELA and Math.

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

After reviewing state assessment data, only 30% of our students with disabilities are proficient in ELA and Math. We will be addressing this need by reviewing supports during Tier 1 instruction and the interventions being utilized during Teir 2 and Tier 3.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and the 22 FSA in ELA, our lowest quartile in reading grew by 24 points.

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

Some contributing factors for this growth include small group guided reading and strategic interventions during MTSS time.

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

To accelerate learning, we will be looking at ensuring that all students are either receiving tiered interventions or enrichment during the 30 minute MTSS time.

#### 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.

Each Tuesday, our staff will be invited to attend various ELA and Math trainings that will focus on specific instructional strategies to help out students' academic success.

**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 strategic Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

If teachers participate in authentic PLCs in all accountability areas, then engaging lesson plans using high yield strategies and best practices can be planned and common formative assessments can be developed to monitor student achievement. Then student achievement will increase.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

ELA, Math, Science proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

1. Administration, leadership team, and PLC Leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the PLC teams individually and collectively.
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

PLC is defined as "...an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (DuFour, 2006).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Set clear objectives that are focused on student learning. The PLC model is grounded in the assumption that building teachers' competencies will lead to improved academic, behavioral, or social outcomes for students. Consequently, student learning is both the foundation and evidence of an effective PLC.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. PLC teams will develop & implement Collective Commitments (NORMs) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members.
2. School PLC's teams will meet four times a month during early release. This dedicated PLC time will focus on working together for student success purposes.
3. Collaborative teaming PD will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes through the PLC facilitator and administrator.
4. Current Data will be used for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.
5. Mentoring will be conducted by the PLC administrator and facilitator for struggling teams, and additional support will be given to become an effective collaborative team focused on the work.
6. PLC teams will have an embedded leadership team member to assist in the process.

**Person Responsible**

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Culture and Environment****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Well-implemented programs designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to generate, better test scores and higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. These competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop a positive culture they need to succeed in life.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

2021-2022 Panorama Survey showed a 69% of students answered favorably about school belonging. In 2022-2023 this question will be increased by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

1. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive culture within the school.
2. The leadership team will review monthly during the Stocktake PBIS/Leader in Me (LIM), behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop inventions as required.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individuals and be focused and flexible to allow for meeting these different needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based**

**Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students to build on students' individual assets and passions.
2. Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging using Leader in Me resources.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through collaboration during morning meeting.
4. Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness.
5. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support a positive culture for students and staff.
6. LIM/PBIS will be implemented with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school and monitored through the LIM/PBIS leadership team and reported at monthly Stocktake.
7. LIM/PBIS training will be conducted by the district and the school teams for all staff.

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

1. Each Monday, students and staff will participate in wearing their favorite college shirt.
2. School Counselor will present career-based lessons to 3-5th grade.
3. Each grade level will complete Career Lessons on the Xello program.

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

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 65% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups.

**Monitoring:**  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. Administrative team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions should be focused on Costa's higher levels of questions (Inquiry).
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly.

**Rationale for Evidence-based**

Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts or procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use one procedure for a given situation. Procedural fluency builds on a foundation of conceptual understanding, strategic reasoning, and

**Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

problem-solving (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010; NCTM, 2000, 2014). All students need to have a deep and flexible knowledge of a variety of procedures, along with an ability to make critical judgments about which procedures or strategies are appropriate for use, in particular, situations (NRC, 2001, 2005, 2012; Star, 2005). Procedural fluency extends students' computational fluency and applies to all strands of mathematics.

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year, during our Leveling Up Tuesdays, that focuses on the development of fluency and strategies across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training.
2. The math coach will work with teachers to intentionally plan based on student needs.
3. The Math coach will model lessons, when needed, to support content understanding.
4. Teachers will implement a fluency center to focus on developing appropriate automaticity within the grade-level benchmarks.
5. Teachers will use different problem-solving strategies, including visual representations for the fluency benchmarks and progress monitoring (Inquiry; MTR 6).
6. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work collaboratively to share strategies and refine their thinking (Collaboration; MTR 4).

**Person Responsible** Jill Costa (jill.costa@osceolaschools.net)

1. Monthly meetings with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for all students.
2. Teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level fluency benchmarks and provide targeted remediation based on the identified needs of the student using Hand2Mind resources.
3. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1, 2, & 3.
4. Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at risk of becoming non-proficient in mathematics based on a variety of progress monitoring. In addition, advanced students will be offered to students to extend their learning.
5. ELL and ESE classroom support will occur through the collaboration of EES and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies.

**Person Responsible** Jill Costa (jill.costa@osceolaschools.net)

1. Teachers will incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups.
2. Students will be cognitively engaged in problem-solving strategies, discussion techniques, supported by feedback and the ability to self-assess progress.
3. Students will track their progress within their Leadership Notebooks.
4. PLC Teams will determine the data that students will collect for their Leadership Notebooks.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 68% of students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

ELA, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

**Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers will be trained by the Literacy Coach in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction throughout the year during our Leveling Up Tuesdays.
2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one conferencing to meet individual needs.
3. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students.
4. Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations, scoring tools to identify individual

student needs.

5. Instructional staff will utilize high-quality ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans.
6. Kindergarten, First Grade, and Second Grade will implement Open Court into their daily ELA instruction.
7. All students will engage in Lexia Core 5 through the daily reading rotations.
8. Teachers will incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all students.

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

9. Students will participate in targeted intervention for Tier 1,2, & 3.
10. RISE reading will be used as one of our iii interventions.
11. Monthly meetings with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for all students.
12. The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.

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

14. Teachers will incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all students.
15. Students will track their progress within their Leadership Notebooks.
16. PLC Teams will determine the data that students will collect for their Leadership Notebooks.

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

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

If teachers effectively provide opportunities for students to actively participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures, engage in active learning experiences (such as labs, activities, and investigations), and authentically use their interactive science notebook to process their learning, then student engagement and learning will increase.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Science proficiency will increase by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction.
2. Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA, PM, and mock) will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning and coaching for teachers based on individual and small group needs.
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the leadership and/or coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Beth Telemko (beth.telemko@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

**Evidence-based Strategy**

1. Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures
2. Engage in active learning experiences
3. Process learning using interactive science notebooks

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Academic discourse through collaborative structures helps students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions they have. They not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts. WICOR (AVID)
2. Active learning experiences providing opportunities for students to investigate through inquiry, participate in experiments, develop models, and engage in simulations and activities remember the experience, especially if it is connected and relevant to their lives (which is possible in almost all science content). WICOR (AVID)
3. Interactive science notebooks provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence in science as they develop an understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, synthesizing information, and more. WICOR (AVID)

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Through PLCs, develop a common understanding among team members for each instructional strategy and expectations for what each looks like in the classroom.
2. Conduct classroom walkthroughs, focusing on highest priority science instructional strategy. Walkthrough should be focused on student learning (not teacher facilitating). What are students doing? Can students describe what they are learning and why they are learning it?
3. Use data (formative assessments and progress monitoring) to discuss student learning gains and plan for professional learning and coaching needs.
4. Science Coach will conduct content training on the NGSSS standards, differentiated instruction during our Leveling Up Tuesdays.

**Person Responsible** Jill Costa (jill.costa@osceolaschools.net)

8. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.
9. Students will track their progress within their Leadership Notebooks.
10. PLC Teams will determine the data that students will collect for their Leadership Notebooks.

**Person Responsible** Jill Costa (jill.costa@osceolaschools.net)

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**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 school culture and environment.**

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.