Highland Lakes Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Highland Lakes Elementary School

1230 HIGHLANDS BLVD, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

http://www.highland-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Eliza Defant

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2020-21: (63%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Pinellas 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.

Highland Lakes Elementary staff, parents, and the community will be leaders in teaching, learning, modeling, and preparing students for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To reach 100% of each student's individualized social, emotional, physical, and academic goals.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Defant, Eliza	Principal	Instructional Leader and Co-Facilitator
Jessie, Jason	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership
Sboukis, Vickey	Guidance Counselor	
Barrett, Colby	Behavior Specialist	
Allen, Sandie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Bembnowski, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Carballo-Kurek, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Patterson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Siemon, Marge	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Sikorski, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Wightman, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Eliza Defant

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

536

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

6

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	45	91	74	100	70	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	11	13	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	6	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

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

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	74	80	68	96	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	377
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	8	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	2	7	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	74	80	68	96	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	377
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	8	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	2	7	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%			66%			67%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%			67%			62%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%			55%			60%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	64%			68%			70%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%			71%			54%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%			48%			33%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	67%			68%			59%	53%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	64%	8%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	46	39	40	45	38	44				
ELL	50			70							
ASN	73			73							
HSP	58	62		70	77		67				
MUL	47			53							
WHT	66	63	52	64	63	55	73				
FRL	54	64	50	59	59	50	65				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	50		46	33		28				
ELL	50			83							
ASN	70			100							
HSP	71	67		68	58		71				
MUL	75			70							
WHT	64	64	50	70	71	56	68				
FRL	60	71	60	60	68	50	60				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	52	61	31	39	37	18				
ELL	50	58		57	58						
BLK	46			38							
HSP	65	64		72	52		80				
MUL	63	44		71	56		36				
WHT	68	64	72	71	56	29	61				
FRL	60	61	60	64	51	35	51				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	50
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	
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	62
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

NWEA MAP data demonstrated ELA and Math proficiency levels are stagnant and/or decreased from Fall to Spring. In addition, exceptional students (ESE) showed growth as a whole across grade levels in ELA and Math.

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

Students with Disabilities (SWD) continues to be area of the greatest need for improvement. Additionally, accelerating students in the lowest 25% in ELA and Math.

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

Contributing factors include minimal teacher understanding and implementation of specially designed instruction and differentiation. New actions needed to address this area for improvement include orientation to and implementation of new materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence-based practices and B.E.S.T. Standards. Furthermore, develop and implement a strategic plan to ensure growth in students in the lowest twenty-five percent in ELA and Math.

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

5th grade ELA and Math showed the most improvement from Fall to Spring (MAP data).

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

The contributing factors that led to this improvement include teacher expertise in content, strong student-teacher relationships (behavior management), and effective collaborative planning. Furthermore, teachers and instructional leaders utilized the comparative results tool in Performance Matters to highlight areas of strength and needs for growth across all content area assessments.

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

Strategies needed to be implemented in order to accelerate learning include strategic planning using on-going formative assessment data. Teachers will need to ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English language supports, students in the lowest twenty-five percent, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Leader in Me, B.E.S.T trainings, Equity and Mental Health, Differentiation, Interventions and Supports (MTSS).

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Data driven focus, systematic approach to MTSS process (academic and behavior), consistency with monitoring, observing and providing student and teacher feedback.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Standards-based data (Florida State Assessment, common assessments, and walkthrough data) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing in the lowest twenty-five percent in Math, ELA, and Science lack the growth needed to reach proficiency. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with a review of standards-based tasks not yet mastered, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning gaps.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency in Science will increase 3% (from 67% to 70%), as measured by the Science State Assessment by May 2023. Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 3% (from 62% to 65%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) by May 2023. Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 3% (from 64% to 67%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) by May 2023. Black student proficiency in ELA will increase 32% (from 18% to 50%) and Math will increase 14% (36% to 50%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) by May 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) 2. Scheduled walkthroughs with timely and specific feedback- prioritizing individual teachers and/or grade levels according to on-going progress monitoring data for all subgroups 3. Instructional Support Model (ISM) and Peer walkthroughs 4. Individual and grade level data chats- September 2022 and January 2023 5. On-going professional learning communities and collaborative planning
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Develop a professional learning plan that results in improved practice and better student outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows that professional development leads to better instruction and improved student learning when it connects to the curriculum materials that teachers use, the district and state academic standards that guide their work, and the assessment and accountability measures that evaluate their success (Learning for Justice). Furthermore, Highland Lakes begins year one of professional development in becoming a Leader in Me school beginning in August 2022. Research has demonstrated Leader in Me schools produces academic results, promotes student leadership and a supportive environment, and positively impacts attendance. (Franklin Covey)

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 and administrators engage in just in time training needed to implement the B.E.S.T. standards, curriculum, and other instructional initiatives underway (ex. Leader in Me).

