Aloma Elementary

leadership
analysis
students
Florida
college and career
mission
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
relationships
teaching
learning
resources
areas of focus
success
supportive environment
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.ocps.net

Demographics

Principal: Donald Vega

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
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 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%)
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

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.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	80%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	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
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 intervention 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 for Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership.
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.
Lufkin, Lauren	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.
Thornburgh, Jennifer	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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/8/2017, Donald Vega

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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%)
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	80	78	94	80	86	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	495
Attendance below 90 percent	9	16	22	17	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	7	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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	
	(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	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	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%					
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				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
FRL	57	49	55	55	45	30	35				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				
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	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	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	79
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	49
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	53
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	66
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	50
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.

Math is the lowest performance component based on 2019-2020 i-Ready MOY data. We had 25% of our 3rd graders show proficiency on the BOY which increased to 38% on the MOY. In 4th grade, 41% of our students showed proficiency on the BOY which increased to 57% on the MOY. Our 5th grade students scored 35% proficiency on the BOY which increased to 45% on the MOY. In reviewing the data we determined that algebra was our strongest domain across all three grade levels. The geometry domain was our lowest domain across third, fourth, and fifth grade. We attribute this to the geometry standards not being presented to our students until later in the school year as outlined by the district's scope and sequence.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline across third, fourth, and fifth grade from the prior year was math. For the last three years, math has been an area of focus at Aloma Elementary. After analyzing the data, we noted that there was a decline of 3% from 2018 to 2019 in the geometry domain on the i-Ready MOY diagnostic. Based on this data we have determined the decline occurred as a result of the teachers not having ample time to reteach and reassess the geometry standards presented in the third and fourth nine weeks.

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 data component with the greatest gap in comparison to the state average is the 2018-2019 FSA Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains. With a 21% gap, 30% of Aloma's lowest quartile made a learning gain as compared to 51% of the state. In order to increase student proficiency, a crucial practice would be to implement explicit, systematic methods of teaching. Time will be allotted to address student deficiencies and strengthen foundational math skills. Moving forward the leadership team will schedule time to conduct routine progress monitoring on individual students or classes as a whole. The data gathered will be used to identify, target, and adjust instruction and intervention.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the 2018-2019 FSA ELA. Aloma increased 11 points with 65% of students meeting proficiency. All grades significantly improved with third increasing 20 points, fourth grade increasing 10 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), close-reads, use of text-dependent questions, as well as academic discourse.

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

Based on the EWS data, an area identified as a concern is second grade attendance. In the prior year, there were 22 second graders present less than 90% of the school year. Improved attendance is imperative as we prepare the students for the ELA and math state assessments. To limit potential gaps in learning, these students will be closely monitored and encouraged to be in attendance daily.

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

1. Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2. Overall Proficiency for Students with Disabilities (ESSA)
3. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
4. Science Proficiency
5. Social Emotional Learning and Leadership

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Aloma will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. 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 positive culture for social and emotional learning, we will see an increase in student achievement and a decrease in student discipline.
Measurable Outcome:	The specific measurable outcome we would like to see decrease is threats to self and others. With an increased focus on social skill groups and the new SELL initiative, we anticipate a 10 percent drop in reports of threats to self or others from 15 to 13 reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Courtney Williams (courtney.williams@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aloma will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

SELL Site Team will monitor, measure, and modify SELL implementation as needed.

Person Responsible	Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

Establish a common language to support a school culture and climate of social emotional learning for students and teachers.

Person Responsible	Courtney Williams (courtney.williams@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Aloma's area of focus is to accelerate student performance by increasing the overall proficiency for the ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities. Last school year's data shows that the students with disabilities under performed the other subgroups as identified by ESSA therefore resulting in Aloma being identified as a Targeted Support and Improvement school.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall student proficiency for students with disabilities from 27 percent to 41 percent as outlined in the 2020-2021 Every Student Success Act.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aloma will build a culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) in order to increase student success through data-driven common planning, PLCs, support facilitation, push-in/ pull-out support, and input in the MTSS process. As a result, both general education teachers, ESE teachers, and paraprofessionals will provide intensive standards aligned ELA and math instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collaboration between the general education teacher, the ESE teacher, and the ESE paraprofessional each will bring their skills, training, and perspectives to the team. Resources are combined to strengthen teaching and learning opportunities, methods, and effectiveness. By combining their expertise and skills teachers are able to build a strong relationship to better meet the needs of all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaboration between the general education teacher, the ESE teacher, and the ESE paraprofessional to support student learning through intensive standards-based ELA and math instruction.

Person Responsible Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

Common planning and data-driven PLCs that allow teachers to collaborate and identify trends to adjust instruction/intervention as needed. PLC meeting notes coupled with actionable feedback will assist with monitoring to determine effectiveness and execution.

Person Responsible Jennifer Thornburgh (jennifer.thornburgh@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In order to improve attendance rates, Aloma's leadership team will cultivate a school wide culture of attendance. The team will stress the importance of going to class daily, engaging staff members in consistently sending positive messages that attendance matters, and by implementing a school wide system for perfect attendance that provides students with incentives and recognition quarterly. The leadership team will also start outreach to targeted families before school begins. In addition, Aloma will participate in the celebration of National Attendance Awareness month in September. The celebration will launch the school year off with a strong start and build awareness of the importance of attendance.

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.

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.

Aloma Elementary partners with the PTA in order to hold multiple events throughout the year to promote the partnership between the school and the community. These events include curriculum nights such as literacy night, math night, and science night; multicultural night to promote and recognize diversity; family events such All Pro Dads, ice cream socials; and fundraisers such as the Fall Festival and Go Take a Hike. Aloma also partners with additional volunteers through Full Sail University and the Read2Succeed program. Both entities support students by helping to improve their vocabulary, reading/math fluency, and reading/ math comprehension. Through these events as well as collaboration with the School Advisory Council, Aloma has achieved the Five Star School Award for 2019-2020 school year.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	1401 - Aloma Elementary	General Fund		$2,500.00
			Notes: Teacher pay and supplies.			
					Total:	$2,500.00