

Orange County Public Schools

Aloma Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.ocps.net

Demographics

Principal: Donald Vega

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	100%
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: C (52%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: A (63%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.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	96%
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	C	B	A	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
Vega, Donald	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessments of MTSS skills of school staff; guarantees implementation of intervention support and documentation; endorses adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Calibrate classroom walk-through data as a method to progress monitor as a leadership team. DPLC-District facilitator and school level facilitator.
Gonzalez- Garcia, Marta	Other	Provides support with Class Dojo to teachers and parents as needed; monitors ELL students; ensures that teachers are using appropriate strategies to safeguard student success; serves as Spanish translator and supports ELL parents; facilitates Imagine Learning, MPLC and grade level intervention groups; DPLC school level participant. Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities/ materials into Tier 3 instruction; collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching to ensure that SWD are receiving differentiated and rigorous instruction; monitors the implementation of all IEPs and 504 plans; and facilitates a grade level intervention group.
Gallagher, Diane	Other	Monitors discipline and implements intervention; develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides guidance on K-12 Reading Plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; as well as facilitates a grade level intervention group.
Kohr, Heather	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides guidance on K-12 Reading Plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and facilitates a grade level intervention group.
Williams, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Develops, leads, and evaluates our school core curriculum and content programs; assists with school screening programs like i-Ready, that provide appropriate, evidence-based intervention and differentiated teaching strategies; supports MTSS through PLC team collaboration while leading teachers to a common goal of student achievement. Monitors classroom walk-through frequency and pinpoints areas of support with the leadership team for coaching. DPLC school level participant.

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	95	84	86	84	87	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	7	10	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	24	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	6	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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)

42

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

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	18	14	9	10	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	5	9	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	38	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	1	1	11	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	18	14	9	10	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	5	9	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	38	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	1	1	11	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	65%	57%	57%	60%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	58%	58%	70%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	53%	70%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	63%	63%	73%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	61%	62%	79%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	48%	51%	61%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	56%	53%	64%	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	95 (0)	84 (0)	86 (0)	84 (0)	87 (0)	105 (0)	541 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (18)	14 (14)	7 (9)	10 (10)	11 (14)	13 (13)	68 (78)
One or more suspensions	1 (2)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (5)	4 (8)	9 (15)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (1)	2 (3)	6 (5)	7 (9)	6 (11)	5 (7)	27 (36)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (24)	24 (38)	43 (30)	83 (92)

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	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	63%	0%	64%	-1%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	53%	-12%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	29		22	33						
ELL	48	56	67	61	51	38	28				
ASN	83			75							
BLK	57	57		54	52		25				
HSP	60	55	53	60	46	31	42				
WHT	76	56		75	64		57				
FRL	57	49	55	55	45	30	35				
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	27	67	83	30	47	50					
ELL	38	74	83	63	70	53					
ASN	64	55		86	64						
BLK	57	46		57	62		47				
HSP	47	63	86	57	61	50	39				
WHT	61	60		78	56		60				
FRL	51	59	73	61	60	53	50				
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	24	50	54	34	48	50	35				
ELL	34	58	67	54	66	47	40				
ASN	68	67		84	83						
BLK	61	82		68	82		36				
HSP	49	70	67	62	72	57	51				
MUL	60			80							
WHT	74	69		89	86		93				

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
FRL	54	66	64	69	76	63	56				

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	55
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	53
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	79
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	49
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	53
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	66
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	50
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.

Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains was Aloma's lowest performance area at 30 percent of students making gains. We had 2 classes significantly under perform in math. One class had 12 percent of the students meet proficiency and the other class had 18 percent of the students meet proficiency. These

two classes were inconsistent with differentiating math instruction and in utilizing the iReady program. We have dropped in performance over the last three years. In 2018, 50 percent of our Lowest 25% made learning gains in math. In 2017, 61 percent of our Lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

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

Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains was Aloma's greatest decline from the prior year. Aloma dropped 20 points. Inconsistency with differentiating math instruction and utilizing the iReady program contributed to the decline.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains. The state average is 50 percent. Aloma scored 30 percent marking a 20 point gap. Inconsistency with differentiating math instruction and utilizing the iReady program contributed to the gap.

