**School District of Osceola County, FL** 

# Pleasant Hill Elementary School



2023-24 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

# **Table of Contents**

| SIP Authority and Purpose                                   | 3  |
|---|----|
|   |    |
| I. School Information                                       | 6  |
|   |    |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review                            | 11 |
|   |    |
| III. Planning for Improvement                               | 16 |
|   |    |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review                       | 34 |
| •   |    |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 34 |
| •   |    |
| VI. Title I Requirements                                    | 37 |
| •   |    |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus                       | 0  |

# **Pleasant Hill Elementary School**

1801 JACK CALHOUN DR, Kissimmee, FL 34741

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), <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">https://www.floridacims.org</a>, 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.

Pleasant Hill Elementary School will provide a safe learning environment and challenging curriculum that enables students to obtain their full potential.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to cultivate a safe and caring learning environment that enables all students to become college and career ready through a rigorous curriculum that challenges students at all levels.

# School Leadership Team, 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Pagan,<br>Shelby             | Principal              | The principal works with students, parents, and staff to maintain an atmosphere focusing on performance through a culture of shared excellence and reaching college and career goals. the principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP, and receive monthly reports and give feedback. The principal oversees all student data, tier levels and instruction. |
| Kalloo<br>Molina,<br>Annette | Assistant<br>Principal | The assistant principal works directly with staff in the area of scheduling students and handles extended learning opportunities. The assistant principal conducts walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and provides feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and student data. The assistant principal will be responsible for the school stocktake, monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback.  |
| Pearson,<br>Jennifer         | Reading<br>Coach       | The literacy coach provides support for ELA (reading and writing) instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in reading and writing. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.   |
| Millet,<br>Jessica           | Math Coach             | The math and science coach provides support for math/science instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in math and science. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.   |
| Severance,<br>Jeri-Lynne     | Staffing<br>Specialist | The ESE compliance specialist provides support for ESE instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESE students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.  |
| Cruz, Emy                    | School<br>Counselor    | The guidance counselor provides support for all through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the ways to work with children/. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to   |

| Name                                    | Position<br>Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
|   |                                 | provide support by modeling, intervention, small group and enrichment strategies.  |
| Woods,<br>Kyra                          | Instructional<br>Media          | The media specialist provides support for ELA (reading and writing) instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in reading and writing. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling, intervention, and enrichment strategies.   |
| Erin<br>Alexander,<br>Erin<br>Alexander | Instructional<br>Coach          | The Test Coordinator, MTSS and AVID coach supports all tiers of learning through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for all students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies. In addition, she models AVID strategies. |
| Valencia,<br>Ivonne                     | ELL<br>Compliance<br>Specialist | The ESOL compliance specialist provides support for ELL instruction through providing professional development, peer coaching, data analysis, and student engagement in all subjects. As a member of our team, she brings the most current classroom best practices and a deep understanding of the content and curriculum for our ESOL students. She works through the MTSS process with teachers to provide support by modeling intervention and enrichment strategies.  |

# 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.

During the September 2023 SAC meeting. Pleasant Hill Elementary School will present and discuss the SIP with all stakeholders to gather feedback. We will share flyers with students and post school website and social media at least seven days prior to the meeting in English and Spanish to announce and invite stakeholders to participate and provide input. In addition, the school will provide translation services in Spanish, as well as the translation of other meeting documents as needed. The SIP and meeting documents will be disseminated in the school's website, social media, and a hardcopy will be available in the school's front office. The SIP's progress will be monitored and reviewed at the December 2023 SAC meeting by sharing data to evaluate the progress of the plan and effectiveness of the activities as well as to determine if an amendment is needed.

# **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))

The leadership team with input from teachers will monitor 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 monthly during Stocktake meetings. If it is found that an action step is not meeting the needs of students, and or another action step is needed in conjunction with the current steps, we will revise, edit, and add as needed to best meet the needs of all students.

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

| 2023-24 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served   | Elementary School  |
| (per MSID File)   | PK-5   |
| ,   | FR-5   |
| Primary Service Type  | K-12 General Education   |
| (per MSID File)   | TO 12 General Education  |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status   | Yes  |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate   | 86%  |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate   | 100%   |
| Charter School  | No   |
| RAISE School  | Yes  |
| ESSA Identification   |  |
| *updated as of 3/11/2024  | ATSI   |
| 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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.   | 2021-22: C<br>2019-20: C<br>2018-19: C<br>2017-18: C   |
| 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 |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|---|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator   | K  | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 41 | 43          | 26 | 40 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 7  | 3           | 7  | 7  | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46    |  |  |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0  | 0           | 2  | 12 | 5  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34    |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0  | 0           | 2  | 10 | 1  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 7  | 30 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0           | 0  | 6  | 36 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87    |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 60 | 67          | 57 | 79 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263   |  |  |

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 |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 7           | 3 | 7 | 29 | 32 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126   |  |  |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12    |  |  |
| 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 |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|---|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator   | K  | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 45 | 31          | 40 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 7  | 3           | 9  | 6  | 6  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39    |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0  | 0           | 30 | 12 | 3  | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62    |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0  | 0           | 3  | 8  | 0  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 3  | 28 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0           | 0  | 3  | 32 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79    |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Total |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0     | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15    |

# The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1 | 6           | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12    |  |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|---|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator   | K  | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 45 | 31          | 40 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 7  | 3           | 9  | 6  | 6  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39    |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0  | 0           | 30 | 12 | 3  | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62    |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0  | 0           | 3  | 8  | 0  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 3  | 28 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0           | 0  | 3  | 32 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79    |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |  |  |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                            | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15    |

#### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| Indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 Company             |        | 2023     |       |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       |  |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| Accountability Component           | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement*                   | 40     | 44       | 53    | 42     | 48       | 56    | 39     |          |       |  |
| ELA Learning Gains                 |        |          |       | 50     |          |       | 42     |          |       |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile         |        |          |       | 43     |          |       | 38     |          |       |  |
| Math Achievement*                  | 43     | 46       | 59    | 44     | 44       | 50    | 38     |          |       |  |
| Math Learning Gains                |        |          |       | 48     |          |       | 26     |          |       |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile        |        |          |       | 31     |          |       | 22     |          |       |  |
| Science Achievement*               | 50     | 43       | 54    | 39     | 46       | 59    | 35     |          |       |  |
| Social Studies Achievement*        |        |          |       |        | 55       | 64    |        |          |       |  |
| Middle School Acceleration         |        |          |       |        | 42       | 52    |        |          |       |  |
| Graduation Rate                    |        |          |       |        | 42       | 50    |        |          |       |  |
| College and Career<br>Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |  |
| ELP Progress                       | 54     | 59       | 59    | 54     |          |       | 52     |          |       |  |

<sup>\*</sup> 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)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 46   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 228  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44   |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 3   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 351 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# **ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

|                  |                                       | 2022-23 ES               | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMA                                      | RY  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive<br>years the Subgroup is Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |
| SWD              | 23                                    | Yes                      | 4   | 2   |
| ELL              | 32                                    | Yes                      | 2   |   |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| ASN              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| BLK              | 42                                    |                          |   |   |
| HSP              | 45                                    |                          |   |   |
| MUL              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| WHT              | 49                                    |                          |   |   |
| FRL              | 43                                    |                          |   |   |

|                  | 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWD              | 25                                    | Yes                      | 3   | 1   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL              | 34                                    | Yes                      | 1   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK              | 39                                    | Yes                      | 1   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP              | 43                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                  | 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT              | 52                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL              | 42                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2021-22 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2021-22 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| All<br>Students | 40   |        |                | 43           |            |                    | 50          |         |              |                         |                           | 54              |  |  |
| SWD             | 16   |        |                | 11           |            |                    | 25          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 43              |  |  |
| ELL             | 21   |        |                | 32           |            |                    | 38          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 54              |  |  |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| ASN             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| BLK             | 38   |        |                | 42           |            |                    | 58          |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |  |  |
| HSP             | 39   |        |                | 40           |            |                    | 51          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 55              |  |  |
| MUL             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| PAC             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| WHT             | 47   |        |                | 53           |            |                    | 31          |         |              |                         | 4                         |                 |  |  |
| FRL             | 37   |        |                | 40           |            |                    | 48          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 51              |  |  |

|                 | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| All<br>Students | 42   | 50     | 43             | 44           | 48         | 31                 | 39          |         |              |                         |                           | 54              |  |  |
| SWD             | 3  | 43     | 50             | 10           | 27         | 33                 | 0           |         |              |                         |                           | 32              |  |  |
| ELL             | 25   | 43     | 39             | 30           | 36         | 23                 | 19          |         |              |                         |                           | 54              |  |  |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| ASN             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |

|           | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
|-----------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| BLK       | 41   | 33     | 40             | 44           | 44         |                    | 29          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| HSP       | 39   | 54     | 45             | 40           | 47         | 33                 | 35          |         |              |                         |                           | 54              |  |  |
| MUL       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| PAC       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| WHT       | 44   | 46     |                | 60           | 58         |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| FRL       | 35   | 47     | 46             | 39           | 46         | 32                 | 34          |         |              |                         |                           | 55              |  |  |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
|--|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students                                | 39          | 42     | 38             | 38           | 26         | 22                 | 35          |         |              |                         |                           | 52              |
| SWD  | 21          | 30     | 33             | 33           | 33         | 29                 | 19          |         |              |                         |                           | 38              |
| ELL  | 29          | 45     | 29             | 36           | 29         | 16                 | 28          |         |              |                         |                           | 52              |
| AMI  |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN  |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK  | 35          | 27     |                | 33           | 27         |                    | 26          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| HSP  | 36          | 42     | 41             | 37           | 27         | 19                 | 31          |         |              |                         |                           | 50              |
| MUL  |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC  |             |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT  | 50          | 59     |                | 49           | 18         |                    | 61          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| FRL  | 32          | 40     | 38             | 34           | 27         | 26                 | 31          |         |              |                         |                           | 44              |

# 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 44%      | -3%                               | 54%   | -13%                           |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 43%    | 49%      | -6%                               | 58%   | -15%                           |

|       |               |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 38%    | 44%      | -6%                               | 50%   | -12%                           |

|       |               |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 40%    | 49%      | -9%                               | 59%   | -19%                           |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 48%      | 7%                                | 61%   | -6%                            |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 35%    | 41%      | -6%                               | 55%   | -20%                           |

|       |               |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 46%    | 40%      | 6%                                | 51%   | -5%                            |

# 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.

Based on FSA scores the lowest-performing sub-group for the 22-23 school year, are our students with disabilities (SWD) in all three subject areas: Reading, Mathematics, and Science, however our area of lowest performance is math, and that subject will be the focus. We know that a lot of work needs to be done in this area to get our students to reach success at their ceiling.

We did make progress from the 21-22 school year and want to continue the actions steps put into place, as well as add additional steps to ensure success for all. In mathematics they were at 10% in 21-22 and 12% for the 22-23 school year, this was only a slight increase.

