

School District of Osceola County, FL

Harmony High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Harmony High School

3601 ARTHUR J GALLAGHER BLVD, Harmony, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Harmony High School will make a positive difference in the academic, social, emotional and physical well-being of students, staff and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Harmony High School will be one of the highest-performing public schools in the state, providing rigorous, high-quality learning opportunities for all students. We will foster excellence and prepare students for college and career success through collaboration, data-based decision-making, and continuous improvement. Our curriculum and instruction will engage all students and allow them to analyze decisions, approach challenges, and celebrate successes; it will be based on research-proven methods and aligned to high academic standards that meet the learning needs of all students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hickey, James	Principal	As the Instructional Leader of the school, he oversees all personnel selections. He observes and supports the English, Reading, and Performing Arts Departments, develops, submits, and implements the school budget and funds, builds and strengthens community relationships, provides regular updates and communication regarding school performance to all stakeholders, works collaboratively with the School Advisory Council, plans and executes weekly administrative leadership meetings. He monitors data through regular Stocktake meetings throughout the school year and helps to develop and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Yontz, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership and support to the Math and Guidance Departments, creates the master schedule, oversees dual enrollment, College & Career, graduation rate, and FTE, conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensures that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. She also facilitates regular Stocktake meetings throughout the school year and helps to develop and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Hoyle, Henry	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership and support to the Science, PE, World Language, ESOL and Fine Arts Departments, oversees facilities, technology, athletics, attendance, grades and conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensure that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. He also helps develop and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Keeton, Dustin	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership and support to the Social Studies Department and Elective teachers, oversees Student Services, PBIS, PLCs and conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensure that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. He also helps develop and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Ramsey, Laurel	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership and support to the ESE and CTE Departments, coordinates and oversees Advanced Placement curriculum, acceleration, MTSS, and AVID; conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensure that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. Helps to develop and monitor the School Improvement Plan.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Eno, Jason	Dean	Provides Student Services support focusing student discipline management, and data including but not limited to student investigations, threat assessments, no contact contracts, bullying investigations, expulsion packets, transition duty, and teacher coaching. He is also the expulsion packet lead, transportation liaison, business partner liaison, threat assessment meeting – Vice Chair, and ISS Coordinator.
Kraus, Jason	Dean	Provides Student Services support focusing student discipline management, and data including but not limited to student investigations, threat assessments, no contact contracts, bullying investigations, expulsion packets, transition duty, and teacher coaching. He is also the lunch detention lead, the bullying lead, oversees tardy reports, Stocktake representative, and Hope Scholarship liaison.
Zbikowski, Matthew	Dean	Provides Student Services support focusing student discipline management, and data including but not limited to student investigations, threat assessments, no contact contracts, bullying investigations, expulsion packets, transition duty, and teacher coaching. He is also drill commander – back up, transportation – back up, oversees parking violations, coordinates parking lot dismissal, oversees bells.
Whaley, Katherine	Reading Coach	Provides instructional support and coaching to teachers, including but not limited to coaching cycles and the mentoring of new teachers. She monitors student data and provides guidance to teachers regarding data driven instruction that aligns with the district curriculum. She oversees the remediation of students that are not on grade level and have not obtained a passing or concordant score on the ELA state assessments. She is the ELA representative for Stocktake and she is on the MTSS problem solving team.
Irizar, Regiena	Math Coach	Provides instructional support and coaching to teachers, including but not limited to coaching cycles and the mentoring of new teachers. She monitors student data and provides guidance to teachers regarding data driven instruction that aligns with the district curriculum. She oversees the remediation of students that are not on grade level and have not obtained a passing or concordant score on the Algebra I state assessments. She is the Math representative for Stocktake and she is on the MTSS problem solving team.
Sumer, Lila	Instructional Coach	Coordinates and facilitates the implementation of academic and social-emotional interventions for students in need of support towards meeting course standards. She mentors teachers and provides instructional guidance regarding learning strategies that can be implemented to meet the individual needs of students. She monitors student data and updates the MTSS data as students move across the tiers. She plans student interventions and monitors student growth during the intervention implementation. She leads to MTSS problem solving team and she is an integral part of the PBIS team.

