

Orange County Public Schools

# Dr. Phillips Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Autherene Leighvard**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (72%) 2014-15: A (76%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">37%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">53%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	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
Hargreaves, Alexis	Instructional Coach	Coordinates all school-wide state and district assessment. Coaches teachers with instructional focus for Science. Member of the MTSS team supporting 1st and 5th grade teachers and students.
Hargrett, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Supports principal with key decisions regarding instruction, teacher development, FTE, PBIS initiatives, student progress, and overall safety of the school.
Rogers, Christine	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Oversee supervision of all personnel, instructional focus for all grade levels and subjects, and individual student progress, safety and wellbeing.
Wallick, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Assigned to coach all teachers with pedagogy and instruction. Assists teams with developing common assessments and lesson plans as well as selecting complex texts to use for standards-based instruction. Member of the MTSS team supporting 2nd and 3rd grade teachers and students.
Williams, Madeline	Instructional Coach	Assigned to support all ELL students with proper placement and testing. Supports teachers with instruction to support ELL students achieve success. Coaches teachers with instructional focus for mathematics. Member of the MTSS team supporting Kindergarten and 4th grade teachers and students.

### 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	131	125	123	126	118	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	11	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	2	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	1	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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)**

52

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/8/2019

**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	19	13	12	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	4	1	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	27	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

**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	2	1	3	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

**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	19	13	12	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	4	1	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	27	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	2	1	3	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

## 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	80%	57%	57%	73%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	58%	58%	73%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	53%	54%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	63%	63%	81%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	82%	61%	62%	81%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	48%	51%	75%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	75%	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	131 (0)	125 (0)	123 (0)	126 (0)	118 (0)	131 (0)	754 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (19)	7 (13)	11 (12)	11 (9)	10 (8)	12 (10)	64 (71)
One or more suspensions	2 (2)	1 (3)	2 (2)	2 (4)	12 (4)	10 (10)	29 (25)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (2)	2 (3)	2 (4)	2 (1)	4 (24)	7 (7)	18 (41)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (15)	22 (27)	19 (11)	55 (53)

### 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	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
	2018	74%	55%	19%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
	2018	81%	55%	26%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
	2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
	2018	88%	53%	35%	55%	33%
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 2017-18
SWD	35	38	40	35	69	67	33				

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	76	73	74	83	81	76	72				
ASN	89	82		96	88						
BLK	62	48		59	74	69	54				
HSP	73	63	53	82	83	83	78				
WHT	86	76	70	86	81	63	80				
FRL	68	61	47	74	82	78	63				
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	25	43	41	44	65	67					
ELL	67	73	55	82	81	87	90				
ASN	93	82		96	82						
BLK	60	68		63	68						
HSP	72	69	44	80	69	55	84				
WHT	80	62	64	83	76	75	87				
FRL	65	57	43	70	62	50	78				
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	15	46	48	35	67	63	27				
ELL	42	61	60	65	76	65	44				
ASN	77	89		97	94		83				
BLK	48	65	60	52	65	60					
HSP	69	72	55	77	80	76	61				
WHT	80	74	56	86	84	82	85				
FRL	60	67	50	68	73	71	63				

**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	75
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	603
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	77
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
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.**

The lowest performing data component in 2019 was SWD science achievement (33% proficiency). Overall, the school saw an overall decline in science achievement. All of the SWD students did not demonstrate proficiency in science also did not score proficiency in ELA (level one and level two students). Majority of the SWD students who did not score proficiency were with one of the two teachers who had the overall lowest pass rates.

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

5th Grade Science showed the greatest decline. In 2018 student proficiency was 88% which declined to 73% in 2019, resulting in a 15% decline. One teacher had a significantly lower student pass rate as compared to her peers within the department (39% pass rate as compared to the school's 77% overall proficiency in 5th grade science).

**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.**

Dr. Phillips Elementary School scored above the state averages in all grade components. The grade component with the smallest average above the state was ELA Lowest 25%. DPES had 58% of the lowest 25% make a learning gain in ELA as compared to the state average of 53%.

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

Learning gains in math of the lowest 25% showed the most improvement. In 2019, 73% of students earned a learning gain in the lowest 25% as compared to 2018 where 63% of students earned a

learning gain, a difference of a 10% increase. During the 2018-2019 school year the school focused on common assessments, common planning, and MTSS interventions. During the 2018-2019 school year the school had added an additional 15 minutes of math.

