

Orange County Public Schools

Chickasaw 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Chickasaw Elementary

6900 AUTUMNVALE DR, Orlando, FL 32822

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

Demographics

Principal: Xhuljeta Gjini

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Chickasaw Elementary

6900 AUTUMNVALE DR, Orlando, FL 32822

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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.

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
Ledesma, Bethany	Principal	Bethany Ledesma is the instructional leader of our school. She provides on-going support to staff and students. With her guidance and direction, the leadership team is able to find solutions that best support our students and teachers in reaching success. She is an advocate for our school; she motivates and encourages staff, parents, and students to work collaboratively to achieve academic excellence. Her primary goal is the all-around success of our students, staff, and school.
Adames, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Cynthia Adames is the curriculum compliance teacher and will provide all teachers with ESOL information and strategies to reach the needs of all students that are learning a second language. She will also provide a direct intervention for students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade that are new in the country with limited English. She monitors the Tier 3 ESOL students to ensure they are receiving the right curriculum and intervention to obtain achievable goals. She provides the parents with guidance, materials, and websites to support ELL students at home.
Bogosian-Boutwell, Paula	School Counselor	Paula Bogosian-Boutwell provides a comprehensive guidance program with a focus on prevention and intervention in accordance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Act. Students and families will also have access to school and community resources through the guidance program.
Victor, April	Instructional Coach	April Victor supports the teachers with instructional practices through coaching conversations, modeling, guided peer observations, professional development, and data analysis so that teachers can best support all students.
Ebersole, Linda	Other	Linda Ebersole provides support to teachers and students to effectively minimize behavior disruptions to help create a safe environment for all students. She also coordinates and sponsors the Science SECME Team and Science Fair.
Kiem, Melanie	Instructional Media	Melanie Kiem helps support the global school goals by working to help students develop their literacy, critical thinking, and social skills as they learn how to access, assess, and use information as life-long learners. Through the use of the school integrated Accelerated Reader

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		program, she helps build enthusiasm for reading and other content areas. She strives to turn the students into lovers of reading and avid seekers of knowledge.
Whittlesey, Julie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Julie Whittlesey works as a resource teacher with a focus on curriculum. Her duties include working with teachers to coordinate interventions for students who are struggling in reading or mathematics.</p> <p>She facilitates data meetings with teachers to review progress monitoring data and make decisions for instruction, including the students in the lowest 25%. Another responsibility includes teaching small groups of students who are struggling with math skills, working directly with students, including those in the lowest 25%.</p>
Bryant, Lauren	Teacher, ESE	<p>Lauren Bryant is the staffing specialist and her duties include monitoring student progress toward interventions and using data, along with a team, to determine eligibility for the exceptional student education program, including students that are gifted, students with disabilities, and the lowest 25%.</p> <p>She also facilitates meetings between parents, teachers, school and district representatives, to ensure that students, including the lowest 25% are receiving Individual Education Plans, 504 plans, health plans, and/or accommodations to make progress toward grade level curriculum.</p>
Hamann, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	<p>Jacqueline Hamann is the assistant principal and works as an instructional leader while ensuring that operational functions of the school are at the highest level at all times to guarantee that students have the best learning environment possible. She assists in coordinating schedules, works closely with teachers through the PLC process, and monitors data to target areas needed for growth throughout the school year. She also evaluates teachers and provides specific feedback in areas of growth using the Marzano model.</p>
Zayas, Emilie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Emilie Zayas is a reading resource teacher who works with small groups of students to increase their reading proficiency and close gaps. She utilizes the Leveled Literacy Intervention system with these groups to track and improve reading proficiency and comprehension.</p>

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Wednesday 8/5/2020, Xhuljeta Gjini

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	63	82	100	102	106	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	27	27	32	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	

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	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

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	96	93	104	97	105	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	15	19	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	0	7	9	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	0	3	9	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	96	93	104	97	105	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	15	19	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	0	7	9	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	0	3	9	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	59%	57%	57%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	58%	58%	49%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	53%	57%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	63%	63%	56%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	62%	49%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	51%	47%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	56%	53%	50%	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	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	63%	-2%	64%	-3%
	2018	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	53%	-7%
	2018	51%	53%	-2%	55%	-4%
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	39	40	22	33	31					
ELL	44	52	49	52	51	47	36				
BLK	67	73		67	53						
HSP	57	52	50	61	56	51	51				
WHT	54	29		56	50		42				
FRL	57	51	49	58	54	38	53				
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	7	18	19	14	15	6	18				
ELL	34	46	44	40	24	11	24				
BLK	66	50		55	35		58				
HSP	54	50	44	53	32	21	52				
WHT	56	42		50	32		80				
FRL	55	49	38	54	31	19	55				

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	17	41	48	20	37	39	18				
ELL	32	48	59	45	53	51	39				
BLK	69	55		61	60		50				
HSP	50	50	59	55	49	50	49				
WHT	54	35		53	42		50				
FRL	53	49	57	56	49	47	50				

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	56
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	51
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	65
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	56
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	46
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	54
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is 2019-20 science achievement showing 38% achievement based on PMA #2. Some contributing factors are lack of previously learned knowledge and lack of vocabulary.

