Pinellas County Schools

Orange Grove Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 10

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 24

Budget to Support Goals 24

Orange Grove Elementary School

10300 65TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33772

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

Demographics

Principal: Christine Porter D

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 10

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 24

Budget to Support Goals 24

Orange Grove Elementary School

10300 65TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33772

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	44%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

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.

Establish leadership and a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Porter, Christine	Principal	The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Dority, Jessica	Other	To support the district's curriculum, instruction, assessment, and improvement system for the school community through effective communication and appropriate training.
Raffaele Shillibeer, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Schultz, Candace	Teacher, ESE	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Mays, Jamie	Teacher, ESE	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
White, Stacey	School Counselor	Provides a comprehensive school-counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. Responsibilities may vary depending upon the specific work setting and counselor to student ratio and should correspond to the needs and priorities established in the schools and district's counseling program.
Kirchoffer, Kim	Psychologist	Instructional support staff position, which provides comprehensive psychological services for students experiencing learning and behavioral problems and for students exhibiting high-level abilities and talents. Comprehensive psychological services include formal and informal assessment, counseling, behavior management, consultation, research and in-service training.
Grimshaw, Justin	Teacher, K-12	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.

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	32	47	63	72	52	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	2	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/18/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	8	4	5	8	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	76%	54%	57%	70%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	59%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	53%	36%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	61%	63%	80%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	62%	58%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	48%	51%	36%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	53%	53%	61%	53%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	32 (0)	47 (0)	63 (0)	72 (0)	52 (0)	54 (0)	320 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	5 ()	2 ()	5 ()	2 ()	4 ()	18 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	10 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
	2018	69%	53%	16%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	56%	29%	58%	27%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
	2018	67%	50%	17%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
	2018	91%	62%	29%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	93%	64%	29%	64%	29%
	2018	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	60%	18%
	2018	72%	61%	11%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	53%	18%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	40	59	45	62	56	40					

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
HSP	95	69		91	44		73				
MUL	69	54		94	92						
WHT	74	70	57	84	69	55	70				
FRL	67	69	61	81	67	59	69				

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	30	41	18	46	39	38					
HSP	86	53		91	87						
MUL	83			92							
WHT	69	50	33	84	66	52	78				
FRL	69	55	43	81	68	57	70				

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	55	67		40	25						
HSP	68	46		82	54						
WHT	70	63	33	80	58	33	63				
FRL	60	55	32	78	58	44	51				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our lowest level of performance is Learning Gains among our L25 students in ELA and Math. We made significant increases in learning gains overall (71% to 76% in ELA; 34% to 62% in ELA L25; 68% to 68% in Math; and 53% to 61% in Math L25), however, the goal continues to be learning gains for ALL students.

ELA: Contributing factors include lack of consistency with student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor. We need to increase time on task reading grade-level text, engaging in discussion, and writing with feedback. We need more emphasis on foundational skills, with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. We also need to consistently assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction.

Math: Contributing factors include lack of consistency with student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor. We need to consistently use Purposeful Questions, Number Routines and multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction, including Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS, and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and/or “in the moment” student work analysis. We will also use student work to guide the analysis of student learning in grade-level PLCs.

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

Our 5th-grade cohort data show a decline of 8% in ELA and 9% in Math from the previous year. The 5th-grade cohort data from 2017-18 also showed a significant decline of 13% in ELA and 15% in Math. The team planned collaboratively with the standards in mind. However, the tasks need to be more aligned with the complexity of the standard. Bi-weekly assessments were also not utilized consistently as a means to drive instruction.

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.

OGE consistently scores above the state average in ELA and Math. However, 5th grade has the largest gap when compared to the state average when compared to 3rd and 4th grade. Consistent standards-based instruction and levels of complexity contributed to this gap.
ELA: 5th grade was 8% over in 2019 and 12% over in 2018.
ELA: 4th grade was 27% over in 2019 and 16% over in 2018.
ELA: 3rd grade was 13% over in 2019 and 12% over in 2018.

Math: 5th grade was 18% over in 2019 and 11% over in 2018.
Math; 4th grade was 29% over in 2019 and 25% over in 2018.
Math: 3rd grade was 22% over in 2019 and 29% over in 2018.

