William S Maxey Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

William S Maxey Elementary

602 E STORY ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://maxeyes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Sean Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	N/A
* 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

William S Maxey Elementary

602 E STORY ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://maxeyes.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	91%

School Grades History

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

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
Davis-Wilson, Carletta	Principal	Principal, Carletta Davis-Wilson: The principal leads the school and ensures all faculty and staff are working towards the school's mission and vision. She conducts all formal observations to make sure all instructional employees are implementing the Marzano Instructional Framework. She utilizes data-based decision-making to ensure the students are provided a meaningful education. The principal is responsible for ensuring students are provided standards-based and differentiated instruction, as well as intervention services. She facilitates data meetings and school leadership team meetings to discuss student academic progress. The principal regularly communicates with stakeholders regarding the school and students' academic progress.
Young, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Tara Young: The resource teacher is responsible for timely inventory and delivery of instructional resources to teachers. The CRT schedules, organizes, and maintains the testing calendar to ensure assessments are completed. She is the designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state assessments. She is responsible for collecting and analyzing data as well as generating data reports bimonthly to identify trends in instruction. The CRT schedules all professional development trainings, supports classroom instruction, and conducts peer feedback.
McPherson, Demetries	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Demetries McPherson and Instructional Coach, Irarissa Louis: The instructional coaches ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. They facilitate weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coaches assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at-risk." In addition, they assist in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. They routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. Instructional coaches model lessons and support

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction. Coaches are also an integral part of developing common assessments.
	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Maria Saulsby: The guidance counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. As a member of the Child Study Team, Mrs. Saulsby provide intervention to families and students identified as needing intervention for truancy. She is the liaison for families needing academic, behavioral, and/or mental support services. She assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children considered "at-risk." The guidance counselor facilitates IEP meetings and is a member of the MTSS team. The guidance counselor is responsible for modeling and monitoring implementation of health lessons grades K-5.
Horne, Christine	Other	ESOL Compliance Specialist, Christine Horne: As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Horne coordinates assessments for English Language Learners, oversees placements and supports in the general education classroom. She is responsible for monitoring and tracking ELL student performance in order to identify trends in instruction. She provides professional development trainings in accountable areas.
Louis, Irarissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Demetries McPherson and Instructional Coach, Irarissa Louis: The instructional coaches ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. They facilitate weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coaches assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at-risk." In addition, they assist in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. They routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. Instructional coaches model lessons

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction. Coaches are also an integral part of developing common assessments.
Urquhart, Michelle	Other	Behavior Specialist, Dr. Michelle Urquhart: As a Behavior Specialist, Dr. Urquhart facilitates the MTSS Behavior Team. The Behavior Team establishes school-wide procedures designed to meet district and State objectives. This includes creating a safe, inclusive learning environment for all students; especially those with special needs as well as general education students needing behavior intervention support. Dr. Urquhart is responsible for monitoring and tracking behavioral data for ESSA subgroups in order to determine school needs. Additionally, as the school's designated Title I Contact, Dr. Urquhart works directly with the Parent Engagement Liaison to implement the objectives outlined in the Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Sean Brown

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	N/A
* 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	36	71	70	62	69	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	362
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	7	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Thursday 6/25/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	5	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

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

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	5	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

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

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	66%	57%	57%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	58%	58%	58%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	67%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	58%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	61%	62%	64%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	51%	48%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	56%	53%	35%	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	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
	2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	63%	18%	64%	17%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	68	38		53	38						
ELL	53	61	54	63	61	45	31				
BLK	65	62		85	71		63				
HSP	62	65	60	67	66	50	47				
FRL	63	66	69	73	67	63	59				
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	42	71		58	71						
ELL	49	73	80	47	48						
BLK	73	78		79	64		50				
HSP	57	76	75	63	58	70	27				
FRL	65	77	88	75	64	71	46				
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	36			27							
ELL	39	59	64	42	59						
BLK	61	57		60	59	45	23				
HSP	46	59	67	52	68		29				
FRL	57	58	67	58	64	48	35				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	69
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	62
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	67
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.

According to 2018-2019 FSA results, the data component that performed the lowest across grades 3-5 is English Language Arts (ELA). When comparing 2018-2019 FSA ELA data to 2019-2020 I-Ready ELA data, similar trends exist. Teachers were provided i-Ready professional development targeting vocabulary instructional strategies. There is a need for additional support which will be provided during common planning in supporting students lack of vocabulary acquisition and the ability to analyze complex text of various genres. Teachers will intentionally teach academic vocabulary and plan strategies that will be used to determine the meaning of unknown words and phrases (inferences, definition, example, antonym and synonym).

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

The percent of students making learning gains overall in ELA declined from 77% in 2018 to 64% in 2019. The lowest 25% of students making learning gains in ELA declined from 84% in 2018 to 59% in 2019. When comparing 2019-2020 I-Ready beginning of the year diagnostic (BOY) to middle of the year diagnostic (MOY), subgroups with the lowest percentage point increase are ELL (10 points) and Lowest 25% (9 points). Factors contributing to this decline for ELL students show a need for differentiated learning opportunities for students targeting word knowledge and word learning strategies. Factors contributing to this decline for the Lowest 25% of students show a need for differentiated learning opportunities when comprehending and analyzing informational text.

