

Orange County Public Schools

Eagle Creek Elementary



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	12

Eagle Creek Elementary

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

<https://eaglecreekes.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Cells, Patricia	Assistant Principal
McCloe, Robert	Principal
Sanchez, Oscar	Assistant Principal
Bielski, Heather	Instructional Coach
Brinzo, Kristen	Instructional Media
Scully, Jessica	Instructional Coach
Velarde, Sonia	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Rob McCloe (Principal):

- Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention
- Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement
- Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement
- Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups

Oscar Sanchez and Patricia Cells (Assistant Principal):

- Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP
- Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff
- Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation
- Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation
- Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities
- Discipline
- Develops documents necessary to manage and display data that addresses areas of focus identified in the SIP

Heather Bielski (Instructional Coach):

- Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction
- Facilitates all district and state assessments
- Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed
- Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan
- Assists in data analysis
- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning
- Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP
- Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP
- Provides guidance with K-12 Math Plan

Kristen Brinzo (Instructional Media)

- Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan
- Facilitates professional development
- Manages school social media accounts
- Assists in planning grade level field trips that align with standards
- Manages K-5 Literacy program

Jessica Scully, (Instructional Coach):

- Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP
- Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation
- Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation
- Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities
- Common Planning
- Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan
- Assists in data analysis
- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning
- Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP
- Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP
- Provides guidance with K-12 Math Plan

Sonia Velarde (Guidance)

- Provides support for healthy emotional and social development strategies and programs
- Assist/ train teachers in resources for the new elementary health course
- Conduct individual and small group counselling
- Implement and participate in individual, family, and school crisis intervention
- Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP

Karla Perry (Staffing Specialist):

- Facilitates and supports data collection activities
- Assists in data analysis
- Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP
- Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success
- Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP

Luz Seda (CCT):

- Supports ELL students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance
- Facilitates and supports data collection activities
- Assists in data analysis
- Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP

The Leadership Team will attend PLC and data meetings as assigned. Members are responsible for understanding the curriculum at each grade level as well as their Tier II and Tier III intervention needs. Members will use data from grade level unit assessments, iReady, and other formative assessments to review and keep abreast of grade level needs.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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
Attendance below 90 percent	21	14	11	16	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	43	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		1	1	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 7/17/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	21	15	18	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	1	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	29	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	21	15	18	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	1	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	29	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Based on Eagle Creek's 2018 Math FSA data, Tier I students, including our highest achievers, made adequate growth or excelled. However, the lowest 25% of students did not make the same amount of growth as compared to 2017 Math data indicating a downward trend in this area.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Based on the data from the 2016-2017, overall we saw the greatest decline in the math gains for the 2017-2018 school year.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Eagle Creek Elementary outperformed the state average in all areas. However, there was only a 1% difference between Eagle Creek Elementary scores and the state scores in the area of learning gains for the lowest 25% in math.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Our science data continues to remain the highest, at 87% for two consecutive years.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Through careful planning sessions during weekly PLC meetings, the fifth grade team in collaboration with the science coach, would review formative assessments, plan for intervention, and problem solve to devise action plans to meet student needs.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	56%	56%	75%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	55%	55%	60%	52%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	48%	48%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	80%	63%	62%	76%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	67%	57%	59%	61%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	47%	56%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	87%	55%	55%	59%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	21 (23)	14 (21)	11 (15)	16 (18)	9 (12)	12 (12)	83 (101)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (1)	5 (5)	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (6)	8 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	32 (31)	43 (29)	30 (38)	105 (98)

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
03	2018	68%	55%	13%	57%	11%
	2017	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
	2017	74%	57%	17%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2018	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%
	2017	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
	2017	83%	63%	20%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	71%	62%	9%	62%	9%
	2017	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2018	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
	2017	77%	56%	21%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	80%	53%	27%	55%	25%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	33	25	13	29	18	40				
ELL	65	66	56	71	66	56	73				
ASN	89	65		89	91		100				
BLK	79	68		62	41		75				
HSP	71	63	50	79	67	57	84				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
MUL	86			93							
WHT	79	66	62	85	65	38	90				
FRL	68	65	57	74	58	48	79				
2017 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	18	32	29	36	36	26	36				
ELL	68	62	60	84	84	71	81				
ASN	89	59		96	86		85				
BLK	76	76	58	78	81	40	67				
HSP	79	62	60	89	86	72	89				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	81	66	21	90	84	63	90				
FRL	73	61	53	82	83	64	76				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Mathematical learning gains with a focus on increasing overall student achievement.
Rationale	To support and meet the needs of students falling into the lowest 25th percentile as well as provide enrichment activities to continue to accelerate students that are performing on or above grade level.
Intended Outcome	Through purposeful planning and small group support, student performance among the lowest 25% of students will increase as well as accelerate students that are performing on or above grade level.
Point Person	Jessica Scully (jessica.scully@ocps.net)

Action Step

Description	Through culturally responsive approaches, awareness of cultural biases and an understanding of how it affects student learning will be infused into mathematics instruction. Teachers will implement mathematics interventions to students in need of support using a variety of strategies to meet the needs of all learners. Mathematics interventions will be monitored through the MTSS process. District templates will be used to record collaborative processes during PLC meetings and a student services committee comprised of various stakeholders will review data on an ongoing basis. Teachers will continue to accelerate progress among students that are on or above grade level through enrichment initiatives and development of STEM activities.
Person Responsible	Patricia Cells (patricia.cells@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	To monitor the effectiveness of the plan, teachers will enter data into a grade level spreadsheet that is monitored by the leadership team. In addition, the leadership team will conduct classroom walks and collaborate on trends observed using a shared template. Lastly, the MTSS team will closely monitor iReady response to instruction data and work with teachers to ensure that targeted students are making gains. Information will be shared with various stakeholders through weekly leadership meetings, monthly student services meetings, and monthly School Advisory Council meetings (SAC). Leadership team members will also conduct BOY/MOY/EOY surveys to monitor progress of Eagle Creek's culturally responsive school plan.
Person Responsible	Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	District Professional Learning Communities with a focus on close reading strategies and preparing to write in response to complex texts across all content areas.
Rationale	Eagle Creek Elementary has a high percentage of students that are performing at or above grade level. Although there are no significant downward trends in regards to learning gains in ELA, Eagle Creek will continue to increase the percentage of students making adequate gains each year.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to increase learning gains overall with the lowest 25% of students as well as continue to accelerate learning for students performing on and above grade level.
Point Person	Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)

Action Step	
Description	Through the DPLC initiative, we will continue to use close reading strategies and complex texts as a basis for participating in rigorous discussions and responding to text dependent questions. Eagle Creek will use strategies and tools to prepare students for writing in response to complex texts across all content areas. The instructional coach will be working with teacher leaders to support implementation of close reading strategies and responding to text dependent questions. Additionally, the instructional coach will be using the Lastinger coaching cycle to support teachers professional growth. Continued capacity building with teacher leaders will support all teachers with implementation as well as instruction of writing in response to complex texts across content areas.
Person Responsible	Kristen Brinzo (kristen.brinzo@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	The leadership team will monitor planning processes to ensure that strategies are being planned for with fidelity. Follow up classroom walks to observe strategies and provide specific feedback will support teachers by continuing to build capacity with implementation . The leadership team will collaborate on trends observed using a shared template. Additionally, the leadership team will participate in grade level PLC meetings and professional development initiatives to support teachers with implementation and common language.
Person Responsible	Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------