Harmony Community School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Harmony Community School

3365 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Harmony, FL 34773

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davenport, Sandra	Principal	
Costa, Jill	Math Coach	
Osborne, Deanna	Reading Coach	
Kowalski, Melissa	Dean	
Salvato, Faith	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Data will be analyzed by the School Leadership team. Goals will be written accordingly, with input from the grade levels. The goals will be shared with the teachers and staff. Finally, students will set individual goals. Students will then lead data chats with their teachers and parent two times a year. The principal will present the school goals to the SAC members and allow for input.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Each month, the Leadership Team will have a Stocktake meeting to discuss goals and action steps needed. Those next steps will be added to the Stocktake agenda and reviewed at the beginning of each meeting. When schoolwide assessment is administered, the Stocktake team will review the data and update the SIP as needed. Monthly, grade levels and classes will review progress toward goals. In

addition, individual students will monitor their personal goals and track progress in the leadership notebooks.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	33	28	29	24	33	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	7	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	12

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	0	1	9	25	0	0	0	38

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	15	20	24	19	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	7	0	6	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	9	2	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	27	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	20	22	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	5	1	2	19	27	0	0	0	60

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	15	20	24	19	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	7	0	6	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	9	2	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	27	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	20	22	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63			68	48	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				68	56	61	54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57	47	52	33		
Math Achievement*	64			65	47	60	70		
Math Learning Gains				55	55	64	59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40	46	55	48		
Science Achievement*	65			54	43	51	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	52			65			63		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	1	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	65			
HSP	54			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	56			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	63			64			65					52
SWD	17			25			38				4	
ELL	50			46			46				5	52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70			60							2	
HSP	59			55			54				5	54
MUL	69			56							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			68			71				4	
FRL	49			47			49				5	48

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	68	57	65	55	40	54					65
SWD	29	74	70	32	47	27	31					
ELL	58	76	91	48	52		50					65
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	67	71	55	57	54	43	45					53
MUL	69			54								
PAC												
WHT	68	67	58	68	56	38	57					
FRL	54	67	56	51	51	30	44					50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	54	33	70	59	48	60					63
SWD	30	36	32	34	36	38	30					
ELL	50	60		55	50		30					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	60	55		67	52		48					67
MUL	70			60								
PAC												
WHT	67	53	38	71	59	41	65					
FRL	50	47	23	60	47	36	48					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	44%	20%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	49%	24%	58%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	49%	19%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	48%	21%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	41%	20%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	40%	22%	51%	11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The reading score was 65% proficient in the Spring of 2023 and in Spring of 2022 the score was 68% proficient. Showing a drop of 3%. A contributing factor to this would be the teachers understanding the depth of the BEST standards.

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

SWD showed a drop from 29% proficient to 21% proficient in ELA. A contributing factor to this was a loss of a VE teacher and the case load had to be split between three VE teachers instead of four.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Although we scored above the state average overall. The closest score compared to the state was 5th grade math. Our score was 61% and the state was 54% giving difference of 7%. While 5th grade math was above the state, they were historically low, and improved by 13 points last year.

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

Fifth grade math showed the largest gain improving 13 points. We jumped from 48% to 61% We implemented using previous FAST data to identify areas of weakness per student. Students utilized Reflex Math. Provides professional development for CRA approach to mathematic instruction. Teachers practiced the strategies taught.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

There were 107 students that were absent 10% or more of the school year. There were 40 students identified with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Increase proficiency in reading in all subgroups.
2. Increase proficiency in math in all subgroups.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the 2022-23 school data finding that only 65% 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 3% 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.
2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the leadership team in the areas of focus.
3. Leadership team will monitor classroom data and improvement in student achievement using various assessments ie: formative, unit and state testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Osborne (deanna.osborne@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Florida Benchmark Advance 2022, Florida Edition (FLDOE Review of Instructional Materials Percent of Alignment- (K-96.78%, 1st - 100%, 2nd -85.94%, 3rd -81.25%, 4th -79.68%, 5th- 95.31%)
Open Court Foundational Skills (What Works Clearinghouse evidence: Strong)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Train teachers in best practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction

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

By When: Monthly during Leveling Up Tuesdays

Disaggregate data from FAST progress monitoring administration to identify intervention groups

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

By When: Within 30 days of administration window closing

ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS to ensure 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)

By When: Monthly during Stocktake

Incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all students. Students will track their progress within their Leadership notebooks.

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

By When: Monthly during Level Up Tuesdays.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the 2022/2023 school year 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 3% 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 high level of questions (Inquiry).
3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Leadership Team on the Area of Focus.
4. Use of Dreambox to ensure conceptual understanding and procedural fluency

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly. Dreambox will be used K-5 (What Works Clearing House Evidence Strong)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional development will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of fluency and strategies across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training.

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

By When: Monthly during Leveling Up Tuesdays

Disaggregate data from FAST progress monitoring administration to identify intervention groups

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

By When: Within 30 days of window administration window closing

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

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

By When: Monthly during Stocktake

Incorporate WICOR and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all students. Students will track their progress within their Leadership notebooks.

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

By When: Monthly during Level Up Tuesdays.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 2022-2023 Panorama Survey showed that 68% of students answered the school climate at Harmony Community is favorable. This is a decrease by 10% from the Winter survey.

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

For the 2023-2024 Panorama Survey, that number will increase to 71%.

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, behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop inventions as required.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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. The Leader in Me program is implemented at Harmony Community. Each month, a new leadership habit is introduced and taught. Additionally, counseling and social skills group will occur with school counselors and the social worker.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the Leader in Me Program, students were 43% less likely to say they don't like school compared with a non-LiM student. DR. C. TIDD (2016) WALDEN UNIVERSITY, p. 53

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide Leader in Me teachers Training Sessions during the First Semester

Person Responsible: Stacey Alderman (stacey.alderman@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Pre-planning- August

Teachers will introduce the first four habits in the Leader in Me program.

Person Responsible: Stacey Alderman (stacey.alderman@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Be Proactive - August Begin with the End in Mind - September Put First Things First- October Think Win-Win- November

Guidance lessons will be conducted in all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Kristine Rivera (kristine.rivera@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Once a week by the social worker and per semester by school counselors.

Counselors will meet weekly with the dean to go over behavior and MTSS data.

Person Responsible: Camryn Lang (camryn.lang@osceolaschools.ne)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will introduce the habits 5-7 in the Leader in Me program.

Person Responsible: Stacey Alderman (stacey.alderman@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Seek First to Understand, Then to Be Understood- December Synergize - January Sharpen the Saw-February