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.

When comparing the 2018-2019 FSA data to the state average, Maxey Elementary did not show any gaps. All areas met or exceeded state averages.

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

The 2018-2019 FSA data component that showed the most improvement was ELA for students with disabilities (SWD). In 2018, overall achievement was 48% compared to 68% in 2019. When comparing 2018-2019 FSA ELA data to 2019-2020 I-Ready ELA data, similar trends existed. The SWD subgroup showed the largest point increase amongst other subgroups (24 points) when comparing BOY diagnostic to MOY diagnostic. Students utilized strategies such as SMART 7, Close Reading, and chunking in order to process and comprehend complex texts. In addition to ESE push in/pull out support, students received differentiated learning tasks during centers and Foundational Basic Skills (FBS).

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

One area of concern is the number of incoming fourth graders who would have potentially scored a Level 1 on the 2019-2020 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). According to 2019-2020 i-Ready MOY diagnostic, 14% of 3rd grade students were on grade level or above. 70% of 3rd grade students were at least one grade level below. 17% of 3rd grade students were identified as being two or more grade levels below.

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

1. Increase ELA achievement for Black and ELL subgroups.
2. Increase learning gains for the Lowest 25% in reading and math.
3. Increase learning gains for ELL students.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The number of students in our ELL subgroup meeting proficiency in ELA showed the lowest performance from the prior year's FSA data and the 2019-2020 i-Ready data. Focusing on increasing ELA achievement in this subgroup will increase learning gains and overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to improve ELA achievement on i-Ready MOY from 26% to 32% for our ELL subgroup. In addition, our plan is to maintain 61 percentage points overall ELA learning gains for ELL students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will effectively implement differentiated learning tasks and small group instruction for our ELL students focusing on word knowledge and word learning strategies. The i-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used to identify deficiencies and monitor student progress toward achievement targets. Additionally, standards-based common assessments will be used to gauge student mastery of grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected to meet students at their individual level while providing scaffolds and support. Systematic progress monitoring will allow teachers to fluidly group students based on their specific needs and skill level; which in turn will help students progress towards mastery of grade level content.

Action Steps to Implement

Content area coaches will facilitate weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards-based instruction with embedded opportunities for scaffolding and support is evident. Academic and content specific vocabulary words will be identified and explicitly taught to students. Additionally, differentiated centers will be planned and shared.

Person Responsible	Irarissa Louis (irarissa.louis@ocps.net)

During weekly common planning, teachers will plan student centered activities that allow ELL students to verbally demonstrate their learning and English speaking abilities. The activities will be structured to support student-to-student or group interaction. ELL students will be encouraged to use English to explain concepts and contribute to the work.

Person Responsible	Christine Horne (christine.horne@ocps.net)

Quarterly data meetings will be held to analyze data, identify trends in instruction and develop next steps. Progress monitoring tools will be utilized to track performance of the ELL subgroup. The instructional framework will be utilized to monitor and assess the effectiveness of strategies on student growth.

Person Responsible	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

The ESOL Compliance Specialist and bi-lingual Parent Engagement Liaison will provide quarterly parent workshops centered on strategies to support English Language Learners.

Person Responsible	Christine Horne (christine.horne@ocps.net)

Identified ELL students will utilize Imagine Learning which is a personalized learning program to help ELL students acquire the English language. Students will access Imagine Learning daily as a center rotation. Progress will be monitored bi-monthly.

Person Responsible   Christine Horne (christine.horne@ocps.net)

The bilingual paraprofessional will work with students daily in small groups to target specific skills needed to read and comprehend grade level text.

Person Responsible   Christine Horne (christine.horne@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The number of students making learning gains in the Lowest 25% subgroup in ELA and math showed the lowest performance when comparing 2019-2020 i-Ready BOY to MOY data. Focusing on increasing the learning gains of the Lowest 25% of students will lead to an increase in overall ELA and math proficiency and reduce the achievement gap within this population of students.
Measurable Outcome:	According to 2019-2020 I-Ready ELA MOY diagnostic, 61% of the Lowest 25% subgroup met their typical growth. For i-Ready Math MOY diagnostic, 48% of the Lowest 25% subgroup met their typical growth. Our goal is to increase the percent of students meeting their typical growth from 61% to 66% on i-Ready ELA diagnostic and from 48% to 53% on I-Ready math diagnostic. In addition, our plan is to increase learning gains on the statewide assessment for the Lowest 25% subgroup from 59 to 65 percentage points for both ELA and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will effectively implement small group instruction for ELA and mathematics instruction for students performing in the Lowest 25% subgroup. The i-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used to identify deficiencies and monitor student progress toward achievement targets. Additionally, standards-based common assessments will be used to gauge student mastery of grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected to meet students at their individual level while providing scaffolds and support. Small group instruction allows teachers to identify students' learning strengths, locate gaps in reading and math skills, and tailor lessons focused on specific learning objectives. Systematic progress monitoring will allow teachers to fluidly group students based on their specific needs and skill level; which in turn will help students progress towards mastery of grade level content.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be provided planning time to analyze student data, group students and plan for instruction.

