
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Poinciana High School

2300 S POINCIANA BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Schwartz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Engaging all stakeholders in respectful communication and productive collaboration for post-secondary success.

Provide the school's vision statement

Poinciana High School will serve every student in an environment of college and career readiness by delivering a rigorous curriculum and promoting a culture of no excuses.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schwartz, Jeff	Principal	Jeff Schwartz, Principal (Responsible for the school stocktake process, will monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback. Also responsible for the areas of Mathematics and Social Studies).
Darago, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Responsible for CTE and Industry Certifications
Walters, Erica	Assistant Principal	Responsible for the school stocktake process, will monitor the SIP and receive monthly reports and give feedback. Also responsible for ELA/Reading
Hendricks, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan
Farrell, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal over testing, ESE, and science. Will guide the SIP process.
Duran, Carlos	Instructional Coach	Science Coach. Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan
Martinez, Hegal	Other	Learning Resource Specialist Responsible for MTSS and Attendance Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan
Mchatton, Jesse	Other	Resource Compliance Specialist Oversees the ESE Department Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan
Aviles, Jennifer	Dean	Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan
Scott, Roydrick	Dean	Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Leroy	Dean	Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan
Zevallos, Summer	Guidance Counselor	Will participate in the school stocktake process, will provide feedback and suggestions for improvements. May be responsible for execution of steps in the actions plan

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Jeffrey Schwartz

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

0

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

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

125

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students

	Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563	560	600	483	2206
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	100	127	133	432
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	19	19	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	96	70	16	209
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	67	15	18	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	92	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	147	34	207

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	48	73	45	173

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	8	5	33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506	539	524	463	2032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	18	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	27	20	17	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	108	89	55	269
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	165	126	110	513

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	77	48	25	161

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	41	32	30	140

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506	539	524	463	2032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	18	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	27	20	17	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	108	89	55	269
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	165	126	110	513

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	77	48	25	161

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	41	32	30	140

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	57%	56%	39%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	48%	51%	45%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	42%	39%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	28%	46%	51%	26%	39%	51%
Math Learning Gains	35%	41%	48%	37%	40%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	46%	45%	46%	46%	45%
Science Achievement	60%	69%	68%	53%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	70%	73%	49%	70%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	37%	47%	-10%	55%	-18%
	2018	38%	47%	-9%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	41%	47%	-6%	53%	-12%
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	62%	-5%	67%	-10%
2018	54%	68%	-14%	65%	-11%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	62%	-11%	70%	-19%
2018	49%	61%	-12%	68%	-19%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	17%	49%	-32%	61%	-44%
2018	25%	52%	-27%	62%	-37%
Compare		-8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	44%	-11%	57%	-24%
2018	26%	39%	-13%	56%	-30%
Compare		7%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	39	33	16	32	37	33	15		88	10
ELL	14	32	36	16	29	24	49	29		88	35
ASN	53	39		33	29		71	55			
BLK	38	44	44	24	34	29	46	49		99	28
HSP	38	42	33	25	35	33	59	48		91	36
MUL	69	67		40	31			82		100	50
WHT	56	53	50	45	38		80	72		97	45
FRL	34	40	34	25	34	33	55	48		94	34

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	14	34	31	15	40	44	25	19		68	20
ELL	15	35	30	12	35	45	30	28		78	40
ASN	63	67		33	23						
BLK	29	43	51	21	38	51	48	49		92	26
HSP	37	44	33	25	38	46	50	45		88	42
MUL	59	59		21	31					100	30
WHT	51	43	39	40	40	38	76	70		84	59
FRL	33	41	35	22	36	46	52	46		87	39

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	11

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	47
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math Achievement was the lowest performance component. Contributing factors included staff turnover, majority of students not proficient in math in 8th grade placed in Algebra 1, student absences, staff absences, student apathy, lack of spiral content and differentiation.

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

Math Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Contributing factors included staff turnover, student absences, staff absences, student apathy, lack of spiral content and differentiation.