In Math, we need to make sure that students continue growing at a more rapid rate. Our students need work with concrete skills and number sense. Students also showed little confidence in this area, so that will also be a focus.

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

Our greatest decline from 21-22 to 22-23 is in the area of mathematics. In 21-22 they demonstrated 60% proficiency while in 22-23 this lowered to 53% demonstrating proficiency.

The contributing factors include:

- -teacher turn over
- -teacher vacancy
- -a rise in teachers who did not study education in college

# 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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was mathematics. The state average for mathematics in 22-23 was 58%, and our students demonstrated 44% proficiency in the area of mathematics. This has a 14% gap.

We are still working to close the opportunity gap that was widened by the COVID pandemic. We see that number sense is an area of weakness. Students are missing pieces to build upon as the skill and standards progress.

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

We saw the biggest growth in the area of science. In 21-22 39% were proficient whereas 46% were proficient in 22-23. This was a 7% increase.

In science, we added a monthly school wide science lesson, as well as making sure that there were more hands-on science learning experiences to help students understand what they were learning. We also began house of science, and spiral review beginning in August. This continual practice and review coupled with continual motivation and encouragement was paramount in the student's growth.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the number of students that are absent more than 10% of the school year and the number of students scoring a level 1 in ELA/Math.

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

- 1. Increased achievement in the area of ELA.
- 2. Increased achievement in the area of Mathematics.
- 3. Increased achievement in the area of science.
- 4. school culture and climate
- 5. parental engagement

#### 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.

Currently our 3-5 grade ELA data shows that only 41% of our students are proficient in the area of reading. This is well below that state average of 54%. Black and African American students are only showing 64% proficient in ELA, 42% proficient in ELA in 4th grade, and 22% proficient in ELA. It is imperative we continue to work with our Black and African American students. ELL students are only showing 16% proficient in ELA. It is imperative we continue to work with our ELL students.

3-5 FAST and K-2 STAR Assessments in ELA Data indicates a need for explicit and intentional understanding of the benchmarks and planning to the full intent of the standard using data and best practices to help teachers be better prepared for instruction that will be aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

According to the standards-based data collected from the 2022-2023 FAST and Star Data Standards-based data collected from the spring 2023 administration of the FAST-showed students in K-2 performing at 50% proficient in ELA. In grades 3-5 the data indicates 44% proficient in ELA, which indicates that we have work to do.

There is a need for teachers to continue collaboratively planning during common grade-level planning with support from the content area coaches and teacher mentors. We also need to make sure to not just focus on the when and what, but the how as well. We have seen growth this year, and are making progress, we just need to stay on track and remain focused on our goals.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

We intend to increase the proficiency of our 3-5th grade students to 54% proficient. We intend to increase the proficiency of our 3-5th grade students to 54% proficient, which includes students with disabilities. If we work on deepening a stronger Tier 1 in ELA, Math, and Science, ESE, Black/African American, ELL students will excel as well.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

We will administer the FAST assessment three times a year to check for proficiency. We will also have milestone pulse checks, including progress monitoring, along with formative and formal assessments to provide ongoing data showing students strengths and areas of improvement.

We will monitor for the desired effect with:

Classroom walk throughs by the leadership team weekly.

Data reviews: Administration to teacher, data chats, Leadership team, and PLC's

Grade level common assessments/State assessment

We will follow the district's Reading Plan/Decision Tree and ensure the evidence-based programs and practices implemented for ESE and ELL students, as applicable.

- Language Power (Visible Learning effect size phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)
- Lexia English (Visible Learning effect size comprehensive reading program: .47 promising)
- Pre-Teaching Lessons (Visible Learning effect size Strategy to integrate prior knowledge: .93 strong)

# Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@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.)

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies and Benchmark curriculum, as well as the school district curriculum unit plans when planning for instruction with professional learning teams. Teachers and coaches will then monitor student progress using weekly common formative assessments and state-wide progress monitoring through FAST and STAR. Teachers will use Benchmark, Lexia, Open Court, and STAR to provide interventions for students who are not meeting progress.

We will utilize the following:

**Open Court Intervention** 

Benchmark Intervention

Reading Mastery

Sonday

FCRR Online Resources

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed above include feedback with an effect size of .73; distributed practice with an effect size of .71; direct instruction with an effect size of .59; worked examples with an effect size of .57; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41, according to Visible Learning data compiled by John Hattie. In addition, DreamBox Learning has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

# 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.

Instructional coaches will hold common planning with teachers every Friday during each grade levels common planning to support and guide as

lessons are planned that meet the intended learning goal. They will focus on the what, when, and the HOW.

We will work with teachers to make sure that they are implementing our curriculum to the extent of the grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material with a focus on SWD, BLACK, and ELL students.

#### Evidence:

Lessons Plans/Classroom walk through trend data.

#### Impact:

With an aligned focus and intentional planning to meet our goals we will see increased student achievement.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** This will begin during preplanning August 9, and continue each Friday for the remainder of the school year.

Teachers will scaffold instruction and provide differentiation for students using Tier 1 core curriculum and following the district CUPS to meet the full intent of the benchmark, including but not limited to our SWD, Black, and ELL students.

#### Evidence:

Collaborative trend walks with Literacy Coach, MTSS Coach ECS, and RCS.

There will be visiting of classrooms with VE support and self-contained BEST classrooms, as well as our sheltered classrooms.

#### Impact:

Ensure all students are getting access to guaranteed viable curriculum at a Tier 1 Level and their instructional level to show growth on assessments.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** Classroom Walks will begin August 10, and continue through-out the remainder of the school year.

Teachers will continue to implement 30-30-30 model of instruction that began during the 4th nine weeks of the 2022-2023 school year. This will be supported by the instructional coaches through planning, modeling, and side by side teaching.