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

We showed the most improvement in learning gains in ELA and Math in all four categories. We placed a major focus on goal setting with every student. We utilized the learning continuum to connect the goals to standards and every child had an action plan to achieve their goals. Plans were routinely monitored and discussed with students. We were also more consistent including students and parents in data chats. The fourth-grade team
placed a big focus on JRGR and also utilized Literacy Footprints.
ELA Learning Gains:
2019 68%
2018 53%
2017 60%
ELA Learning Gains L25:
2019 62%
2018 34%
2017 36%
Math Learning Gains:
2019 68%
2018 68%
2017 58%
Math Learning Gains L25:
2019 61%
2018 53%
2017 36%

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

18 students with Attendance below 90%
10 Level 1 students

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

1. Increase ELA Learning Gains for all students, including L25, by increasing school-wide focus on aligning
the level of rigor to standard-based instruction, as it relates to instructional delivery, tasks, and assessments.
2. Increase Math Learning Gains for all students, including L25, by increasing school-wide focus on aligning the level of rigor to standard-based instruction, as it relates to instructional delivery, tasks, and
assessments.
3. Implement AVID strategies schoolwide that move the classroom learning environment from teacher-centered to student-centered with rigor.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 76%, as evidenced by 2018-19 FSA. We expect our performance level to increase by a minimum of 5%. The problem/gap is occurring because learning gains are not showing adequate progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students performing at or above grade level will increase from 76% to 81%, as measured by 2019-2020 FSA. The percent of all students making learning gains will increase from 68% to 78% and the L25 students will increase from 62% to 72% as measured by 2019-2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate, grade-level text & apply foundational skills, with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our current level of performance is 76%, as evidenced in FSA. We expect our performance level to increase by a minimum of 5%. The problem/gap is occurring because learning gains are not showing adequate progress.
Action Step	
Description	1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction 2. Utilize Jan Richardson's Guided Reading Routine (as well as other small group methods) to meet the unique needs of students 3. Design lessons on a trajectory of difficulty with multiple checkpoints and critical questions to find out what students know and then adapt instruction to meet students' needs. 4. Conduct regular PLCs inclusive of "data chats" to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data. 5. Administrator monitors teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. 6. Teachers intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Marzano's Taxonomy and adjust instruction through the use of talk, task, text and student needs. 7. Provide multiple opportunities for students to grapple with vocabulary across the literacy block (reading, writing, speaking and listening).
Person Responsible	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 86% as evidenced in 2018-19 FSA. We expect our performance level to increase by a minimum of 5%. The problem/gap is occurring because learning gains are not showing adequate progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students performing at or above grade level will increase from 86% to 91%, as measured by 2019-20 Math FSA. The percent of all students making learning gains will increase from 68% to 78% and the L25 students will increase from 61% to 71% as measured by 2019-20 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video. Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction, including Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and/or “in the moment” student work analysis. Use student work to guide analysis of student learning in grade level PLCs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our current level of performance is 86% as evidenced in 2019 FSA. We expect our performance level to increase by a minimum of 5%. The problem/gap is occurring because learning gains are not showing adequate progress.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers collaborate to collect and implement rigorous tasks aligned to each standard, including Mathematics Formative Assessment System (MFAS), Unify Unit Assessments, Rich Mathematical Tasks, and iReady curriculum resources from the Curriculum Guides. 2. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning. Grade level teams analyze data by grade, class and students and adjust instruction as needed. 3. Teachers use various mathematics tools and manipulatives (rulers, number lines, counters, pattern blocks, base ten blocks, etc) and encourage students to select tools that support making sense of problems. 4. Standards Based Collaborative Planning with an emphasis on unpacking standards, identifying learning targets, aligning tasks /assessments/ resources.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 74% as evidenced in the 2019 SSA. We expect our performance level to be 84% by the 2020 SSA. The problem/gap is occurring because previous grade level standards are not transferring to the 5th grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students proficient in Science will increase from 74% to 84%, as measured by 2019-20 SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Raffaele Shillibeer (raffaeleje@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. Monitor for consistent, effective instruction that promotes student-centered with rigor for all science labs grades 1-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our current level of performance is 74% as evidenced in the 2019 SSA. We expect our performance level to be 84% by the 2020 SSA. The problem/gap is occurring because previous grade level standards are not transferring to the 5th grade.
Action Step	
Description	1. At all grade levels, regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. 2. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. 3. Teachers utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and includes appropriate grade-level utilization of science labs in alignment with the Standards. 4. Develop, implement and monitor science lab schedule for all students in grades 2-5. 5. Conduct and implement a 5th grade standards review plan based on data from the 3rd and 4th grade Review Diagnostic Assessment. 6. Develop (by September) and implement an instructional review routine of ongoing support in 3rd and 4th grade standards. 7. Utilize diagnostic data to identify instructional resources to support the ongoing review and expansion of learning with an emphasis on informational text and academic vocabulary.
