

Orange County Public Schools

# Metrowest Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Metrowest Elementary

1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Sherry Donaldson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 88%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (47%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: C (45%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Metrowest Elementary

1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 76%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 80%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | 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 to 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Gjini, Xhuljeta    | Principal           |                                 |
| Owens, Matthew     | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Thinn, Latoya      | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| LeSuer, Brandon    | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| McGhee, Adriane    | Other               | CRT                             |
| Mitchell, Cynthia  | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| Ventura, Christine | Other               | School Social Worker            |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/14/2019, Sherry Donaldson

**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.*

2

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

#### Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 88%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (47%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: C (45%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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               | 20          | 105 | 88 | 111 | 115 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 538   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 7           | 22  | 9  | 14  | 17  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 1   | 0  | 1   | 5   | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0  | 8   | 18  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 6   | 19  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 16  | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 14  | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |

**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 | 7 | 28 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |

**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**

Tuesday 7/14/2020

**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     | 114         | 118 | 111 | 127 | 102 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 689   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 13          | 14  | 12  | 7   | 7   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 1   | 2   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 7           | 11  | 11  | 2   | 4   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 37  | 23  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |

**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 | 4           | 2 | 3 | 25 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |

**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 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| 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     | 114         | 118 | 111 | 127 | 102 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 689   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 13          | 14  | 12  | 7   | 7   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 1   | 2   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 7           | 11  | 11  | 2   | 4   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 37  | 23  | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |

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 | 4           | 2 | 3 | 25 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |

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 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| 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             | 53%    | 57%      | 57%   | 58%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 58%    | 58%      | 58%   | 55%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 47%    | 52%      | 53%   | 61%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 51%    | 63%      | 63%   | 59%    | 61%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 51%    | 61%      | 62%   | 53%    | 64%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36%    | 48%      | 51%   | 38%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 48%    | 56%      | 53%   | 31%    | 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 | 41%    | 55%      | -14%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 55%      | -11%                       | 57%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 53%    | 57%      | -4%                        | 58%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 54%      | -7%                        | 56%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 49%    | 54%      | -5%                        | 56%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 51%    | 55%      | -4%                        | 55%   | -4%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 38%    | 62%      | -24%                       | 62%   | -24%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 61%      | -20%                       | 62%   | -21%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 58%    | 63%      | -5%                        | 64%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 50%    | 62%      | -12%                       | 62%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 42%    | 57%      | -15%                       | 60%   | -18%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 59%      | -11%                       | 61%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2019 | 42%    | 54%      | -12%                       | 53%   | -11%                    |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 53%      | -13%                       | 55%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 13       | 42     |             | 21        | 31      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 46       | 53     | 45          | 49        | 52      | 30           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 87       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 48       | 57     | 53          | 41        | 45      | 33           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 53       | 53     | 43          | 49        | 49      | 31           | 62       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 57     |             | 64        | 64      |              | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 56     | 46          | 45        | 48      | 36           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 18       | 42     |             | 29        | 37      |              | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 54     | 65          | 38        | 51      | 45           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 80       | 80     |             | 80        | 80      |              | 82       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 47       | 43     | 50          | 45        | 43      | 32           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 54     | 48          | 43        | 40      | 32           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 46       |        |             | 77        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 44     |             | 57        | 53      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 46     | 50          | 46        | 44      | 33           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 22       | 34     | 43          | 28        | 40      | 24           | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 62     | 64          | 52        | 60      | 48           | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 81       | 66     |             | 89        | 72      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 53       | 50     | 53          | 48        | 44      | 30           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 54       | 60     | 68          | 57        | 58      | 46           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 52       | 61     |             | 64        | 53      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 66       | 48     | 60          | 71        | 52      | 36           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 54     | 59          | 55        | 50      | 35           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 52   |
| 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 | 69   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 413  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 27   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 49   |
| 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  | 80   |
| 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                                 | 47   |
| 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   | 51   |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 62  |
| 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                                | 49  |
| 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.**

Our lowest 25% in Math showed the lowest performance. PLC teams were learning the data analysis model throughout the year and began to work on differentiation of strategies to learn how to individualize instruction to close the gaps with this subset of students. Contributing factors to this were no intervention time for math and small groups were not tiered at the students level, students were not grouped by ability level.

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

Our only area of decline was with the lowest 25% in ELA. The teams were using the whole group approach for instruction verses a small group approach for instruction. There was also an inconsistency in monitoring the data. For the 2019-2020 school year we saw an increase in this area

due to changing instructional approaches, where we saw a decline was in Science. Science decline occurred due to a lack of instructional capacity, planning, and implementation of standards with fidelity.

**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.**

Our greatest gap from the state was Grade 3 Math. PLC teams were learning the data analysis model throughout the year and began to work on differentiation of strategies to learn how to individualize instruction to close the gaps with this subset of students

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

Our area for most improved was ELA learning gains. This increase is due to the fourth grade team that implemented new instructional strategies after professional development in November. This team also took the data and analyzed and monitored throughout the remainder of the year. This remained true for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

Our areas of concern are level 1 on state assessment and attendance.