#### Evidence:

Collaborative trend walks with Literacy Coach, and administrative team. PLC meetings to discuss progress, glows, and grows based on current data.

# Impact:

Growth in proficiency in reading

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Our goal is to begin implementation by August 28th, 2023.

As we meet as an MTSS PLT we will Continue to assess, decide, and guide iii ELA instruction utilizing intervention programs such as Sonday and corrective reading, as well as other programs focusing on multiple avenues of data.

#### Evidence:

Collaborative trend walks with Literacy Coach, and administrative team. PLC meetings to discuss progress, glows, and grows based on current data.

#### Impact:

Growth in proficiency in reading

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Our first MTSS PLT after PM1 will be August 30th, 2023.

Teachers will utilize feedback cards from Benchmark assessments and the school city assessment platform to form and change guided reading groups fluidly and base instruction on standards and student need.

#### Evidence:

Collaborative trend walks with Literacy Coach, and administrative team. PLC meetings to discuss progress, glows, and grows based on current data.

Impact:

Growth in proficiency in reading

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will start August 14th and continue for the remainder of the school year.

Teachers will provide instructional time for students to build stamina by reading books of choice independently with incremental increasing time.

Support student stamina and independent reading by forming battle of the book's teams in grades 3-5.

Support student stamina and independent reading by forming books clubs in grades K-2.

Evidence:

Review of schedule

Monitoring of the team and their progress by media specialist and literacy coach

Collaborative trend walks with Literacy Coach, and administrative team. PLC meetings to discuss progress, glows, and grows based on current data.

Impact:

Growth in proficiency in reading

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

**Person Responsible:** Kyra Woods (kyra.woods@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023, start date.

MTSS meetings will take place with all grade levels and the progress of ESE, ELL, and Black/African American students will be shared with teachers. Also, next steps will be discussed to devise a plan for successful academic progress.

Person Responsible: Erin Alexander Erin Alexander (erin.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Starting August 30, 2023

# #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.

The 2022 - 2023 school data findings found that 43% of our students in grades three, four, and five were proficient in the area of mathematics. Production, focused, and student-centered actions are necessary to accomplish our goal of 58% proficiency for all students in the area of mathematics. This is well below that state average of 58%, which we plan to reach. Black and African American students are only showing 57% proficient in Math in 3rd grade, 42% proficient Math in 4th grade, 35% proficient in Math. It is imperative we continue to work with our Black and African American students. ELL students are only showing 21% proficient in Math. It is imperative we continue to work with our ELL students.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome for the 2023-2024 school year is that we increase proficiency by at least 15% to 58% proficient in grades 3-5. We intend to increase the proficiency of our 3-5th grade students to 54% proficient, which includes students with disabilities. If we work on deepening a stronger Tier 1 in ELA, Math, and Science, ESE, Black/African American, ELL students will excel as well.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

We will monitor for the desired effect with:

Class room walk throughs

Data reviews: Administration to teacher, teacher to student (data chats), Leadership team, and PLC's Grade level common assessments

State assessment growth from one administration to the next

# 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.)

ONP

Dreambox

The BIG M

Reveal Math

# **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed above include feedback with an effect size of .73; distributed practice with an effect size of .71; direct instruction with an effect size of .59; worked examples with an effect size of .57; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41, according to Visible Learning data compiled by John Hattie. In addition, DreamBox Learning has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

# 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.

We will work with teachers to make sure that they are implementing our curriculum to the extent of the grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material with a focus on SWD, BLACK, and ELL students.

Instructional coaches will hold common planning with teachers every Friday during each grade levels common planning to support and guide as lessons are planned that meet the intended learning goal.

#### Evidence:

Lessons Plans/Classroom walk through trend data.

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** This work will begin during preplanning and the first common planning will be held on August 18th, 2023.

ESE teachers will be implementing the curriculum to the extent of the grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material.

#### Evidence:

•Observations during math whole group/small group instruction

Weekly walkthroughs with math coach and RCS.

#### Impact:

· Growth in proficiency in math

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning August 11, 2023.

#### Intervention:

Tier 3:

Targeted Instruction for our T3 math students

# Evidence:

We will use of the Osceola Numeracy Project

Progress Monitoring tool given every 3 weeks and tracked through TEAMS spreadsheet.

#### Impact:

• Growth in proficiency in math, showing a closing of the opportunity gap.

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

#### Tier 2:

Target Instruction for our T2 math students

#### Evidence:

• Teachers will utilize the targeted interventions and Take Another Look/Reinforce Understanding located in the McGraw-Hill Curriculum (Connect-Ed)

Exit Ticket/Formative Assessment tools in McGraw-Hill.

# Impact:

Growth in proficiency in math, showing a closing of the opportunity gap.

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023, when we have had the opportunity to analyze PM1 data.

We will implement a 90-minute Math Block in the 30/30/30 model (30-Math Paws, 30-Whole Group Mini-Lesson/Math Tasks, 30-Small Groups/Re-teaching)

#### Evidence:

• Teachers will implement small group instruction at the beginning and end of the math block to provide math interventions based on benchmark data collected from formative and summative assessments.

Weekly walkthroughs from coaches and administration during specific times of the math block to ensure fidelity.

# Impact:

· Growth in proficiency in math

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: We will begin on August 10th, 2023.

K-5 use of Dreambox for our math digital program.

#### Evidence:

Usage monitored through Dreambox on a weekly and monthly basis.

Usage reports pulled on a weekly and monthly basis.