Person Responsible	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	Our current level of performance for Multiracial students in grades 3-5 is 69% in ELA, 54% in ELA Learning Gains, 94% in Math, and 92% in Math Learning Gains. 100% of our Black students were proficient in 2018-19 as identified by FSA and MAP data.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of Multiracial students achieving proficiency will increase to 79% in ELA and 95% in Math. 100% of black students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on FSA and make annual learning gains in ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Evidence-based strategies will include growing our group of equity champions, continued implementation of Restorative Practices, PBIS, and Culturally Relevant Teaching with a focus on SEL (Social Emotional Learning). *This includes cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. 2. Implement universal screening for gifted identification to expand the number of black students served within the talent development groups or identified as gifted learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because of the need for increased professional development in CRT practices. If culturally relevant teaching would occur, the percent of Multiracial students achieving proficiency will increase to 79% in ELA and 95% in Math and 100% of black students will be proficient in ELA and Math.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will participate and implement strategies from Restorative Practices. 2. Multiracial students will be academically monitored at SBLT and PLC's. 3. All multiracial students will be involved in an extended day activity (IE Extended Learning, Enrichment, STEM, etc.)
Person Responsible	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 3 referrals (1 student) and 10 incident reports in the 2018-19 SY.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to have 0 behavior referrals in 2019-20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence-based strategies will include growing our group of equity champions, continued implementation of Restorative Practices, PBIS, and Culturally Relevant Teaching with a focus on SEL (Social Emotional Learning).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If on-going implementation of Restorative Practices, SEL, and Culturally Relevant Teaching practices occur, school-wide behaviors will reduce. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies at SBLT meetings, PLC's, and Leadership Team meetings.
Action Step	
Description	1. Pre-School: Revisit core values and guidelines for sucess. 2. Pre-School: Equity training (3 hours) and Mental Health training (3 hours). 3. Pre-School: AVID training for schoolwide implementation. 4.. Actively display, reteach and implement school-wide Tier 1 practices and strategies through restorative circles. 3. Ongoing Professional Development in Restorative Practices, AVID, and Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies. 4. Book study applicable to all classroom settings (general education and ESE) 5. Proactively address students with identified behavior concerns and provide differentiated support to students in need (small groups/lunch bunch/mentors). 5. Provide new students to Orange Grove Elementary with a school tour and connection to a peer upon their arrival. 6. School Counselor lessons will take place monthly based on grade level areas of need and guidance standards.
Person Responsible	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	96% of all students met expected levels of performance. 18 students were absent more than 10% of the school year. We expect our performance level to be 97.6% by May, 2020.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of` students missing 10% or more of school will decrease from 18 to 0, as measured by CST (Child Study Team) monthly attendance reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of strategies on a bi-weekly basis at CST and bi-monthly at SBLT.
Action Step	
Description	1. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student-specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis. 2. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared) 3. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions for both students and staff. 4. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff.
Person Responsible	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	Based on results from our 18-19 AdvancedEd survey, we will continue to focus on building positive relationships with families and community partners.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increased rating on the AdvancedEd survey results in 2019-20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Intentionally building positive relationships with families and community partners is a priority at Orange Grove Elementary. Throughout the year, we have 2 to 3 opportunities each month for parents, students, and teacher to participate in after-hours activities to build relationships. We have an active PTA which supports all of our efforts to bridge home to school endeavors.
Action Step	
Description	1. Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices. 2. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. 3. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. 4. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners. 5. Communicate with parents the key points of restorative practices at an evening activity.
Person Responsible	Christine Porter (porterch@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is Silver, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will reach Gold status by April 2020 as evidenced in the Alliance for Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kuenn (kuennl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies as it relates to personal health.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Schools can play an important role in promoting healthy eating habits to children, and ensuring school food provides healthy, balanced, and nutritious meals with the appropriate amount of energy and nutrients pupils need.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student 2. Attend district-supported professional development 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan 5. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Recognition, if applicable
Person Responsible	Laura Kuenn (kuennl@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

1. Priority 1: Standards-based planning
If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support standards-based planning, then the percent of L25 students achieving learning gains in ELA and Math will increase from 62% in ELA and 61% in Math to 72% in ELA and 71% in Math.

2. Priority 2: Standards-based instruction
If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support standards-based instruction, then the percent of L25 students achieving learning gains in ELA and Math will increase from 62% in ELA and 61% in Math to 72% in ELA and 71% in Math.

3. Priority 3: Conditions for learning
If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support conditions for learning, then the

percent of L25 students achieving learning gains in ELA and Math will increase from 62% in ELA and 61% in Math to 72% in ELA and 71% in Math.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

n/a

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

n/a

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

n/a

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

n/a

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ELA**				**$1,850.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

		140-Substitute Teachers	3021 - Orange Grove Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	370.0	$1,850.00
			Notes: TDE's for standards-based planning in ELA			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Math**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$1,850.00**