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Administrators will ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Principal, Assistant Principal, and teacher leaders will provide regular and consistent structures for planning/PLCs where teachers engage in data/student work analysis as preparing for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Administrative team will regularly collaborate as a leadership team to engage in meaningful discussions and collective goal-setting around improving student outcomes including, but not limited to teachers support, community outreach, and strengthening a culture of high expectations for all students.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Teachers and administrators will engage in professional development on various aspects of differentiation (provided by Gifted, ESE, and ESOL). Intentionally plan for differentiation (using formative assessment/ observation data) for all learners. Differentiate for all learners by moving beyond just adapting content, product and process to include thinking skills (asking questions, making plans, organizing and creating information).

Person Responsible Jason Jessie (jessiej@pcsb.org)

Teachers will create daily learning targets that state the purpose for learning and identify critical content, clarify the high yield instructional strategy, clarify the evidence to ensure it is aligned to the rigor of the grade level standard, align Resources to Standards, and plan to close the achievement gap using data.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Teachers and staff will accelerate learning through student experiences and high expectations for all.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Standards-based data (Florida State Assessment, on-going common assessments, and walkthrough data) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students preforming below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with effective Specifically Designed Instruction (SDI) to ensure Students with Disabilities have the appropriate access to grade-level content.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Student with Disabilities proficiency in ELA will increase 21% (29% to 50%) and Math will increase 10% (40% to 50%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) by May 2023. In addition, Students with Disabilities proficiency in Science will increase 6% (44% to 50%), as measured by the Science State Assessment by May 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST)- October, January, May 2. Scheduled walkthroughs with timely and specific feedback- prioritizing individual teachers and/or grade levels according to on-going progress monitoring and progress of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) 3. Instructional Support Model (ISM) and Peer walkthroughs 4. Individual and grade level data chats- September 2022 and January 2023 5. On-going professional learning communities and collaborative planning
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Instruct students with disabilities in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade-level content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	"A robust body of research tells us that systematic, explicit foundational skills instruction is crucial for students as they are learning to read and write in English. As the building blocks of early reading and writing, secure foundational skills are crucial for students' success in literacy and so are key enablers of equity." (Achieve the Core). "Students with special needs and students who struggle spend most of their day in the general education classroom; therefore, core instruction provided by the classroom teacher must meet most of their needs. In order to raise achievement for all students who struggle, districts need to faithfully implement best practices for teaching reading and ensure that students with mild to moderate disabilities are benefiting from these best practices." (Nathan Levenson)

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 provide instruction that is aligned to student's IEP goals and specially designed to meet the student's unique needs.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Teachers will collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives on an intentional and regular schedule. Adjust services and accommodations if supported by data.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Teachers will use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills.

Person Responsible Jason Jessie (jessiej@pcsb.org)

Teachers will employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests and cultural background; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Teachers will implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible Jason Jessie (jessiej@pcsb.org)

Teachers will embed strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Principal will schedule weekly PLCs with the ESE and EBD classroom teachers to analyze student data, and mutually learn and plan best inclusive practices for SWD.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Behavioral Specialist will support EBD teachers with in-class modeling of skills needed to support teachers in data collection and behavioral support.

Person Responsible Colby Barrett (barrettc@pcsb.org)

Provide embedded professional development and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Develop weekly walkthroughs to ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice for students with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Highland Lakes Elementary Leadership Academy will build a positive school culture and environment by engaging and implementing the Leader in Me program, Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (PBIS), and equity-based practices for all students.

The Leader in Me program creates school cultures where students and staff feel safe and engaged. In addition, the environment of Leader in Me schools engages student learning and positively supports the development of student social-emotional leadership skills. Furthermore, Leader in Me schools work to empower teachers with meaningful leadership opportunities and engage them in guiding the social, emotional, and academic development of their students. Staff will be engaged in pre-school training on Core 1 practices and the 7 Habits. Leader in Me training will also be provided to parents and families throughout the school year.

The school-wide PBIS program will be enhanced to ensure common language and positive incentives are provided to all students across all grade levels. Highland Lakes will re-create the guidelines for success and rewards program to ensure it aligns and supports the Leader in Me program and MTSS process. Staff will be engaged in pre-school training on the school-wide processes/procedures, expectations, and PBIS rewards. Throughout the school year, the PBIS team will use data to ensure consistency and follow through with the school-wide plan. Positive recognition will be used through the use of the PBIS rewards app for both teachers and students. Parents and families will have access to the PBIS rewards app so they can support our school-wide expectations and celebrate success.

Equity-based practices will be learned and implemented as a result of continued professional learning and training such as AVID CRT, Kognito, Youth Mental Health and Awareness, equity-based problem solving protocols, and/or book study (Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain).

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Principal and Assistant Principal (PBIS coordinator)- Initiation of PBIS plan and positive school culture and environment

PBIS team- Monitor and support teachers with consistency of PBIS plan and rewards program

Behavior Specialist- Tier 2/3 interventions and supports, coaching and supporting teachers who work with students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Social Worker- Tier 3 interventions (Functional Behavioral Assessments), attendance tracking, and providing parent and family supports, as needed

Counselor- social/emotional and growth mindset instruction for small groups

Parents/families- support of the school/teacher in building life-long learners ready for the 21st century

Partnerships with outside resources- individual counseling, mentoring, and support for student and families in need