# Impact:

· Growth in proficiency in math

Progress monitoring throughout the school year through STAR and FAST assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin on August. 10. 2023.

Teachers and students will hold Intentional data chats on a regular basis with students based on benchmark data from school city.

#### Evidence:

• Data folders for each student with data from Unit Assessments.

Feedback cards from each unit assessment and reflections in Data Folders for each student

Impact:

#### Growth in proficiency in math

Progress monitoring throughout the school year through STAR and FAST assessments. We will work with teachers to make sure that they are implementing our curriculum to the extent of the grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material with a focus on SWD, BLACK, and ELL students.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin no later than September 1st.

There will be content Support for teachers through weekly planning and math content preview for upcoming units.

Evidence:

Lesson plans and implemented lessons in the classroom.

Classroom walkthrough trend data.

Impact:

Growth in proficiency in math

Quizzes and Unit assessments done in School City

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Beginning August 7th, 2023

MTSS meetings will take place with all grade levels and the progress of ESE, ELL, and Black/African American students will be shared with teachers. Also, next steps will be discussed to devise a plan for successful academic progress.

Person Responsible: Erin Alexander Erin Alexander (erin.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Starting August 30, 2023.

# #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

# **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 school data findings found that 46% of our students in grade five were proficient in the area of science. The state average was 51%. Black and African American students are only showing 29% proficient in science in 5th grade. It is imperative we continue to work with our Black and African American students. ELL students are only showing 7% proficient in Science, It is imperative we continue to work with our ELL students.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome for the 2023-2024 school year is that we will increase proficiency by at least 8% to at least 54%. We intend to increase the proficiency of our 3-5th grade students to 54% proficient, which includes students with disabilities. If we work on deepening a stronger Tier 1 in ELA, Math, and Science, ESE, Black/African American, ELL students will excel as well.

# **Monitoring:**

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

We will monitor for the desired effect with:

Classroom walk throughs by administration and the math and science coach beginning August 14, 2023 Data reviews: Administration to teacher, teacher to student (data chats), Leadership team, and PLC's Grade level common assessments

State assessment growth from one administration to the next

#### 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.)

The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making to meet the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, the collaborative analysis of both formative and summative assessment data to refocus instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities and a different first language. Research also indicated that the MTSS model that focuses on students' needs coupled with differentiating and scaffolding instruction has a positive effect on student growth and achievement.

# **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves as a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2002), Reeves (2010), Dutour, et al (2010). The interventions listed above include feedback with an effect size of .73; distributed practice with an effect size of .71; direct instruction with an effect size of .59; worked examples with an effect size of .57; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41, according to Visible Learning data compiled by John Hattie.

#### 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.

The need for common planning is apparent, with the number of new teachers.

Instructional coaches will hold common planning with teachers every Friday during each grade levels common planning to support and guide as

lessons are planned that meet the intended earning goal.

Evidence of implementation:

Lessons Plans/Classroom walk through trend data

Evidence of Impact:

With an aligned focus and intentional planning to meet our goals we will see increased student achievement.

We will work with teachers to make sure that they are implementing our curriculum to the extent of the grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material with a focus on SWD, BLACK, and ELL students.

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** The first common planning will be held on Friday, August 18 and will continue through the rest of the year.

Using common planning as the vehicle we will ensure that teachers are planning and then implementing from the CUPS with fidelity in regard to the 5 E's: engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate. Evidence of implementation:

- · Observations during science whole group/small group instruction
- \* Weekly walkthroughs with math coach and RCS.
- \* Review of lesson plans

Evidence of impact:

growth in proficiency in science

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** The first common planning will be held on Friday, August 18 and will continue through the rest of the year.

House of Science and science spiral review boot camps will be conducted based on data with emphasis on note taking. This supports our AVID goal and Hattie's research that note taking has an .85 effect size. We will look at PM Data from NWEA, weekly CIM data.

Evidence of implementation:

• Teachers will implement small group instruction at the beginning and end of the science block to provide science interventions based on benchmark data collected from formative and summative assessments.

Weekly walkthroughs from coaches and administration during specific times of the math block to ensure fidelity.

Evidence of Impact:

growth in proficiency in science

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin no later than the first progress reports on September 15th.

We will promote hands on science, as a way to engage students in science and create students that love science. We will host a school wide science triple iii monthly for students in grades PK-5. The first one will be held on August 15th. They will be scheduled for the whole year as follows:

Science Triple iii dates: (ESEPK and VPK will each join a kinder class)

Month and Day

August 15th

September 12th

October 10th

November 14th

December 12th

January 16th

February 13th

March 19th

In addition, we will have a math/science block class in grade 2, 3, and 4 with a hands-on science. emphasis.

We will also keep students engaged in science by using science leveled readers during reading iii.

# Evidence of implementation:

Administration and math/science coach will walk classes during science triple iii and post pictures in photo circle for all to learn from each other.

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin August 15, 2023.

MTSS meetings will take place with all grade levels and the progress of ESE, ELL, and Black/African American students will be shared with teachers. Also, next steps will be discussed to devise a plan for successful academic progress.

**Person Responsible:** Erin Alexander Erin Alexander (erin.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Starting August 30, 2023.

# #4. 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.

At Pleasant Hill Elementary School, we plan to increase our communication with our families and develop deeper relationships.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Parent coffee chats will increase by 5 families from one meeting to the next.

We will increase attendance at nighttime events.

We will have at least 10 families attend the parent empowerment classes that we will be hosting.

