

Orange County Public Schools

Eagle Creek Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Eagle Creek Elementary

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

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

Demographics

Principal: Patricia Cells

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2019-20 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%)
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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Eagle Creek Elementary

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>37%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>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>78%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	Teacher, K-12	<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	Instructional Coach	<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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/5/2015, Patricia Cells

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	19	139	166	158	183	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	8	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	12	0	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	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	

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	
	(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.

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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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.

Due to no testing data for the 2019-2020 school year, 2018-2019 FSA data is still being considered for the 2020-2021 School Improvement Plan. 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.

Due to no statewide testing occurring for the 2019-2020 school year, there were no declines in any components. Based on the 2018-2019 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.

Considering the 2018-2019 FSA data, 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?

For the 2018-2019 school year, the data component which 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?

Based on most recent EWS data, two potential areas for concern are level 1 scores on the 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) (81 students) and attendance rates below 90% (71 students). This will be addressed through strategic planning with the MTSS process and monthly student services meetings to review all forms of data (academic, attendance, discipline) with a diverse team of school stakeholders.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) 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 Steps to Implement

1. Backward design/ common planning - Leadership team (August 20, 2020 - ongoing).
2. Coaching observations - Leadership team (August 2020 - ongoing).
3. Data analysis - all stake holder groups (August 2020 - ongoing).
4. Weekly PLC meetings- Leadership team (August 2020 - ongoing)
5. Job embedded professional development- Instructional coach, administration
6. Before and after school tutoring programs- teachers, leadership team (October 2020- April 2021)
7. MTSS professional development/ progress monitoring - (August 2020 - ongoing)
8. Implementation of district approved math programs (iReady, Reflex math) - (August 2020 - ongoing)

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: 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 Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) 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 Steps to Implement

1. Backward design/ common planning - Leadership team (August 20, 2020 - ongoing).
2. Coaching observations - Leadership team (August 2020 - ongoing).
3. Data analysis - all stake holder groups (August 2020 - ongoing).
4. Weekly PLC meetings- Leadership team (August 2020 - ongoing)
5. Job embedded professional development- Instructional coach, administration
6. Before and after school tutoring programs- teachers, leadership team (October 2020- April 2021)
7. MTSS professional development/ progress monitoring - (August 2020 - ongoing)
8. Implementation of district approved reading programs (iReady, Learning A to Z, SIPPS) - (August 2020 - ongoing)

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To support and meet the needs of of the whole child through social emotional and cultural competency initiatives.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is an increase in reading 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: To support social emotional learning and cultural competency, we will continue to build capacity at Eagle Creek elementary through the Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) and Minority Achievement (MAO) initiatives. close reading strategies with text dependent questions, pre-teaching vocabulary, front loading concepts, implementing universal design for learning (UDL) strategies, and supporting teachers with the implementation of high yield strategies. We will monitor progress through the MTSS process, before school tutoring programs, social emotional curriculum implementation, and engage in group problem solving and data analysis.

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 Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) and MAO initiatives. 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 Steps to Implement

1. Backward design/ common planning addressing SEL- Leadership team (August 20, 2020 - ongoing).
2. Coaching observations - Leadership team (August 2020 - ongoing).
3. Data analysis - all stake holder groups (August 2020 - ongoing).
4. Weekly PLC meetings- Leadership team (August 2020 - ongoing)
5. Job embedded professional development- Instructional coach, administration
6. Before and after school tutoring programs- teachers, leadership team (October 2020- April 2021)
7. MTSS professional development/ progress monitoring / SEL strategies - (August 2020 - ongoing)

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will address the remaining school wide improvement priorities by engaging in data analysis to drive instructional and social emotional initiatives. We will closely monitor the implementation of strategies to make content more comprehensible to our students with special needs. We will analyze data and create plans for reteach and reassess through the MTSS process. Lastly, we will continue to build a positive school culture through district Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) initiatives.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Eagle Creek Elementary builds a positive school environment by seeking valuable input and establishing strong relationships with school and community stakeholder groups. Eagle Creek works tirelessly to provide positive and culturally responsive experiences for students, staff, and families. The school community is always looking for new and inventive ways to enable students to meet their highest level of potential. Strong school and community partnerships drive school decision making through informed, collaborative initiatives that provide our students with the best educational experience possible.

Eagle Creek's school advisory council meets monthly to discuss school improvement efforts centered on the academic and social emotional well-being of our students. The collaboration between school and community has supported students and teachers through providing valuable resources to increase student achievement. Eagle Creeks SAC has shown tremendous support for building teacher capacity through professional development. The school advisory council has helped to fund training in positive school culture initiatives such as the model school conference.

Eagle Creek has a well-established parent teacher association (PTA) that works hard to provide meaningful experiences for the community. The PTA supports all families and students through various community events throughout the year. Some examples of how Eagle Creeks PTA supports a positive school culture are through events such as the annual school carnival, school dances, community fundraisers and enrichment opportunities for all students. For the 2020-2021 school year, Eagle Creek's PTA will continue to support teacher development through funding professional development that continues to build cultural awareness as well as teacher development in support of our specialized classrooms.

The school based DPLC team works closely with teachers to help support culturally responsive instruction through the implementation of evidence based strategies that support all student groups. As a school

community, Eagle Creek will continue to support teacher development in this area, and enhance it through job imbedded professional learning.

Eagle Creek has over twenty teacher-sponsored clubs to help support the diverse needs and interests of all students. School clubs give students a variety of choices that appeal to them. Additionally, school club activities enable students to build positive relationships with peers.

Eagle Creek also supports the OCPS induction program with our teacher sponsored “Cub Club.” The “Cub Club” meets monthly with teachers within their first three years in the classroom. The “Cub Club” supports new teachers in learning about various topics such as the instructional framework, MTSS, and the ways of OCPS. The “Cub Club” brings new and veteran teachers together to help increase teacher capacity and build strong relationships among the staff.

Going into the 2020-2021 school year, Eagle Creek elementary will begin the implementation of a Culture Awareness Club. The club will focus on ways to bring positive culture to the school by working closely with stakeholders to increase community wide cultural competency. This club will support our stakeholder groups by providing parent training, book studies, community feedback surveys, and community events.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$97,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	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 and after school in the area of mathematics.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$147,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary	General Fund		\$140,000.00
			<i>Notes: Identified teachers will support MTSS (multi-tiered system of supports) process to close the 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% of students.</i>			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$245,000.00