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

ELA proficiency showed the most improvement. Overall, Aloma increased 11 points with 65 percent of students meeting proficiency. All grades significantly improved with third grade increasing 20 points, fourth grade increasing 10 points and fifth grade increasing 7 points. This was done through support, feedback, and collaborative planning with staff members in order to help them understand and plan standards-based instruction through the use of content specific, complex texts and standards aligned tasks (DPLC), as well as the use of text-dependent questions.

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

Two areas of concern for the upcoming school year are Science Proficiency and Math/ ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains. In science, we scored 44 percent proficiency which is 11 points lower than the state average. In Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains, we scored 30 percent. The state average is 50 percent. In ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains, we scored 56 percent. The state average is 59 percent.

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

1. Math and ELA Lowest 25%
2. Science Proficiency
3. SWD gap in ELA Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest 25% Math and ELA [Division Priority- Narrow Achievements Gaps]
Rationale	This area of focus was selected due to a significant drop in Math and ELA learning gains within the lowest quartile. In Math, 30 percent of the lowest quartile made a learning gain. This is a 20 percent decline from the previous year. In ELA, 56 percent of the lowest quartile made a learning gain. This is an 18 point decline from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase learning gains within our lowest quartile. We intend to increase by 30 percentage points in Math for a total score of 60 percent. In ELA, we intend to increase by 5 percentage points for a total score of 61 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	DPLC Literacy Strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	DPLC initiative focuses on student utilization of close reading strategies and complex texts to enhance proficiency across all content areas. These strategies are effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including ELL and ESE students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze students in the lowest quartile and determine support needed for ELL and ESE students. 2. Maximize differentiation in ELA and Math by incorporating small group instruction and learning stations. 3. Provide after school tutoring targeting ELA and Math standards. 4. Open computer lab before school for students to work on iReady. 5. Monitor students' common assessments and iReady diagnostics. The data will be used to drive and adjust instruction based on individual student needs. 6. Continue implementing DPLC initiatives focusing on complex texts, academic discussions and close reading. 7. Continue implementing and monitoring the MTSS process and conduct MTSS meetings. 8. Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs and provide the teachers with meaningful and actionable feedback.
Person Responsible	Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency [Division Priority- Narrow Achievements Gaps]
Rationale	Science scores have decreased over the last two years. Aloma scored 44 percent proficiency. This marks a six point decline from the 2018-2019 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase the proficiency of all 5th grade students on the Science FCAT by 16 percentage points. Aloma will achieve 60 percent proficiency as measured by the 2019-2020 Science FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit Systematic Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. This strategy is effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including ELL and ESE students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine supports needed for ELL and ESE 5th grade students. 2. Incorporate DPLC literacy strategies such as close reads, text dependent questions and academic discussion using science text. 3. As needed, instructional coach will provide support in planning and instruction through the coaching cycle. 4. Monitor 5th grade students' common assessments and PMA results. Data from these assessments will be used to drive and adjust instruction based on individual student needs. 5. Initiate Science Saturdays once per month for 4th and 5th grade students. Students will work on hands on experiments aligned to science standards from October to March. 6. Hold Science Boot Camp for 5th grade students in April. Standards from the three Science PMAs will be identified and focused on during the camp. 7. Strengthen vocabulary skills with school-wide focus on science vocabulary. We will hold a vocabulary competition each semester. 8. Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs and provide the teachers with meaningful and actionable feedback.
Person Responsible	Donald Vega (donald.vega@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).

Continuing the MAO initiative of Culturally Responsive Schools, Aloma will create a committee that is focused on cultural awareness. This committee will work to encourage parental engagement from all cultures; and celebrate diversity and multiculturalism. Aloma will host a Multicultural Night in December in which the students will engage in songs and dances from around the world. As part of our Global Studies Academy our students study specific regions of the world. Students will showcase their research

and projects during Multicultural Night. Our students will also make global connections as they explore culture, arts, and sciences.