Person Responsible	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

Content area coaches will facilitate weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards-based instruction is evident. Teachers will use the Backwards Design Model to intentionally plan whole group and small group instruction aligned to standards.

Person Responsible	Irarissa Louis (irarissa.louis@ocps.net)

Quarterly data meetings will be held to analyze data, identify trends in instruction and develop next steps. Progress monitoring tools will be utilized to track performance of the Lowest 25% of students.

Person Responsible	Tara Young (tara.young@ocps.net)

Students will monitor their progress on goal setting charts to measure individual growth and celebrate achievement. Seeing their results will promote self-awareness, motivation, and accountability for learning. Teachers will conduct monthly student data chats to help students take realistic steps to achieve their goals.

Person Responsible	Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

The instructional framework will be utilized to monitor and assess the effectiveness of strategies on student growth.

Person Responsible Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

Tutoring will be available to students in ESSA subgroups who have been identified as below grade level on the i-Ready diagnostic.

Person Responsible Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social and emotional learning (SEL) enhances students' capacity to integrate skills, attitudes, and behaviors to deal effectively and ethically with daily tasks and challenges. Students apply their knowledge, attitudes, and skills to develop and achieve goals related to their academics, social-emotional and mental health well being. As a Title I and Trauma Sensitive school, Maxey ES students benefit from targeted interventions using a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). Students demonstrated needs in the areas of problem solving, self esteem development, and the application of appropriate social skills. Students who are able to self regulate and manage their emotions will attend to learning within the academic environment; therefore, increasing the performance for the bottom 25% of students.
Measurable Outcome:	The specific measurable outcomes we plan to achieve will be evidenced by the anticipated impact of culture and climate on student achievement. This outcome will be illustrated by a decrease in the number of students receiving support at Tier II and Tier III. Currently, twenty two students receive Tier II SEL support and seven students receive SEL support at the Tier III level. Our goal is to decrease the number of students in each tier by 10%. Guidance referrals will be utilized to collect and monitor data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Urquhart (michelle.urquhart@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy that will be utilized is distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaborations in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan 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.
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

Social and Emotional Learning Leadership (SELL) site team will provide professional development to teachers.

Person Responsible	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

SEL resources (Second Step and CASEL SELect) will be utilized during class meetings and small group.

Person Responsible	Michelle Urquhart (michelle.urquhart@ocps.net)

Classroom observations will be utilized to identify trends and monitor implementation of SEL strategies.

Person Responsible   Tara Young (tara.young@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will facilitate individual teacher data chats twice a quarter. During the data chats, the leadership team will lead teachers in creating an action plan and goals for the various levels of students. We will continue to make instructional decisions based on data and trends observed during instructional walkthroughs.

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.

As we build momentum towards enhancing student learning, Maxey Elementary School will continue to develop positive relationships with parents, families, and the community by creating a warm, nurturing, and safe environment that meets the needs of all students. We will achieve this welcoming experience by ensuring that all members of the Maxey family understand their role and responsibility in the school-home partnership.
Additionally, it is imperative that all stakeholders are able to contribute to the development and implementation of school improvement strategies, therefore ensuring that our goals are inclusive, equitable, and of benefit to our students. To foster school-home collaboration and engagement, Maxey Elementary encourages stakeholders to engage in volunteer and partner opportunities. Information is provided in multiple languages in order to sufficiently inform stakeholders, match needs and interests, and involve partners that share a common value.

Our school's dedicated Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) primary role is to provide a link for families to connect to the school, assess community needs, and pair resources to support families. Furthermore, the information gathered from parents is used in the development of activities and workshops during our monthly Breakfast Learning Series seminars or at one of our designated curriculum nights. These targeted sessions provide practical tips to positively engage parents with strategies to help students be successful academically and behaviorally. Additionally, we house a parent resource room that includes essential items such as food, clothing, and personal hygiene products to make immediate impacts. Our goal is to ensure that families' basic needs are met, so that students are able to focus and learn.

Additional targeted interventions that help to build a positive school culture and environment for stakeholders, include opportunities for parents to plan, review, and improve school programs through a collaborative process, including School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings and the annual Title I meeting. Stakeholders further engage in parent and family capacity-building activities and are continuously encouraged to review academic data, School Improvement Plan, Parent & Family Engagement Plan (PREP), and the Title I Compact.

As a trauma sensitive school, Maxey Elementary engages stakeholders in targeted interventions through Social Emotional Learning (SEL) opportunities. All staff are trained in school-wide implementation of strategies including positive reinforcement, soft starts, safe corners, de-escalation, and community building. Students apply their knowledge, attitudes, and skills to develop and achieve goals related to their academics, social-emotional and mental health well-being. As a Kindness Certified School, we have and will continue to implement our Kindness Initiative, which fosters random acts of compassion and care within our school community. This initiative encourages all stakeholders to show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and become responsible decision makers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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