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

The first area of concern is the 5th grade science achievement as the school had a 15% decline in student proficiency. A second area of concern is the achievement of subgroup data of our SWD and ELL students compared to our Gen Ed students, as well as our Black and Hispanic students compared to our White students.

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

1. Targeted reading and math interventions tailored to the specific needs of students.
2. Fluid PLC meetings to plan standards based instruction, data meetings to plan differentiated instruction, as well as plan for small group instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
3. Ongoing data chats to analyze data trends as a department, as well as trends of student subgroups, in order to use data to make instructional decisions and MTSS interventions.
4. Provide ongoing professional development of research-based reading strategies as well as student engagement strategies.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Staff will collaboratively plan rigorous standards based lessons using complex text, research based reading strategies, and student engagement strategies monitored by ongoing common assessments.
<b>Rationale</b>	All teachers will provide rigorous instruction using complex text, which will result in increased student achievement.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	All teachers will provide rigorous instruction using complex text, which will result in increased student achievement.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Through common planning and the use of backwards design teacher will focus on evaluating activities and assessments to ensure they are aligned to the standard, as well as incorporating strategies to yield high student cognitive engagement.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	During the 2018-2019 school year the school focused on backwards design for common planning and common assessments aligned to the standard. Overall the school saw an increase in student performance.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The school site team will plan and facilitate professional development on standards aligned tasks, using content specific, complex texts for all classroom teachers throughout the school year.</li> <li>2. Focusing on evaluating activities and assessments to ensure they are aligned to the standard.</li> <li>3. Focus on planning purposeful student engagement strategies to yield high student cognitive engagement.</li> <li>4.Provide support and coaching to struggling teachers, with implementation of reading strategies.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Leadership and teachers will structure, implement, and monitor a Multi Tiered Title System of Supports (MTSS) to close the achievement gap between minority subgroups and the student population.
<b>Rationale</b>	There is an achievement gap, particularly with our ESE, ELL, Black and Hispanic students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Using the MTSS process to monitor appropriate intervention and strategies, we will narrow the achievement gap in reading and mathematics for our ESE, Black and Hispanic students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Nicole Hargrett (nicole.hargrett@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	By using the MTSS process and using data to inform instruction, teachers will be able to plan to meet student needs.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	During the 2018-2019 school year, the school focused on implementing MTSS process to provide appropriate student interventions. While there were increases in several areas of student performance there is still a need to close the achievement gap.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Instructional coaches will provide support throughout the school year during PLC, data meetings, and targeted professional development as needed.</li> <li>2. Teachers will monitor student progress in response to interventions, communicate to all stakeholders, and make adjustments as needed.</li> <li>3. Focus on small group instruction in the rotation model and FBS to address specific learning needs</li> <li>4. All staff will build relationships with students to motivate struggling students and provide support; implementation of PBIS</li> <li>5. Intense focus on analyzing data trends by whole school and subgroups.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Nicole Hargrett (nicole.hargrett@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).**

n/a

**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.**

Establishing and maintaining positive relationships with families is essential to student academic performance and overall school improvement. Dr. Phillips Elementary is fortunate to have a high level of family involvement with our Parent Teacher Association (PTA) , during evening events and with volunteers during the school day. The PTA works diligently to provide support for the educational and recreational needs of the school. Our volunteers assist teachers within the classroom, work with individual students or small groups, promote school spirit, and provide support in other areas of the school where there is a need.

Mrs. Rogers, the principal, provides vitally important information via the Connect Orange phone message system as required and/or necessary for parents. Monthly newsletters are sent to families by the principal to assist with maintaining school and home communication as well as to share information about upcoming events. Parents are encouraged to become ADDitions volunteers so that they can assist in the classroom and attend field trips.

Parents are provided opportunities to become involved in their child's academic education. Parent information nights for specific content areas, Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) testing, and "Preventing the Summer Slide" are opportunities for parents to help their children find success through partnership with the school.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend all meetings that pertain to their child's education, such as PTA, School Advisory Council (SAC), Exceptional Student Education (ESE), MPLC, parent/teacher conferences and any individual meetings scheduled to support the academic and/or behavior placements.

Parents provide input on BPIE Assessment results. Parents are invited to MTSS Tier 3 meetings, as well as, the school communicating Tier 2 interventions. The school also sends out the MTSS brochure to parents.

