Metrowest Elementary

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Metrowest Elementary

1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

https://metrowestes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Sherry Donaldson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	88%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange 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.

Table of Contents

Metrowest Elementary

1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

https://metrowestes.ocps.net/

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 PK-5	No	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gjini, Xhuljeta	Principal	
Owens, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Thinn, Latoya	Instructional Coach	
LeSuer, Brandon	Instructional Coach	
McGhee, Adriane	Instructional Coach	
Mitchell, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	
Cymbal, Sabreena	Instructional Coach	

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	114	118	111	127	102	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	12	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	11	11	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	23	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	4	2	3	25	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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)

44

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/28/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	16	14	11	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	4	8	4	17	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	17	12	4	2	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	47	47	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	2	6	2	12	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	15	16	14	11	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	4	8	4	17	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	17	12	4	2	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	47	47	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	2	6	2	12	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	53%	57%	57%	58%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	53%	61%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	63%	63%	59%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	61%	62%	53%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	48%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	56%	53%	31%	50%	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	114 (0)	118 (0)	111 (0)	127 (0)	102 (0)	117 (0)	689 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (15)	14 (16)	12 (14)	7 (11)	7 (8)	0 (10)	53 (74)
One or more suspensions	1 (4)	1 (8)	2 (4)	1 (17)	0 (19)	1 (18)	6 (70)
Course failure in ELA or Math	7 (17)	11 (12)	11 (4)	2 (2)	4 (11)	3 (14)	38 (60)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	37 (47)	23 (47)	39 (53)	99 (147)

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	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	9%					
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
	2018	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	42%	57%	-15%	60%	-18%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	53%	-11%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	13	42		21	31						
ELL	46	53	45	49	52	30	50				
ASN	87			73							
BLK	48	57	53	41	45	33	32				
HSP	53	53	43	49	49	31	62				
WHT	60	57		64	64		59				
FRL	49	56	46	45	48	36	43				
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	18	42		29	37		27				
ELL	36	54	65	38	51	45	15				
ASN	80	80		80	80		82				
BLK	47	43	50	45	43	32	34				
HSP	51	54	48	43	40	32	44				
MUL	46			77							
WHT	60	44		57	53		58				

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
FRL	49	46	50	46	44	33	43				

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	22	34	43	28	40	24	10				
ELL	41	62	64	52	60	48	9				
ASN	81	66		89	72						
BLK	53	50	53	48	44	30	26				
HSP	54	60	68	57	58	46	30				
MUL	52	61		64	53						
WHT	66	48	60	71	52	36	32				
FRL	54	54	59	55	50	35	26				

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	52
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	62
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	49
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 25% in Math showed the lowest performance. PLC teams were learning the data analysis model throughout the year and began to work on differentiation of strategies to learn how to individualize instruction to close the gaps with this subset of students.

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

Our only area of decline was with the lowest 25% in ELA. The teams were using the whole group approach for instruction verses a small group approach for instruction. There was also an inconsistency in monitoring the data.

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.

Our greatest gap from the state was Grade 3 Math. PLC teams were learning the data analysis model throughout the year and began to work on differentiation of strategies to learn how to individualize instruction to close the gaps with this subset of students

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

Our area for most improved was ELA learning gains. This increase is due to the fourth grade team that implemented new instructional strategies after professional development in November. This team also took the data and analyzed and monitored throughout the remainder of the year.

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

Our areas of concern are level 1 on state assessment and attendance.

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

1. Increasing Learning Gains for our lowest 25% in Math and ELA
2. Increase Overall Achievement and Learning Gains of our Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing Learning Gains for our lowest 25% in Math and ELA
Rationale	Currently our lowest quartile in ELA dropped from 51% to 45%. Although Math lowest quartile has increased from 34% to 36%, it is still below district and state average growth.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reading learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 45% to 51%. Math learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 36% to 45%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use small group differentiated instruction during the Math and ELA blocks as well as push in and walk to intervention during FBS time. We will monitor this through the data chats during PLCs after each common assessment, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies will target student achievement providing scaffolded support aligned with individualized academic needs.
Action Step	
Description	1.We will provide professional development for teachers on authentic engagement and best instructional strategies 2. Administration and Coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions within PLCs weekly focused on, culturally relevant learning, scaffolded support for our lowest quartile, and data discussions creating small groups for instruction. 3. Adjusting small groups for FBS based on common assessments and monitoring the data from the groups to adjust based on learning needs. Teachers will use literacy strategies in small group instruction and across all content areas. 4. Offer Instructional Coaches providing ongoing support using the coaching cycle and modeling lessons 5 .We will monitor this through the data chats after each i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.
Person Responsible	Latoya Thinn (latoya.thinn@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Learning Gains for our SWD students by 5%
Rationale	Currently our SWD subgroup in ELA were 13% on grade level and 17% made learning gains. In Math we had 21% on grade level and 17% made learning gains. This group has not met the ESSA index and they are our focus group for the school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD learning gains in ELA will increase from 17% to 22% and overall achievement will increase from 13% to 20%. SWD learning gains in Math will increase from 17% to 22% and overall achievement will increase from 21% to 30%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	In response to ESSA subgroup data, we will support students with support facilitation and push-in intervention. We also are going to make sure that bubble students are using acceleration strategies and preteaching strategies to students. Students are also pulled out during FBS time into small groups based on i-ready data. We will monitor this by analyzing IEP data as well as common assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies will target student achievement providing scaffolded support aligned with individualized academic needs while addressing the individual needs and goals embedded within the individual student IEPs.

Action Step	
Description	1.We will provide professional development for teachers on ESE strategies, authentic engagement and best instructional strategies 2. Administration and Coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions within PLCs weekly focused on, culturally relevant learning, scaffolded support for our SWD students, and data discussions creating IEP goals that are aligned to the student learning and standards. 3. Adjusting small groups for FBS based on common assessments and monitoring the data from the groups to adjust based on learning needs. 4. Offer Instructional Coaches providing ongoing support using the coaching cycle and modeling lessons with the SLD teacher specific to teachers that support SWD. 5 .We will monitor this through the data chats after each i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback. 6. Teachers will use literacy strategies in small group instruction and across all content areas. 7. Students are also pulled out for, Tier II instruction, during FBS time into small groups based on i-Ready data.
Person Responsible	Sabreena Cymbal (sabreena.cymbal@ocps.net)

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).

These areas are our core concerns for this school year