

Orange County Public Schools

Eagle Creek Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Eagle Creek Elementary

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

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

Demographics

Principal: Patricia Cells

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2019

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)	30%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: No Grade
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCloe, Robert	Principal	<p>Rob McCloe (Principal):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Bielski, Heather	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Brinzo, Kristen	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Scully, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Velarde, Sonia	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Sanchez, Oscar	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Perry, Karla	Other	<p>Karla Perry (Staffing Specialist):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Seda Cruz, Luz	Teacher, K-12	<p>Luz Seda-Cruz</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Cells, Patricia	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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

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	151	158	173	161	187	188	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1018
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	15	10	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	2	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	28	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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		1	0	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

76

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/18/2019

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	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	
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 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		1	1	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	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	
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 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	1	1	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	75%	57%	57%	81%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	58%	58%	65%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	53%	50%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	89%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	61%	62%	85%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	51%	67%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	56%	53%	87%	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	151 (0)	158 (0)	173 (0)	161 (0)	187 (0)	188 (0)	1018 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (21)	11 (14)	15 (11)	10 (16)	10 (9)	16 (12)	71 (83)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (3)	2 (5)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	12 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (32)	28 (43)	42 (30)	81 (105)

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	72%	55%	17%	58%	14%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	62%	15%	62%	15%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	63%	9%	64%	8%
	2018	71%	62%	9%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
	2018	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	54%	11%	53%	12%
	2018	80%	53%	27%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	22	46	60	25	38	42	25				

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
ELL	60	72	62	71	71	48	54				
ASN	87	86		90	86		92				
BLK	84	76		78	67						
HSP	71	72	62	75	72	49	64				
WHT	79	69		85	67		76				
FRL	65	68	57	69	67	49	56				
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				
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				

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	69
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	64
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	88
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	76
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	68
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	75
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	63
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.

Based on Eagle Creek's 2019 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 2018 Math data indicating a downward trend in this area. A contributing factor to the slight decrease in performance was an intense focus on reading interventions versus math interventions.

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

Based on the most recent FSA math data, overall we saw the greatest decline in the math gains of the lowest 25th percentile for the 2018-2019 school year. A factor that contributed to the decline from the prior year was an intense focus on data collection and monitoring of reading interventions versus math interventions.

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.

Eagle Creek Elementary outperformed the state average in all areas except math lowest 25th percentile. There was a three percentage point difference between Eagle Creek Elementary's 45% and the state's 48% for the math lowest 25th percentile. A factor that may have contributed to this trend was the intense focus on reading interventions versus math interventions.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Eagle Creek Elementary's ELA learning gains. New actions that the school took in this area to foster improvement was implementation of the PLC cycle when planning for reading interventions. This cycle included data analysis, problem solving, and plans for improvement at each assessment period.

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

Potential areas for concern based on EWS are level 1 on the state wide assessment (81 students) and attendance below 90% (71 students).

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

1. Math lowest 25%
2. ELA lowest 25%
3. Students with disabilities
4. Science achievement
5. Social emotional learning/ culturally responsive support

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	To support and meet the needs of students falling into the lowest 25th percentile by providing multiple opportunities to expose students to content and close achievement gaps.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is an increase in math scores for students performing in the lowest 25% percentile by four percentage points resulting in 49% proficiency. A one point increase in overall math proficiency will occur as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Eagle Creek will implement a variety of strategies to ensure we meet the needs of our students performing in the lowest 25th percentile. We will continue to support all levels of instruction through the implementation of the District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) initiative. Eagle Creek will monitor and adjust the MTSS process (tiered support) through the use of evidence based interventions, before school tutoring programs, data analysis, problem solving, creation of action plans, monitoring of results, and implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies. As a school we will continue to strive to meet the demands of our changing population through culturally responsive approaches and an intense focus on connecting academics with social emotional learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting these strategies is to increase student exposure to grade level content and monitor progress/ adjust instruction as needed to close achievement gaps. We will monitor the implementation of UDL strategies to ensure that our students that are receiving special education services are making adequate academic progress throughout the school year. Additionally, we will continue support our students through creating a culturally responsive environment in which all staff members exhibit high levels of cultural competency.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Backward design/ common planning- Leadership will implement guiding questions during common planning based on domain 2 of the instructional framework to ensure that the implementation of accommodations meet the needs of students performing in the lowest 25% (including all students with individualized education plans) (August 20, 2019-ongoing). 2. Coaching observations- The instructional coach and administration will conduct classroom coaching observations with a specific focus to determine supports needed regarding the implementation of UDL strategies (August 26, 2019-ongoing). 3. Classroom walk through- Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk through rotations (3-5 minutes in each classroom) to look for differentiated instruction and the implementation of UDL strategies (August 26, 2019-ongoing). 4. Data analysis- The principal will meet with teachers monthly to review student data and determine plans of action to support an increase in student achievement among students performing in the lowest 25% (August 1-ongoing). 5. PLC conversations centered around identified areas of need- PLC meetings during each intervention review period will focus on identifying areas for improvement based on intervention data (tier 1, tier 2, tier 3 data) through the MTSS problem solving model. Tier 1 data will be reviewed at the close of each assessment period (monthly), tier 2 data will be

reviewed bi-weekly (3 data points or 6 weeks to determine instructional changes), and tier 3 data review weekly (August 1, 2019-ongoing).