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 development of the SIP, input is received from all members of the leadership team. We discuss what our goals were for the previous year, the outcome that was obtained, and areas of greatest need within the school. We review data from various sources when determining the goals for our school for the upcoming school. We review our findings with our stakeholders through our SAC meetings in order to get their feedback and input and make any needed adjustments to the plan.

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))

With the academic focus being our bubble students, we monitor gains, growth, and/or regression through data obtained through progress monitoring and FAST data. As new data is collected, student groups are adjusted for small group interventions and the specific standards that need remediation a revisited according to the most recent data. Our other focus is teaching rigorous, standards-based instruction with a focus on unpacking the standards. This is monitored through PLCs and classroom observations/ walkthroughs. As the data is updated, plans are revised to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our students.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: B
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	46	50	46	45	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				47			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			36		
Math Achievement*	32	27	38	40	37	38	40		
Math Learning Gains				44			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			35		
Science Achievement*	66	63	64	55	32	40	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	61	66	66	39	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	88	86	89	95	54	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	65	60	65	61	60	67	52		
ELP Progress	58	46	45	53			55		

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	88

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	95

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	4	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	58			
HSP	55			
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	68			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	47			
HSP	51			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			32			66	65		88	65	58
SWD	19			18			36	40		31	7	31
ELL	25			21			47	34		68	7	58
AMI												
ASN	65			47			80	83		70	6	
BLK	44			21			65	70		56	6	
HSP	40			29			59	53		58	7	58

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	49			24			41				3	
PAC												
WHT	59			38			76	76		71	6	
FRL	41			27			62	59		56	7	61

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	46	47	42	40	44	40	55	66		95	61	53
SWD	22	36	33	20	28	32	32	43		86	32	20
ELL	24	45	46	25	40	43	39	45		98	42	53
AMI												
ASN	68	53						82		100	67	
BLK	38	32	33	33	38	18	58	55		100	65	
HSP	39	45	46	35	40	39	52	60		96	57	52
MUL	53	52	30	35	39		71	67		87	85	
PAC												
WHT	53	49	39	48	49	43	59	73		95	62	
FRL	36	42	43	31	38	42	49	61		93	53	54

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	47	42	36	40	35	35	57	69		97	52	55
SWD	26	39	31	23	31	31	47	47		94	10	30
ELL	20	33	33	18	33	31	33	49		100	53	55
AMI												
ASN	71	47		62			83			100	90	
BLK	43	38	36	31	28	20	45	53		94	41	
HSP	40	41	35	30	33	36	48	54		99	48	53
MUL	48	48								100	59	
PAC												
WHT	53	44	35	51	38	35	67	80		97	54	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	36	38	34	33	33	38	51	55		95	43	50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	50%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	46%	43%	3%	48%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	40%	-15%	50%	-25%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	40%	36%	4%	48%	-8%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	65%	0%	63%	2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	57%	6%	63%	0%

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.

In reviewing our school's data, it was easily noticeable that our lowest perform area was Math with an overall of 35% and more specifically Algebra I with 25%. In the two previous years, 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, we were at 40%. One of the key factors that has remained a constant is the lack of foundational skills and mathematical background knowledge for our incoming 9th graders, which are an overwhelming majority of the students enrolled in Algebra I as it is the lowest level of Math that is offered according to our high school progression plan. The curriculum and standards for Algebra I does not allow for the opportunity to focus on instructing students in basic foundational skills. Even during the allotted remediation time, it is difficult to meet the needs of the students and provide them with both the remediation on the lowest performing Algebra I standards and basic, foundational Math skills and strategies. We do provide lunch and after-school tutoring as well; however, we can't require students to attend.

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

The data component with the greatest decline is Math, we went to an overall 35%, when the previous two years we were at 40%. As mentioned in the question above, one of the major components that contributes to low Math scores is the lack of foundational skills and mathematical background knowledge. We need to provide students the opportunity for intense remediation prior to taking Algebra I, so that they have to skills, tools, and knowledge to successfully navigate the Algebra I curriculum and standards.

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.