# **Monitoring:**

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

We will have sign in sheets for parents to complete. We will also have parents complete parent surveys that will be reviewed to make adjustments. The feedback will be monitored after each event. One of the parent events, Coffee Chats, attendance is discussed at great length and the importance of students being present at school. The leadership team will monitor attendance at each parent event and through our MTSS process. The school counselor they will monitor student attendance and work with parents on attendance contracts and counseling. "Educators who take an asset-based view of families recognize that families are valuable partners in the quest to improve student success," says Robinson. "This intervention builds on that framework and invites parents to engage in their child's education in a way that is concrete and achievable: help get your kid to school more." (Robinson, 2017).

# Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emy Cruz (emy.cruz@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.)

Research from the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education shares that "no matter their income or background, students with involved parents are more likely to have higher grades and test scores, attend school regularly, have better social skills, show improved behavior and adapt well to school."

# **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parental involvement is a critical factor in the success of children's education. When parents are involved in their children's education, children are more likely to do well in school and have better social and emotional development.

Parental involvement improves student achievement, self-esteem, and behavior. It also helps to build strong relationships between parents and their child's school.

#### 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.

We will meet with families face to face to show value and empower families academically and socially while gaining feedback.

We will host the following parent meetings:

Parent Coffee Chats from 9:00 – 10:00 in room 5019

September 18th: Expectations, Safety, getting to know PHES (Pagan and Alexander)

November 13th: Reading and Writing (Pagan and Pearson)

February 12th: Math and Science (Pagan and Millet) April 15th: Assessments (Pagan and Alexander)

We will discuss the above topics, take questions, and gather input.

Evidence of implementation Sign in sheets

Evidence of impact increased parent involvement increase student achievement

Person Responsible: Shelby Pagan (shelby.pagan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: The first meeting will be held on September 18th.

We will meet with families face to face to show value and empower families academically and socially while gaining feedback.

We will host the following parent meetings:

Parent Empowerment Classes with Mrs. Valencia and Mrs. Noureddin September 25, October 2, 9 and 16th from 9:00 – 10:30 in building 8

Classes will be taught to give parents knowledge on how to support their child's academic journey.

Evidence of implementation

Sign in sheets

Evidence of impact increased parent involvement increase student achievement

Person Responsible: Ivonne Valencia (ivonne.valencia@osceolaschools.net)

By When: The first class will be held on September. 25.

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

# **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.

Currently our 3-5 grade ELA data shows that only 41% of our students are proficient in the area of reading. This is well below that state average of 54%. Black and African American students are only showing 64% proficient in ELA, 42% proficient in ELA in 4th grade, and 22% proficient in ELA. It is imperative we continue to work with our Black and African American students. ELL students are only showing 16% proficient in ELA. Black and African American students are only showing 57% proficient in Math in 3rd grade, 42% proficient Math in 4th grade, 35% proficient in Math. ELL students are only showing 21% proficient in Math. It is imperative we continue to work with our ELL students. The 2022-2023 school data findings found that 46% of our students in grade five were proficient in the area of science. The state average was 51%. Black and African American students are only showing 29% proficient in science in 5th grade. ELL students are only showing 7% proficient in science. It is imperative we continue to work with our ELL, ESE, and Black and African American students.

3-5 FAST and K-2 STAR Assessments in ELA Data indicates a need for explicit and intentional understanding of the benchmarks and planning to the full intent of the standard using data and best practices to help teachers be better prepared for instruction that will be aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

School data findings found that 43% of our students in grades three, four, and five were proficient in the area of mathematics. Production, focused, and student-centered actions are necessary to accomplish our goal of 58% proficiency for all students in the area of mathematics. This is well below that state average of 58%, which we plan to reach.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

We intend to increase the proficiency of our 3-5th grade students to 54% proficient, which includes students with disabilities. If we work on deepening a stronger Tier 1 in ELA, Math, and Science, ESE students will excel as well.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

We will administer the FAST assessment three times a year to check for proficiency. However, we will also have milestone pulse checks, including progress monitoring, along with formative and formal assessments to provide us with ongoing data showing students strengths and areas of improvement to best meet their needs.

We will monitor for the desired effect with:

Classroom walk throughs by the leadership team weekly.

Data reviews: Administration to teacher, teacher to student (data chats), Leadership team, VE teachers, RCS, and PLC's

Grade level common assessments

State assessment growth from one administration to the next

# Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeri-Lynne Severance (jerilynne.severance@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.)

The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making to meet the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, the collaborative analysis of both formative and summative assessment data to refocus instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities and a different first language. Research also indicated that the MTSS model that focuses on students' needs coupled with differentiating/scaffolding instruction has a positive effect on student growth.

**Open Court Intervention** 

Benchmark Intervention

Reading Mastery

Sonday

FCRR Online Resources

ONP

Dreambox

BIG M

Reveal Math. The collaborative analysis of both formative and summative assessment data to refocus instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities and a different first language. Research also indicated that the MTSS model that focuses on students' needs coupled with differentiating and scaffolding instruction has a positive effect on student growth and achievement.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves as a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2002), Reeves (2010), Dutour, et al (2010). The evidence-based programs and practices implemented for students with a disability, students with an Individual Educational Plan (IEP), and students who are English language learners, as applicable: Language Power (Visible Learning effect size - phonics instruction: .70 strong; vocabulary programs: .63 moderate; comprehension programs: .55 moderate; direct instruction: .60 moderate)

- Lexia English (Visible Learning effect size comprehensive reading program: .47 promising)
- Pre-Teaching Lessons (Visible Learning effect size Strategy to integrate prior knowledge: .93 strong)

#### 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.

Instructional coaches will hold common planning with teachers every Friday during each grade levels common planning to support and guide as

lessons are planned that meet the intended learning goal. They will focus on the what, when, and the HOW.