**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.**

Students who exhibit signs of social-emotional stress and/or behavioral concerns are referred to the school guidance counselor and behavior specialist for counseling and support. The students' needs are met through behavior plans and supports, social-skills lessons and positive behavioral reinforcements. Students' needs are monitored monthly by the MTSS team to ensure student success. In addition, teachers will complete classroom-specific needs assessment surveys so they and the guidance counselor can develop tailored guidance lessons. The guidance counselor provides parents with contacts for counseling resources outside of the school if additional assistance is needed to support the school and/or in the home environment.

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

Students completing our Pre-Kindergarten varying exceptionalities program have IEPs amended to add transition goals. Home schools are furnished with transition IEPs for each student. Children ready to enter kindergarten are invited to attend yearly summer registration and our kindergarten orientation. Parents are encouraged to enroll students early to begin the transition process. All kindergarten students at Dr. Phillips Elementary School are assessed in order to determine individual and group needs and to

assist in the development of robust instructional/intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of basic skills/school readiness, oral language/syntax, print/letter knowledge, and phonological awareness/processing.

Core kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice of all academic and/or social-emotional skills identified by the screening data. Social skills instruction will occur daily and will be reinforced throughout the day through the use of a common language, re-teaching, modeling and positive reinforcement of pro- social behavior. Screening tools will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine learning gains, necessary changes to instruction and intervention programs.

Records are reviewed for incoming transfer students to ensure appropriate services are provided. The guidance counselor and fifth grade teachers coordinate fifth grade students' orientation to ensure effective transitions to middle school. Input on schedule and placements are provided as requested by middle school counselors.

**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.**

The MTSS Coach and principal or assistant principal meet with teachers twice a month to analyze and interpret student assessment data. As applicable, appropriate referrals are submitted to the MTSS team for review. Those students identified below grade level are assigned to specific intervention groups based on skill deficit. Teachers are responsible for ongoing progress monitoring. Progress will be tracked and graphed to ensure appropriate interventions are successful.

Title III funds are used to provide support for our ELL population. Support is offered to our kindergarten through fifth grade ELL students, providing reinforcement of skills taught in the classroom. Two ESOL paraprofessionals will work with identified ELLs. Bilingual dictionaries will be requested from the district and/or purchased as needed. Our new ELL students will use the Imagine Learning program to help them acquire the needed English language skills.

The Homeless Education program, provided through the McKinney-Vento Act, allows for services to students if they are classified as homeless. When parents register, they complete the Orange County Public School Housing questionnaire. The school guidance counselor is the contact for the program and ensures parents are aware of the services available to the family. The District Homeless Social Worker provides resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

DPES has implemented a Student-of-the-Month program. Classroom teachers, the guidance counselor, and/or support staff teach the monthly character traits. The guidance counselor will teach social skills groups for targeted students as identified through the MTSS process, data meetings or teacher referral. The Varying Exceptionalities resource teacher will consult with ESE students identified via the IEP process.

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

Destination College continues to be culturally embedded at DPES. Third, fourth and fifth grade students create Destination College binders, which are portfolios of student work that are reviewed every nine weeks with their classroom teachers. By fifth grade, students will earn a word-processing certificate. Fifth

graders also learn to utilize the Cornell note-taking system.

Dr. Phillips Elementary participates in Teach-In every year to expose students to a variety of career opportunities. All classes participate in Teach-In. Approximately 50 sessions presented by many professionals are scheduled. Sessions have included information about being a doctor, a photographer, a model, a wedding planner, a physical fitness trainer, a yoga instructor, a scientist, a computer programmer, an engineer, a chef, a theme park employee, a financial adviser and many other professions.

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Staff will collaboratively plan rigorous standards based lessons using complex text, research based reading strategies, and student engagement strategies monitored by ongoing common assessments.</b>				<b>\$11,120.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$6,120.00
			<i>Notes: Three TDY days during the school year.</i>			
		239-Other	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Kagan Training, Materials, and follow up PD.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Leadership and teachers will structure, implement, and monitor a Multi Tiered Title System of Supports (MTSS) to close the achievement gap between minority subgroups and the student population.</b>				<b>\$51,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		239-Other	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: Additional instructional resources for intervention and small groups</i>			
		160-Other Support Personnel	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$45,000.00
			<i>Notes: Additional support personnel and tutoring.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$62,120.00</b>