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

Math Achievement had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Contributing factors included staff turnover, majority of students not proficient in math in 8th grade placed in Algebra 1, student absences, staff absences, student apathy, lack of spiral content and differentiation.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement due to scheduling changes, more spiral and differentiated instruction through stations, and interventions for the second semester 2x a week.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Greatest concerns are our SWD and ELL students who tend to have lower rates of proficiency, smaller learning gains, and greater barriers.

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

1. Improve Math Achievement
2. Improve Math Lowest 25%
3. Improve Math Learning Gains
4. Improve ELA Lowest 25%
5. improve ELL Subgroup Performance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Achievement is an Area of Focus that was identified as a critical need as the data revealed this is both our lowest performance component and our greatest gap compared to the state average.

Measureable Outcome: Our Math Achievement will increase from 28% to at least 33% and our Math Lowest 25% will increase from 34% to at least 39%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robyn Sturgeon (robyn.sturgeon@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Both the Algebra 1 and Geometry PLC's are being trained through the Florida Network for School Improvement on the best practice of Arguing Claims and Error Analysis in mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy aligns with our school and district deliberate practice of writing to learn, processing critical content in order to develop a more conceptual understanding of mathematics resulting in greater retention and comprehension. Research shows that when students generate and defend claims as well as analyze the errors in their thinking, they further develop conceptual mathematical thinking. According to Marzano in the Art and Science of Teaching, "Analyzing errors is a powerful way to deepen students' understanding" (77) and "many who advocate teaching and reinforcing critical thinking skills view error analysis as a primary intellectual skill" (63).

Action Steps to Implement

Implement PLC deeper planning tool to ensure best practices are in daily learning activities. Leadership team member makes a commitment to a PLC until the team systemically ensures key questions are answered in planning that aligns best practices with Marzano.

Person Responsible Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

Specific PD on Arguing Claims / Error Analysis through the Florida Network for School Improvement in conjunction with the Gates Foundation. Teachers are engaged in the continuous improvement cycle of training, practice, reflections/share, data analysis. They must report their data and evidence to the FNSI as well as provide evidence to administration for support and accountability.

Person Responsible Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

Specific classroom observations and the coaching cycle of planning, side by side teaching with the math coach, reflection, and practice will be implemented. Post observation discussions will require data and documentation from learning activities involving arguing claims and error analysis.

Person Responsible Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

Interventions will be provided to the Lowest 25% through Summit on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The math coach will plan student-centered learning activities aligned with power standard weaknesses as determined by assessment data. AVID peer tutors will be used to

support the Lowest 25% students in the interventions in conjunction with individualized teacher attention.

Person Responsible Robyn Sturgeon (robyn.sturgeon@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based upon data results from the 19-20 Winter SEL Surveys on Panorama, School Belonging was the lowest score at 33% with the lowest question "How connected do you feel to the adults at your school?" at 20%.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase the School Belonging score in Panorama to a 45% responded favorably score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will create a Student Forum for student leaders to provide input on SEL issues on campus. We will employ bi-monthly Student Union events during lunch providing clubs and student-leadership groups the opportunity to interact with and build relationships with all members of the school community. We provide professional development for teachers on SEL strategies from Panorama as well as learning activities that encourage student voice and input through academic discussion and open-ended writing prompts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale behind this strategy is the Marzano research that concludes students need a sense of belonging and self-efficacy in truly engaging in academic learning. The Panorama and district curriculum SEL resources will be used for strategies. The research shows that building student opportunities for voice and personal expression is critical. For example, according to Marzano, "People like to talk about themselves and those things that interest them. Once simple technique for engaging students and enhancing their level of energy is to create situations that allow them to talk about their interests" (114).

Action Steps to Implement

Solicit student leaders through SGA, Dean suggestions, and volunteers for the Student Forum meetings. Host meetings either during Summit, lunch, or after school depending upon availability.

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborate with CCC, class and club sponsors, and OBA Coordinator to organize the Student Union events during lunch.

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

PD and support for teachers using SEL resources in ELA as well as open-ended questioning and discussions for student voice in all subjects.