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

1. Increasing Learning Gains for our lowest 25% in Math and ELA
2. Increase Overall Achievement and Learning Gains of our Students with Disabilities

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Currently our lowest quartile in ELA dropped from 51% to 45%. With the gap that occurred from distance learning we foresee that this will still be an area of need for our students. Although Math lowest quartile has increased from 34% to 36%, it is still below district and state average growth. We also know that looking at the gap from distance learning students will need help with fluency and foundational skills in math. Our data increased 2% from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year, yet in the 2019-2020 school year our data was trending at the mid 30%. With the gap that occurred from distance learning we foresee that this will still be an area of need for our students

**Measurable Outcome:**

Reading learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 45% to 51%. Math learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 36% to 42%. Science passing rates will increase from 48% to 53%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will use small group differentiated instruction during the ELA block as well as push in and walk to intervention during FBS time. We will use small group differentiated instruction during the Math block as well as push in support from coaches. We will use different modalities of instruction, digital labs, study island, science boot camp, and coach created PowerPoints during the Science block as well as push in support from coaches. We will monitor this through the data chats during PLCs after each common assessment, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

These strategies will target student achievement providing scaffolded support aligned with individualized academic needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

We will provide professional development for teachers on authentic engagement and best instructional strategies

**Person Responsible**

Latoya Thinn (latoya.thinn@ocps.net)

Administration and coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions within PLCs monthly focused on, culturally relevant learning, scaffolded support for our lowest quartile, and data discussions creating small groups for instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Latoya Thinn (latoya.thinn@ocps.net)

Adjusting small groups for FBS based on common assessments and monitoring the data from the groups to adjust based on learning needs. Teachers will use literacy strategies in small group instruction and across all content areas.

**Person Responsible**

Latoya Thinn (latoya.thinn@ocps.net)

Instructional Coaches will provide ongoing support using the coaching cycle and modeling lessons. Coaches will work with administration to drive change and will be monitored throughout the process by ongoing debriefings and a coaches running receipt.

**Person Responsible** Latoya Thinn (latoya.thinn@ocps.net)

We will monitor this through the data chats after each i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible** Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Increase Learning Gains for our SWD students by 5%. SWD learning gains in ELA will increase from 17% to 22% and overall achievement will increase from 13% to 20%. SWD learning gains in Math will increase from 17% to 22% and overall achievement will increase from 21% to 30%   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>  | Currently our SWD subgroup in ELA were 13% on grade level and 17% made learning gains. In Math we had 21% on grade level and 17% made learning gains. This group has not met the ESSA index and they are our focus group for the school year.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>   | Adriane McGhee (adriane.mcghee@ocps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>   | In response to ESSA subgroup data, Acceleration and preteaching strategies for both reading and math will be used with targeted groups of students. Students are also pulled out during FBS time into small groups based on i-Ready progress monitoring data. We will monitor this by monitoring IEP goals, on-going data analysis of i-Ready and common assessments. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>   | Seeing an increase from the students that were in the Acceleration program allowed us to begin to use the strategies with more students. The teacher teams that implemented Acceleration in the 2019-2020 school year were seeing gains prior to the fourth quarter distance learning.  |
| <b>Action Steps to Implement</b>  |   |
| We will provide professional development for teachers on ESE strategies, authentic engagement and best instructional strategies during preplanning. We will provide professional development on Acceleration once we have our FBS groupings completed.                          |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)  |
| Administration and Coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions within PLCs weekly focused on, culturally relevant learning, scaffolded support for our SWD students, and data discussions creating IEP goals that are aligned to the student learning and standards. |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Adriane McGhee (adriane.mcghee@ocps.net)  |
| Adjusting small groups for FBS based on common assessments and monitoring the data from the groups to adjust based on learning needs.   |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Adriane McGhee (adriane.mcghee@ocps.net)  |
| Instructional Coaches providing ongoing support using the coaching cycle and modeling lessons with the SLD teacher specific to teachers that support SWD.   |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Adriane McGhee (adriane.mcghee@ocps.net)  |
| Teachers will use literacy strategies in small group instruction and across all content areas.  |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Latoya Thinn (latoya.thinn@ocps.net)  |

Students are also pulled out for, Tier II instruction, during FBS time into small groups based on i-Ready data.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Mitchell (cynthia.mitchell2@ocps.net)

We will monitor this through the data chats after each i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible** Adriane McGhee (adriane.mcghee@ocps.net)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b> | 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 culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:<br>* Responsible Decision Making<br>* Self Awareness |
|---|---|

**Measurable Outcome:** By providing a clear vision on improving instructional practices through collaborative work among all teachers, and establishing clear and measurable goals, we will aim for an increase of 5% in student achievement

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)

**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. 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. 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.

**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** Christine Ventura (christine.ventura@ocps.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Matthew Owens (matthew.owens@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We have addressed all areas of focus**

## 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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teacher and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determination next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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