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

Utilizing the 2019-20 PMA #2 data to make comparisons to 2018-2019 FSA data, science achievement showed the most decline decreasing from 54% to 38%. Contributing factors are a lack of science vocabulary and gaps in knowledge from previous years.

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, the learning gains in the bottom quartile for math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average for the 2018-2019 school year. Factors that contributed to that gap include a lack of prerequisite skills and lack of fluency. For the 2019-2020 school year, i-Ready data has been used to monitor student growth and the middle of the year (MOY) proficiency for ELA is 59% and math is 62%.

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

Utilizing the 2019-20 i-Ready middle of the year (MOY) data projections to make comparisons to 2018-2019 FSA data, ELA learning gains achievement showed the most improvement increasing from 52% to 64%. During the 2019-2020 school year, ELA What I Need (WIN) time was continued to target specific student needs. Also, a resource teacher utilized the Leveled Literacy Intervention program to pull small groups of struggling readers to provide intense intervention.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The first concern is attendance below 90 percent and the second concern is ELA course failure for 4th graders.

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

1. Writing as it relates to ELA achievement
2. Science achievement
3. Achievement of students with disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus is specific to improving the writing skills of all students. Writing is incorporated into all subjects and is essential to student success. When utilizing 2019-20 i-Ready MOY data and comparing ELA and math proficiency, ELA performance was lower than math with 59% achievement in ELA and 62% achievement in math.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of a focus on schoolwide writing, 65% of 4th and 5th grade students will achieve proficiency on the ELA Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Thinking Maps - Write from the Beginning training will be conducted for teachers to utilize during instruction. This strategy will provide teachers and students with a more specific process for writing. This strategy will also assist our fragile subgroup of Students with Disabilities to provide a mapped way of planning for writing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Thinking Maps are a tool that is already used schoolwide but hasn't been utilized as a focus for writing instruction. The students have some background knowledge of the maps and how to use them and will be able to apply that knowledge towards writing to help plan and formulate organized writing.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify a specific 30 minute block of time for writing

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Conduct quarterly progress monitoring

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Incorporate cross-curricular writing experiences into lessons

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Utilize Thinking Map rubrics to score writing samples and make decisions about next steps for future lessons

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Conduct professional development to include vertical planning and student samples

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Description: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.</p> <p>Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to increase attendance in school - to improve student behaviors and focus for instruction - to improve student achievement
Measurable Outcome: Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>After participating in social emotional content lessons, we expect for all students to have 90% or better school attendance. Additionally, discipline referrals will decrease and for student achievement as measured by FSA to increase from the previous year.</p> <p>Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Evidence-based Strategy: use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.</p> <p>Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.</p> <p>Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our ESE students are the majority of our lowest performing quartile students. We will provide additional resources and intensified small group instruction to target their IEP goals.

Science remains a concern and area of growth. Additional hands-on experiences will continue to be provided to 5th grade students to enhance their understanding of content and increase knowledge.

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.

Chickasaw Elementary has a Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) who provides resources and support to all families so they can fully participate in their child's education. She works closely with the guidance counselor and social worker to identify needs of families to provide workshops on needed topics.

Social Emotional professional development will be provided to all staff this year to increase their awareness and understanding of student needs as it relates to school and home. This will be intertwined into the regular academic curriculum.

A Multicultural Night will take place where all countries represented at Chickasaw Elementary will present and provide information to all families. This encourages families to take pride in all of the various nationalities and cultures at the school.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$13,491.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1141	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	General Fund		\$3,285.00
			<i>Notes: Train the Trainer - Thinking Maps Write from the Beginning</i>			
	1141	692-Computer Software Non-Capitalized	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$5,706.00
			<i>Notes: Accelerated Reader Schoolwide License & STAR Reading</i>			
	1141	692-Computer Software Non-Capitalized	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: MyOn Reader</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$74,892.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1141	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	General Fund		\$74,892.00
			<i>Notes: Guidance Counselor Salary</i>			
Total:						\$88,383.00