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ESSA subgroup is historically the lowest subgroup on our state-tested areas of focus. PHS needs to increase this subgroups pass rate for state-tested subgroup to move the whole school.

Measureable Outcome: Increase the proficiency of the ESSA subgroup by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using WICOR strategies within the ELL classrooms (sheltered and general courses) as well as the Ellevation platform to appropriately identify and group students within the classroom and instruction. Ensure that students are placed in the right courses as well as with the appropriate teacher based on their FSA ELA levels

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using WICOR strategies, across all content levels, is proven successful as well as implementing the Ellevation platform and using it with fidelity. This program identifies students and their reading/math level and will help group them within the classroom and the teacher can choose appropriate scaffolds or strategies to use. Based on Marzano's research, we know that organizing students for learning and providing opportunities to engage in cognitively complex tasks (especially through reading and writing) is critical. According to McKinney, the use of WICOR strategies helps students identify critical content, build insight, and improve test taking skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers with ELL students in Ellevation platform.

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Ensure the use of WICOR strategies within the classrooms

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Develop ELL Task Force to share and promote differentiated ELL strategies

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Ensure use of district created content glossaries in all courses

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA graduation requirements, regarding testing, need to increase to increase our graduation rate.

Measureable Outcome: ELA (FSA) scores will raise by 5% for the 20-21 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Focus on reading and writing strategies using WICOR in all content area classes, not just ELA. Teachers using both Khan Academy and Achieve 3000 in Reading classes. Reading bootcamps for FSA ELA as well as SAT and ACT bootcamps, the days leading up to the exam. Students in ESE and ELL subgroups being targeted to ensure that they are appropriately prepared for the exam.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: WICOR strategies are proven teaching and learning strategies that help students, of all subgroups. Students receiving test prep before the exam has proven to raise their scores. The ELA strategies and learning sequenced that is focused on in the ELA and Reading classes are aligned to the skills and standards that students will be tested on. Based on our experience using these strategies, we have seen a 10% increase in graduation rate, mainly because of students improved performance on ELA assessments. This shows the WICOR strategies are working and could be expanded for even better results. According to McKinney the use of WICOR, especially in targeted review, improves students' test performance and is an effective "way to review big-picture ideas and concepts before the exam".

Action Steps to Implement

ELA teachers will focus on WICOR strategies as well as aligning the curriculum based on the skills for FSA ELA and SAT exams.

Person Responsible Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

ELL and ESE subgroups will be targeted for test prep/bootcamp in the weeks and days leading up to the state-tested exams as well as the SAT.

Person Responsible Sarah Hendricks (sarah.hendricks@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers in ELA and Reading will focus curriculum and assessment planning during PLCs to ensure they are aligned with teaching the skills and standards that are essential to the FSA ELA and the SAT.

Person Responsible Sarah Hendricks (sarah.hendricks@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our current student population, we will need to be seriously focused on reading in the content area to ensure that students are able to read the questions and be able to comprehend the questions being asked; if we are to see an increase in our scores in the upcoming school year. We also observed that we had many attendance issues with many Biology students last school year so we will address the attendance issues with students much earlier this school year 2019-2020.
Measureable Outcome:	Our proficiency score for science for the 2018-2019 school year was 60%. We are striving for an increase of at least 5% so we are aiming for a proficiency of at least 65% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlos Duran (carlos.duran@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Biology End-Of-Course assessment has long been regarded as a reading test. Data shows that students who are not proficient in reading typically struggle to pass this test. Therefore, in order for us to increase our scores we will have to focus on reading and ensuring that our students are capable of reading the content and able to understand the academic vocabulary associated with the standards. We will target reading through as many avenues as the school day will permit.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Last school year 2018-2019, 301 of 520 students were level 1 and 2 in reading at the beginning of the school year. By focusing on reading within the content are last school year we were able to move 33 students who were a level 1 in reading to a level 3 in biology while we were able to move another 84 who were originally a level 2 in reading to a level 3 in biology. Based on this data we feel comfortable this school year that we are headed on the right direction. Research shows that after the fifth grade students are no longer learning to read, but rather are reading to learn; by focusing on building students' reading skills, we will better prepare them to access the Science content (Shaywitz)..