Our SAC has noted the connection between social emotional learning (SEL) as the foundation to academic success. This year our SAC is supporting the school's social and emotional learning program. A subcommittee within the SAC will be established. The program will reflect the critical role of positive relationships and emotional connections in the learning process. The objective is to help students develop a range of skills they need for school and life. The SEL skills include the ability to set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, make responsible decisions, understand and manage emotions.

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.

Aloma Elementary School develops family and community partnerships through numerous activities and initiatives. The Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) will be responsible for coordinating all community-school events such as curriculum nights, awards ceremonies, and Family Fun Night. The role of the PEL is to further increase family involvement by working to remove barriers that prohibit families from engaging in school events at Aloma Elementary. In addition to coordinating all school family events, the PEL will assist with such tasks as organizing transportation for parents unable to reach the school for events and providing translation for families who are not yet able to communicate in English.

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.

In collaboration with the Winter Park Health Foundation, Aloma offers counseling services through Community Help and Intervention in Life's Lessons (CHILL). The program includes a counselor assigned to Aloma Elementary. Students are supported by the CHILL counselor through teacher referral or parent requests. The program provides counseling for a variety of emotional concerns. Services are offered to both students and parents. In addition, Aloma has a full-time guidance counselor on staff. The guidance counselor provides on-site counseling, small group counseling, class check-ins, SEL classroom lessons, processes outside counseling referrals and crisis intervention.

Aloma has a Threat Assessment Team. The team meets each month to review the progress of any students that had an incident involving a threat in which the Threat Response to Suicide or Harm to Self or Others Incident Form was completed. During the meeting, the team discusses whether the plans and supports put in place have been implemented, if the plans and supports are being successful and if further supports are needed.

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

The PreK teacher collaborates with the kindergarten team and with the Headstart team to help students transition from PreK into kindergarten. Aloma hosts a Meet the Teacher day during preplanning week. Parents and students have an opportunity to visit their classroom to get information and preparation strategies for entering each grade level. Students leaving Aloma at the end of 5th grade will go on an informational field trip and take a tour of Glenridge Middle 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.

Assessment and progress monitoring data are used to align differentiated instruction within Tier 1, 2, and 3 as well as to identify students' needs. Intervention time is built into daily schedule. Students are pulled for small group instruction. Meetings are held to identify problems. Regular data meetings are held to review and analyze the existing problem and the available data. Plans are developed to establish goals. The team then meets again to review and analyze new data. Aloma engages in examining school-wide data to assist in structuring core instruction.

Title I, Part A: Aloma Elementary is a Title I school; therefore, it receives additional federal funding for use with high need students. The majority of our Title I funds are used to fund staff positions to provide additional instructional support. The remainder of the funds are used for staff development, instructional materials and parental involvement activities. Our Parent Engagement Liaison is also funded through Title I. School based after school tutoring is funded by the federal government and provides tutoring for students on campus.

Title III: Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of English Language Learners. Any additional funds are distributed to the school for purchase of instructional materials. Title III is funding one Bilingual Teaching Position and one Bilingual para position. Aloma will continue using the Imagine Learning program for first year ELL students.

Title X- Homeless: Homeless district and school based personnel provide resources such as clothing, school supplies, Social Services referrals for students identified as homeless (under the McKinney-Vento Act). Aloma hosts a number of students classified as homeless. We provide assistance with food and other items for the holidays through school wide food drives.

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

Aloma Elementary School has established a collegiate culture throughout the campus. Teachers and students are encouraged to wear collegiate shirts on Mondays. Teachers are encouraged to talk about the college shirt that they are wearing, including where the college is located. In addition, teachers post on their classroom doors signage of the college/university they attended, the degree they earned and the school's location. Activities such as Teach In and our focus on global studies allows students to be exposed to career and technical information.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest 25% Math and ELA [Division Priority- Narrow Achievements Gaps]				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency [Division Priority- Narrow Achievements Gaps]				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	1401 - Aloma Elementary	General Fund		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Teacher pay and supplies.</i>			
Total:						\$2,500.00