

Orange County Public Schools

Castleview Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

<https://castleviewes.ocps.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jonathan Rasmussen

Start Date for this Principal: 1/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 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	
* 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	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

<https://castleviewes.ocps.net>

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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
Helton, Julie	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Clark, Mary	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment and a positive behavior system; overseeing the exceptional student education program; and other duties as assigned by the principal.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

42

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	0%	57%	57%	0%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	58%	0%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	63%	63%	0%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	61%	62%	0%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	51%	0%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	53%	0%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
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
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
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

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

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 data component showing the lowest performance was English Language Arts for the Students with Disabilities subgroup. Seventy-eight percent (11 out of 14) of SWD scholars in our current fourth and fifth grades scored Level 1 or 2. Castleview does not have scores for last year's fifth grade scholars, as it is a new school and those scholars have matriculated to sixth grade. Factors contributing to last year's low performance may have been a lack of focus on SWD scholars; a lack of resources for accommodating SWD scholars; or inadequate classroom support for SWD scholars.

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

Because Castleview is a new school, there is no prior data to compare.

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.

The Castleview LY subgroup scored 31% in Levels 3 and above, opposed to 39% at the state level. This difference of 8% could be attributed to the percentage of newcomers within the subgroup; lack of ESOL strategies used during instruction; or a lack of differentiation of instruction among the varying ELL proficiency levels.

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

Because Castleview is a new school, there is no prior data to compare.

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

Because Castleview is a new school, there is no EWS data. However, Castleview staff members will closely monitor attendance, suspensions and grades throughout the school year. Immediate interventions will include parent contact (phone conferences, meetings), mentoring, and tutoring.

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

1. Closing the achievement gap in ELA between SWD and general education scholars.
2. Closing the achievement gap in ELA between ELL and non-ELL scholars.

3. Closing the achievement gap in Math between SWD and general education scholars.
4. Closing the achievement gap in Math between ELL and non-ELL scholars.
5. Closing the achievement gap in ELA between Hispanic and white scholars.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Narrowing the Achievement Gap
Rationale	Based on a review of both ELA and Mathematics FSA data from 2018-2019, achievement gaps exist among several subgroups at Castleview Elementary.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Achievement gaps will be narrowed by at least 5% for the following subgroups in both ELA and Mathematics: LY, Hispanic, and SWD.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Close reading will be utilized across all content areas to improve students' literacy skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"A significant body of research links the close reading of complex text—whether the student is a struggling reader or advanced—to significant gains in reading proficiency and finds close reading to be a key component of college and career readiness" (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, 2011, p. 7). Close reading strategies can be used to assist ALL learners in ALL subject areas, including mathematics. Orange County Public Schools has developed a professional development series based on close reading and other literacy strategies, which a team of educators from Castleview will attend. This support will drive the improvement in teaching and learning as the team returns to school and shares their learning with their colleagues.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site based PLC team from Castleview will attend professional development in literacy strategies including close reading, text dependent questions, and evidence-based writing. 2. Teachers will be supported in their planning and implementation of these strategies through PLCs and coaching. 3. Student work will be examined in PLCs, and discussions regarding how to improve teaching and learning will occur. 4. Teachers will take part in peer observations to improve selected aspects of their practice. 5. Administrators will complete coaching, informal and formal observations, and give teachers feedback regarding the implementation of instructional strategies in their classroom.
Person Responsible	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Accelerating Student Achievement
Rationale	Based on the 2019 FSA data of the incoming fourth and fifth graders, 68% scored levels 3-5 on ELA and 79% scored levels 3-5 on Math. Strategies must be implemented that will lead to increased percentages of students who score on or above grade level.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Castleview Elementary will achieve 75% of students scoring levels 3-5 on FSA ELA and 80% of students scoring levels 3-5 on FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Writing in various forms, throughout all content areas, will be utilized to increase student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Writing to Learn develops students' ideas and critical thinking. Writing to Learn supports student processing and interpretation. Writing to Demonstrate Learning provides opportunities for students to communicate what they learned while developing writing skills through interacting with content. Multiple resources were used to determine this focus, such as professional articles and districtwide training.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site based Professional Learning Community members will attend training on evidence-based writing instruction. 2. Castleview teachers will participate in professional development regarding writing to learn and writing to demonstrate learning throughout the school year. 3. Castleview teachers and staff will collaborate in professional learning communities to share best practices and examine student writing to determine the next steps for instruction.
Person Responsible	Julie Helton (julie.helton@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).

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.

Castleview Elementary School is not a 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.

Castleview Elementary School is not a Title I school.

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

Castleview Elementary School is not a Title I school.

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.

Castleview Elementary School is not a Title I school.

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

Castleview Elementary School is not a Title I school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Narrowing the Achievement Gap	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Accelerating Student Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00