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) We will target our level 1 & 2 students with interventions through our SUMMIT intervention periods on Tuesdays and Thursdays with a focus on reading strategies.
- 2) Use the learning scales to drive our standard based instruction.
- 3) Use the Progress Monitoring Sheet to measure the progress of our students.
- 4) Science Café - promote reading and AVID writing to learn strategies within the content via science articles every Wednesday. Ex: stand-share-sit among other strategies.
- 5) We will identify those students who have attendance issues by the end of the first quarter and have a plan to target them in an effort to ensure that they are at school to receive instruction.

Person Responsible Carlos Duran (carlos.duran@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Acceleration Rate improved from 37% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. Acceleration is a critical need as it reflects the number of students who are graduating with college credit or professional industry certifications. These accomplishments earned in high school ensure a higher commitment to and probability for success in post secondary endeavors. Our AP pass rate improved from 23% in 2019 to 43% in 2020.

Measurable Outcome: Our Acceleration Rate will increase to 60% for 2020. AP pass rate will increase to 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Crystal Farrell (crystal.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: AP teachers will utilize the CED curriculum maps to ensure instruction and learning activities are aligned with the AP exams. CTE teachers will use progress monitoring technology to prepare students and address skill/content weakness areas based upon this data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students learn best with a guaranteed and viable curriculum. Using the AP CED and CTE GMetrix and practice assessments guarantee a data-based, viable curriculum. Other resources are the AP Personal Progress Checks and Certiport. As Marzano's research shows, tracking progress, identifying critical content, and engaging in cognitively complex tasks are imperative to learning; using the CED and GMetrix will help to ensure we utilize these best practices. As Schmoker notes, "such 'guaranteed and viable curriculum' (Marzano, 2003, p. 22) is perhaps the most significant school factor that affects learning" (10).

Action Steps to Implement

Use AVID strategies like Focused Note Taking and Collaborative Study Groups school-wide to develop post secondary skills and critical thinking.

Person Responsible Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

Specific planning and observations with AP teachers regarding the use of CED and Personal Progress Checks in all AP courses.

Person Responsible Crystal Farrell (crystal.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

AP Mock Exam week to provide testing condition practice for students as well as formative assessment for instruction to teachers.

Person Responsible Crystal Farrell (crystal.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

CTE PLC meetings will review industry certification progress and collaboratively problem solve all instructional and testing needs.

Person Responsible Stephen Darago (stephen.darago@osceolaschools.net)

The College and Career Counselor in collaboration with the guidance team and teachers will use XELLO to ensure students complete metrics aligned with post secondary opportunities from job resumes and applications to scholarships and career interest surveys.

Person Responsible Crystal Farrell (crystal.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All schoolwide improvement priorities will be tracked and problem solved through the Stocktake process at weekly leadership team meetings. The Stocktake process is a systemic way to ensure highest priority areas are given adequate attention based upon formative data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

PBIS is used to recognize and celebrate positive behaviors. The HERO system is used to track student points earned for positive behaviors that they can cash in every other Friday for rewards. REP the P is our model for expectations representing Respect, Education, and Pride in Poinciana. We use several methods to build culture by celebrating each other. Students and staff give REP the P shout outs to each other through morning announcements, postcards to families, and emails. Teachers are celebrated in front of their students for committing to AVID WICOR best practices. AVID students nominate teachers each month to celebrate the same commitment. The leadership team shares out at least one positive about the staff at every faculty gathering. Most importantly, we continue to build consistency with high expectations among staff and students through expectations sweeps by the leadership team as well as engagement revision meetings with students and parents on the spot.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
----------	---------------	---	---------------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3190	310-Professional and Technical Services	0841 - Poinciana High School	Title, I Part A	0.0	\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: HERO for PBIS, Positive Culture, and Environment Effects.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3190	120-Classroom Teachers	0841 - Poinciana High School	Title, I Part A	0.0	\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Stipends for AVID Summer Institute</i>			
					Total:	\$20,270.00