We will work with teachers to make sure that they are implementing our curriculum to the extent of the

grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material with a focus on SWD, BLACK, and ELL students.

#### Evidence:

Lessons Plans/Classroom walk through trend data.

#### Impact:

With an aligned focus and intentional planning to meet our goals we will see increased student achievement.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Pearson (jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** This will begin during preplanning August 9, and continue each Friday for the remainder of the school year.

We will work with teachers to make sure that they are implementing our curriculum to the extent of the grade level benchmark with scaffolds to help them access the material with a focus on SWD, BLACK, and ELL students.

Instructional coaches will hold common planning with teachers every Friday during each grade levels common planning to support and guide as lessons are planned that meet the intended learning goal.

#### Evidence:

Lessons Plans/Classroom walk through trend data.

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** This work will begin during preplanning and the first common planning will be held on August 18th, 2023.

Teachers will scaffold instruction and provide differentiation for students using Tier 1 core curriculum and following the district CUPS to meet the full intent of the benchmark, including but not limited to our SWD, Black, and ELL students.

#### Evidence:

Collaborative trend walks with Literacy Coach, MTSS Coach ECS, and RCS.

There will be visiting of classrooms with VE support and self-contained BEST classrooms, as well as our sheltered classrooms.

#### Impact:

Ensure all students are getting access to guaranteed viable curriculum at a Tier 1 Level and their instructional level to show growth on assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Jeri-Lynne Severance (jerilynne.severance@osceolaschools.net)

**By When:** Classroom Walks will begin August 10, and continue through-out the remainder of the school year.

Tutoring groups will consist of students from our ESSA Subgroups.

Person Responsible: Annette Kalloo Molina (annette.kalloomolina@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Starting October 2, 2023.

We will promote hands on science, as a way to engage students in science and create students that love science. We will host a school wide science triple iii monthly for students in grades PK-5. The first one will be held on August 15th. They will be scheduled for the whole year as follows:

Science Triple iii dates: (ESEPK and VPK will each join a kinder class)

Month and Day

August 15th
September 12th
October 10th
November 14th
December 12th
January 16th
February 13th
March 19th

In addition, we will have a math/science block class in grade 2, 3, and 4 with a hands-on science. emphasis.

We will also keep students engaged in science by using science leveled readers during reading iii.

# Evidence of implementation:

Administration and math/science coach will walk classes during science triple iii and post pictures in photo circle for all to learn from each other.

Person Responsible: Jessica Millet (jessica.millet@osceolaschools.net)

By When: This will begin August 15, 2023.

# CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Pleasant Hill Elementary (PHE) has a literacy coach that conducts classroom walks with Administration and the leadership team to discuss classroom trends, data, and areas of need. In addition to the literacy coach, Pleasant Hill Elementary has a math/science coach, one teacher interventionist (works with both students), and a teacher mentor who works with both students and adults. There are also four paraprofessionals that Title I funds for PHE that support ESE, ELL, and Black students. All teachers and paraprofessionals push into classrooms and work with groups of students that are under the ESSA subgroup umbrella. Additionally, the teacher mentors teachers to help their ESE, ELL, and Black students-working with accommodations, scaffolds, language goals, glossaries, dictionaries, community and relationship building, total physical response, visuals, re-teach, engaging cultures of all backgrounds, sentence stems/frames, and collaboration. With the additional funded positions, it assists PHE in providing support in all classrooms to our students in need.

District support personnel are providing training and monitoring of ESSA subgroups through Educlimber. In addition to core content academic resource coaches, teachers, and paraprofessionals, the ESE and Multi-Cultural departments are also supporting ATSI, CSI, and TSI schools and subgroups.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

# Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
   Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

# Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

# Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

The 2022-2023 school data findings found that 43% of our students in grades three, four, and five were proficient in the area of literacy. Production, focused, and student-centered actions are necessary to accomplish our goal of 53% proficiency for all students in the area of literacy.

# **Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50
  percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

#### **Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**

N/A

# **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

At least 53% of students in grades 3-5 will score on or above grade level on the FAST end of year administration. Our current 3-5 graders are at 43% proficient.

#### Monitoring

#### Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Progress will be monitored in various ways. We will check reading fluency with fluency checks. We will progress monitor 3-5 grade two times using the STAR assessment in October and March. Students will also take in class formative assessments utilizing the Benchmark curriculum, dictation practice in grades K-2 will be utilized to monitor phonics progress, and statewide assessments, Star Reading and FAST will be used as well. Monthly MTSS meetings will also be conducted to discuss progress of ALL students in each grade level.

# **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Pearson, Jennifer, jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net

# **Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

# **Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies and Benchmark curriculum, as well as the school district curriculum unit plans when planning for instruction with professional learning teams. Teachers and coaches will then monitor student progress using weekly common formative assessments and state-wide progress monitoring through FAST and STAR. Teachers will use Benchmark, Lexia, Open Court, and STAR to provide interventions for students who are not meeting progress.

- 1. Open Court Systematic Phonics Instruction .60 Effect Size
- 2. Benchmark Reading, (Comprehensive Instructional Programs) .72 Effect Size
- 3. Repeated Reading Programs .75 Effect Size

#### Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The above programs were selected based on student need across the district and our specific school. The programs address and meet the needs of all readers from beginning levels to students in need of acceleration and follow the science of reading. Programs utilized needed to be a research-based comprehensive curriculum that align with the Florida B.E.S.T standards while using systematic, explicit instruction. The use of these programs based on school data have shown growth in our students. The interventions listed above include direct instruction with an effect size of .59; phonics instruction with an effect size of .70; and cooperative learning with an effect size of .41. In addition, Lexia Core 5 has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA Website.