6. Instructional coach and administration will conduct job embedded professional development regarding the MTSS process and the implementation of UDL strategies (August 20, 2019 MTSS overview, August 27, 2019 UDL overview).

7. Students performing in the lowest 25% will be invited to before school tutoring to address areas of need to close instructional gaps (September 23, 2019).

8. Resource teachers will provide re-teach support after each assessment period to help close instructional gaps in understanding (September 2019 through the culmination of each math unit assessment).

9. Student programs (reflex math) will be implemented and closely monitored to help increase students basic math fluency concepts. Teachers will review data during PLC meetings to determine additional steps and guide instructional decision making (September 2019-May 2020).

Person Responsible	Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)
-------------------------------	--

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	To support and meet the needs of students falling into the lowest 25th percentile in ELA by providing multiple opportunities to expose students to content and close achievement gaps.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve an increase in ELA scores for students performing in the lowest 25% percentile. A one point increase in overall ELA proficiency will occur as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Close reading strategies with text dependent questions, MTSS tiered support through the use of evidence based interventions, before school tutoring programs, resource teacher support, careful data analysis and problem solving, action plans, monitoring of results, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Eagle Creek will implement a variety of strategies to ensure we meet the needs of our students performing in the lowest 25th percentile. We will continue to support all levels of instruction through the implementation of the District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) initiative. Eagle Creek will monitor and adjust the MTSS process (tiered support) through the use of evidence based interventions, before school tutoring programs, careful data analysis, problem solving, creation of action plans, monitoring of results, and implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies. As a school we will continue to strive to meet the demands of our changing population through culturally responsive approaches and an intense focus on connecting academics with social emotional learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Backward design/ common planning- Leadership will implement guiding questions during common planning based on domain 2 of the instructional framework to ensure that the implementation of accommodations meet the needs of students performing in the lowest 25% (including all students with individualized education plans) (August 20, 2019-ongoing). 2. Coaching observations- The instructional coach and administration will conduct classroom coaching observations with a specific focus to determine supports needed regarding the implementation of UDL strategies (August 26, 2019-ongoing). 3. Classroom walk through- Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk through rotations (3-5 minutes in each classroom) to look for differentiated instruction and the implementation of UDL strategies. (August 26, 2019-ongoing). 4. Data analysis- The principal will meet with teachers monthly to review student data and determine plans of action to support an increase in student achievement among students performing in the lowest 25% (August 1, 2019-ongoing). 5. PLC conversations centered around identified areas of need- PLC meetings during each intervention review period will focus on identifying areas for improvement based on intervention data (tier 1, tier 2, tier 3 data) through the MTSS problem solving model. Tier 1 data will be reviewed at the close of each assessment period (monthly), tier 2 data will be reviewed bi-weekly (3 data points or 6 weeks to determine instructional changes), and weekly tier 3 data review (August 1-ongoing). 6. Instructional coach and administration will conduct job embedded professional

development regarding the MTSS process and the implementation of UDL strategies (August 20, 2019 MTSS overview, August 27, 2019 UDL overview).

7. Students performing in the lowest 25% will be invited to before school tutoring to address areas of need to close instructional gaps (September 23, 2019).

8. Resource teachers will provide re-teach support after each assessment period to help close instructional gaps in understanding (September 2019 through the culmination of each math unit assessment).

9. Student programs (iReady, Learning A to Z, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness) will be implemented and closely monitored to help increase students foundational reading skills. Teachers will review data during PLC meetings to determine additional steps needed to guide instructional decision making (September 3, 2019-ongoing).

10. DPLC- The DPLC school site team will work with grade level teams during common planning to deliver job embedded professional development to support the implementation of close reading strategies, text dependent questions, academic discourse, and academic writing (September 3, 2019-ongoing).

Person Responsible Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@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).

We will address the remaining school wide improvement priorities by using data analysis to drive instructional initiatives in special education programs and science. We will closely monitor the implementation of strategies to make content more comprehensible to our students with special needs. We will analyze science unit assessments and create plans for reteach and reassess through the MTSS process.

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.

Eagle Creek Elementary is a non-title I school.

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.

s.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: Math Lowest 25th Percentile				\$97,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	General Fund		\$70,000.00
			<i>Notes: Identified teachers will provide tiered intervention support in math.</i>			
	2162	500-Materials and Supplies	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	Other		\$20,000.00
			<i>Notes: Supplemental support/ intervention materials needed for both math and reading instruction to assist students performing in the lowest 25% to help increase proficiency.</i>			
	2162	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	Other		\$7,500.00
			<i>Notes: Tutors will support students before school in the area of mathematics.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				\$148,700.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	General Fund		\$140,000.00
			<i>Notes: Identified teachers will support the MTSS process to close instructional gaps that exist among the lowest 25% of students.</i>			
	2162	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	Other		\$7,500.00
			<i>Notes: Tutors will support students before school to increase reading proficiency among the lowest 25%.</i>			
	2162	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	Other		\$1,200.00
			<i>Notes: Saturday school will be offered 5 times to support students in the area of science.</i>			
Total:						\$246,200.00