Once again Math is the focus, at the state combined average for Math is 49% and we are at 35% achievement. Our Math scores dropped 5% from the previous two years. As mentioned above, it is the considerable deficit of students' foundation Math skills, and while we are constantly reviewing data and focusing on our bubble students to review and reteach lowest performing standards, it is a challenge due to time constraints to provide both Algebra remediation and remediation in foundational Math skills.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Biology, it increased from a 55% to 66% achievement level. The Biology PLT created and planned for intentional small group remediation based on the data and students' needs. The students' progress was monitored, and adjustments were made to the remediation plan to ensure that the students' needs were being met in regard to acquiring mastery of the Biology standards.

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

Students that obtained a level 1 in both Math and ELA is greatly concerning. In addition, the largest non-academic concern is students that have below a 90% attendance rate, which greatly impacts instruction within the classroom setting.

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

Our highest priority is focusing on our bubble students in both Math and ELA. These are the students that are on the cusp of obtaining a achievement level of 3. All of teachers, school-wide regardless of the subject area that they teach, know if there is a student on their roster that is a bubble student in Math and/or ELA.

Our second highest priority is ensuring that our students are receiving high level, rigorous standards-based instruction. While identifying the critical content and unpacking the benchmarks when planning instruction within their PLTs.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

While completing our GAP analysis for systems of instruction, it was determined that one of the greatest areas of need was systems for benchmark-based planning and instruction. We understand that planning for and providing student with high level standards-based instruction that focuses on identify critical content is a foundational element to ensure that our students are being provided with a high level of quality academic rigor during instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is for 75% of our classroom room teachers to score innovating on the Marzano element Identifying Critical Content from the Standards.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be collected during classroom walkthroughs and observations to verify that rigorous standards-based instruction with a focus on identifying critical content is being implemented. A universal data collection sheet, in addition to the Marzano observation model, will be utilized for data collection. The data collection form will focus on the learning objective, bell work, learning tasks, and assessment/checking for understanding. Data that is collected during walkthroughs and observations as well as data collected during progress monitoring, and statewide assessments will be disseminated and reviewed to determine if there is an increase in student achievement when the students are being provided with the rigorous, standards-based instruction with a focus on identifying the critical content. The Administrative Team and Academic coaches will also monitor subject area PLTs to ensure that planning is focusing on providing students with standards-based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Hickey (james.hickey@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.)

We will provide our teachers will relevant and impactful professional development on unpacking the standards/benchmark while focusing on the learning objective, bell work, learning tasks, and assessment. In addition, teachers will be provided protected time to meet with their subject area PLTs so that collaboration can occur when planning rigorous standards-based instruction focusing on identifying critical content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing teachers with professional development, specifically on unpacking the standard, gives them the skills, tools, and knowledge to plan and create standards-based instruction for each classroom lesson. Designating a time for teachers to meet within their PLTs gives them the valued opportunity to collaborate when creating meaningful, standards-based lessons. Research indicates that when teachers participate in professional learning that overall student achievement increases and that leadership at the school level shouldn't solely reside with one person (Marzano, 2013).

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional Development on Unpacking the Standards

Person Responsible: Laurel Ramsey (jennifer.ramsey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Complete Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations to collect data regarding implementation of standards-based lessons and identifying critical content

Person Responsible: James Hickey (james.hickey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023

Weekly meetings with Administrative team, Academic Coaches, and Mentors to review walkthrough and observation data to determine support and professional development needs of teachers to provide the skills, tools, and knowledge to deliver standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: James Hickey (james.hickey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023

Subject Area PLTs will meet twice a month on Wednesdays to plan rigorous standard-based instruction, showing evidence of planning in submitted lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Dustin Keeton (dustin.keeton@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

When reviewing our instructional data, it was determined that we had a significant amount of the students that were considered bubble students, a 2.5 on Math and/or ELA achievement. By providing specific and targeted interventions to these students they will obtain a level 3 on the statewide FAST ELA or Math EOC assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase by 3% to an overall 52%, which is higher than both the district and state average.