# **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

# Action Step

## **Person Responsible for Monitoring**

#### Literacy Leadership:

Open Court will be used with fidelity in K-2 as part of tier 1 instruction. Open Court will be used during triple iii for students in grades K-5 that have a deficiency in phonemic awareness and phonics.

We will monitor for fidelity and provide professional development opportunities for teachers to increase their understanding to implement the program with fidelity.

Pagan, Shelby, shelby.pagan@osceolaschools.net

# Literacy Coaching:

We will provide professional development, modeling, and side by side coaching to ensure that teachers are using the program effectively.

Pearson, Jennifer, jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net

# Assessment:

K- 5 will take state FAST testing 3 times each year.

3-5 will take the STAR as a progress monitoring pulse check in October and March.

Erin Alexander, Erin Alexander, erin.alexander@osceolaschools.net

#### Professional Learning:

New teachers attended an Open Court PD as they prepared to start the year using the program.

Another 3-hour session is planned to deepen the learning of a small group. The literacy coach will be modeling and providing side-by side coaching.

Pearson, Jennifer, jennifer.pearson@osceolaschools.net

# Title I Requirements

# Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4)) List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

During the September 2023 SAC meeting. Pleasant Hill Elementary School will present and discuss the SIP and the UniSIG budget with all stakeholders to gather feedback. We will share flyers with students and post school website and social media at least seven days prior to the meeting in English and Spanish to announce and invite stakeholders to participate and provide input. In addition, the school will provide translation services in Spanish, as well as the translation of other meeting documents as needed. The SIP and meeting documents will be disseminated in the school's website, social media, and a hardcopy will be available in the school's front office. The SIP's progress will be monitored and reviewed at the December 2023 SAC meeting by sharing data to evaluate the progress of the plan and effectiveness of the activities as well as to determine if an amendment is needed.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Pleasant Hill Elementary School plans to create a positive culture with parents, families, and stakeholders by providing several meetings throughout the school year for families to be involved in the development of the school's Parent and Family Engagement (PFEP) plan, PFEP summary/brochure, school-parent compact and use of PFEP funds for improved academic achievement. The PFEP documentation will be made available in both English and Spanish at the school as well as on the website. Notifications will be disbursed from the school through automated/reminder calls, flyers and invitations, School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings, Parent-Teacher meetings, social media, and website. Building Capacity events will be held throughout the year inviting families to participate in learning activities specific to academic goals.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Pleasant Hill Elementary School will implement AVID structures and strategies to foster positive culture and environment by cultivating and stimulating positive relationships, equal participation, and active student interactions to increase student achievement by ten percent as indicated by the FAST, decrease behavior incidents by ten percent, and decrease absenteeism by five percent.

Teachers will attend a three-day training in which they will learn to:

- -effective use of data to group students and form collaborative teams
- -use the different collaborative structures to increase engagement to foster thinking, communication skills, social competence, peer collaboration
- -integrate the collaborative structures in their lessons.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Pleasant Hill Elementary School coordinates the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state, and local services, such as: Title I, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education for disadvantaged students; Title II, Part A for the implementation of various Professional Development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title III for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of student enrichment activities; Title IX for the implementation and support of students and families in transition; and Perkins Career and Technical Education for the implementation of postsecondary opportunities and experiences.

# Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Pleasant Hill Elementary School ensures that student skills are improved outside the academic subject areas by providing several strategies, such as: the integration of supplemental paraprofessional personnel to assist with high-needs intervention areas; the incorporation of a parent liaison to build better connections with parents/families to help build their capacity to assist in their child's education; the registration of teachers to attend Professional Development conferences in areas such as Advanced Placement and IB programs; the employment of a tiered support system for students that is provided by targeted MTSS strategies and personnel; etc.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Pleasant Hill Elementary School will have the opportunity to engage fifth grade students in enriching, supplemental STEAM curriculum on the district's Mobile STEAM Lab. This curriculum will provide an indepth learning opportunity that will introduce students to the several postsecondary options available to them through the fields of science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Pleasant Hill Elementary School will hire an MTSS Coach to systematically monitor data, track students' progress and create and implement cohesive interventions to increase student achievement. As part of the tiered model of interventions, teachers will attend AVID Institute training to foster positive culture and environment by cultivating and stimulating positive relationships, equal participation, and active student interactions to increase student achievement by ten percent as indicated by the FAST, decrease behavior incidents by ten percent, and decrease absenteeism by five percent. Teachers will attend a three-day training in which they will learn to:

- -effective use of data to group students and form collaborative teams
- -use the different collaborative structures to increase engagement to foster thinking, communication skills, social competence, peer collaboration
- -integrate the collaborative structures into their lessons.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Pleasant Hill Elementary School will implement AVID strategies and structures to foster positive culture and environment by cultivating and stimulating positive relationships, equal participation, and active student interactions to increase student achievement by ten percent as indicated by the FAST, decrease behavior incidents by ten percent, and decrease absenteeism by five percent. AVID strategies and structures promote healthy relationships and classroom environment aiding teachers with classroom management.

Teachers will attend a three-day training in which they will learn to:

-effective use of data to group students and form collaborative teams

- -use the different collaborative structures to increase engagement to foster thinking, communication skills, social competence, peer collaboration
- -integrate the collaborative structures into their lessons.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) classes provide academic and social skills support to VPK students to prepare them for kindergarten and give students the real-world school environment they will experience throughout their academic careers. The STAR Early Literacy assessment is used to measure the literacy rates of our students and the state-required CLASS assessment to measure the fidelity of instruction in our VPK classrooms.