Math proficiency will increase by 5% to an overall 40%, this will make a percentage of achievement the same it was for the two previous years. ESSA subgroup federal index for Students with Disabilities will increase from 35% to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and the leadership team will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure PLTs are using data to drive instructional interventions for students identified as bubble students. The ELA and Math REN-Star progress monitoring assessments, Pre-AP checkpoints, and PM1, PM2 and PM3 ELA assessments that focus on B.E.S.T. standards will be utilized to monitor student progress and proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Hickey (james.hickey@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.)

Administration and the leadership team will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure PLTs are using data to drive instructional interventions for students identified as bubble students. The ELA and Math REN-Star progress monitoring assessments, Pre-AP checkpoints, and PM1, PM2 and PM3 ELA assessments that focus on B.E.S.T. standards will be utilized to monitor student progress and proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

“For an intervention to last, you need both a quality seed (a well-crafted mindset intervention) and a conducive soil in which that seed can grow (contextual affordances congruent with that mindset),” Yeager wrote in a recent article in *Current Directions in Psychological Science* (Walton & Yeager, 2020). We implemented targeted interventions during the second semester of last school year and our learning gain data, specifically in ELA which was 52% in 9th grade and 63% in 10th grade shows that the interventions worked in increasing student growth and achievement. By implementing this plan throughout the school year our students will show a significant increase in academic growth.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Teachers will identify bubble students, focusing on learning gains and student achievement, to determine groups for targeted intervention and remediation.

Person Responsible: James Hickey (james.hickey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Professional development will be provided to all teachers on collaborative study groups, to support small group instruction for student remediation.

Person Responsible: Laurel Ramsey (jennifer.ramsey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Small group remediation based on student data during STEER, time set aside for intervention, remediation, and enrichment.

Person Responsible: James Hickey (james.hickey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023

Teachers will utilize progress monitoring data to plan for and make necessary adjustments to student specific interventions.

Person Responsible: Laurel Ramsey (jennifer.ramsey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023

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

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

Based upon data from the Panorama survey, the area of sense of belonging, showed that 33% of students surveyed responded that they felt like they belonged at Harmony High School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

2022-2023 Panorama Survey results in the category of sense of belonging will increase from 33% to a 50% for the 2023-2024 survey results.

Monitoring:

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

All surveys will be analyzed and monitored for response regarding sense of belonging.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Yontz (amanda.yontz@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.)

PBIS and MTSS coordinator will work together to increase school initiatives and outreach for all students. Behavior and attendance will be monitored to help identify students that are Tier II and III. Harmony High School will use the Continuous Improvement plan to implement the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) program for the 2022 - 2023 academic year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

“Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based / three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day.” PBIS creates schools that support everyone – especially students with disabilities – for success. Center on PBIS, (2020) When students feel support it increases their sense of importance and belonging.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Building Collateral Positive Phone Calls: Each teacher has to choose an at-risk student in each class period, a total of six students, and make a positive phone call home to the parent/guardian.

Person Responsible: James Hickey (james.hickey@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Each teacher will nominate one student who has never skipped class, never been tardy to class, and given 100% respect for rules and fellow Longhorns, a model Longhorn student who follows our PBIS

HORNS: Honorable, Responsible, Supportive, Organized, and Respectful to kick off our student of the month campaign.

Person Responsible: Dustin Keeton (dustin.keeton@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Student Forum: Students are selected from all areas/groups of the school culture to meet monthly with administration to voice concerns and provide feedback.

Person Responsible: Dustin Keeton (dustin.keeton@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Creating a positive postsecondary culture through College Week activities and the College Fair.

Person Responsible: Amanda Yontz (amanda.yontz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 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)).

The additional funding that is provided to us for being classified as an ATSI school is used to pay for our Literacy Coach. This valuable resource is instrumental in helping both our ELA and Intensive Reading teachers in using the data to plan student specific, intentional remediation and interventions. In addition, our Literacy Coach provides students with small group remediation and interventions based on data and individual needs; our ESE students are a part of these small groups. Our Literacy Coach also provides support through coaching our teachers on research-based learning strategies to implement during all tiers of instruction. This resource is an integral part of ensuring that our students are obtaining appropriate growth in ELA, which impacts other areas of instruction as well.