

Orange County Public Schools

# Dr. Phillips 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

**Dr. Phillips Elementary**

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

<https://drphillipses.ocps.net/>**Demographics****Principal: Autherene Leighvard**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (72%)
<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>	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](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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

**Dr. Phillips Elementary**

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

<https://drphillipses.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	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

**School Grades History**

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

**School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

**SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hargreaves, Alexis	Instructional Coach	Coordinates all school-wide state and district assessment. Coaches teachers with instructional focus for Science. Member of the MTSS team supporting 1st and 5th grade teachers and students.
Hargrett, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Supports principal with key decisions regarding instruction, teacher development, FTE, PBIS initiatives, student progress, and overall safety of the school.
Rogers, Christine	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Oversee supervision of all personnel, instructional focus for all grade levels and subjects, and individual student progress, safety and wellbeing.
Wallick, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Assigned to coach all teachers with pedagogy and instruction. Assists teams with developing common assessments and lesson plans as well as selecting complex texts to use for standards-based instruction. Member of the MTSS team supporting 2nd and 3rd grade teachers and students.
Williams, Madeline	Instructional Coach	Assigned to support all ELL students with proper placement and testing. Supports teachers with instruction to support ELL students achieve success. Coaches teachers with instructional focus for mathematics. Member of the MTSS team supporting Kindergarten and 4th grade teachers and students.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/12/2019, Autherene Leighvard

**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.*

4

**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.*

8

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

56

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (72%)
<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>	N/A
* 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	81	110	108	122	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	9	17	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	0	0	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

Tuesday 7/21/2020

### 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	131	125	123	126	118	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	11	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	2	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	1	1	4	7	11	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	131	125	123	126	118	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	11	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	2	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	1	1	4	7	11	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	80%	57%	57%	73%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	58%	58%	73%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	53%	54%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	63%	63%	81%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	82%	61%	62%	81%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	48%	51%	75%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	75%	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	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
	2018	74%	55%	19%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
	2018	81%	55%	26%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
	2018	88%	53%	35%	55%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	38	40	35	69	67	33				
ELL	76	73	74	83	81	76	72				
ASN	89	82		96	88						
BLK	62	48		59	74	69	54				
HSP	73	63	53	82	83	83	78				
WHT	86	76	70	86	81	63	80				
FRL	68	61	47	74	82	78	63				
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	25	43	41	44	65	67					
ELL	67	73	55	82	81	87	90				
ASN	93	82		96	82						
BLK	60	68		63	68						
HSP	72	69	44	80	69	55	84				
WHT	80	62	64	83	76	75	87				
FRL	65	57	43	70	62	50	78				

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	15	46	48	35	67	63	27				
ELL	42	61	60	65	76	65	44				
ASN	77	89		97	94		83				
BLK	48	65	60	52	65	60					
HSP	69	72	55	77	80	76	61				
WHT	80	74	56	86	84	82	85				
FRL	60	67	50	68	73	71	63				

### 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	75
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	603
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	77
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	86
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	61
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	74
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	79
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	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The lowest performing data component in 2019 was SWD science achievement (33% proficiency). Overall, the school saw an overall decline in science achievement. All of the SWD students did not demonstrate proficiency in science also did not score proficiency in ELA (level one and level two students). Majority of the SWD students who did not score proficiency were with one of the two teachers who had the overall lowest pass rates.

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

5th Grade Science showed the greatest decline. In 2018 student proficiency was 88% which declined to 73% in 2019, resulting in a 15% decline. One teacher had a significantly lower student pass rate as compared to her peers within the department (39% pass rate as compared to the school's 77% overall proficiency in 5th grade science).

**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.**

Dr. Phillips Elementary School scored above the state averages in all grade components. The grade component with the smallest average above the state was ELA Lowest 25%. DPES had 58% of the lowest 25% make a learning gain in ELA as compared to the state average of 53%.

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

Learning gains in math of the lowest 25% showed the most improvement. In 2019, 73% of students earned a learning gain in the lowest 25% as compared to 2018 where 63% of students earned a learning gain, a difference of a 10% increase. During the 2018-2019 school year the school focused on common assessments, common planning, and MTSS interventions. During the 2018-2019 school year the school had added an additional 15 minutes of math.

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

The first area of concern is the 5th grade science achievement as the school had a 15% decline in student proficiency. A second area of concern is the achievement of subgroup data of our SWD and ELL students compared to our Gen Ed students, as well as our Black and Hispanic students compared to our White students.

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

1. Targeted reading and math interventions tailored to specific needs of students.
2. Fluid PLC meetings to plan standards based instruction, data meetings to plan differentiated instruction, as well as for small group instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
3. Ongoing data monitoring to analyze data trends as a department, as well as trends of student subgroups, in order to use data to make instructional decisions and MTSS interventions.
4. Provide ongoing professional development of research-based reading strategies as well as student

engagement strategies for face-to-face and digital settings.

5. Provide ongoing professional development to support Social and Emotional Learning of all students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** All teachers will provide rigorous instruction using complex text, which will result in increased student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:** All teachers will provide rigorous instruction using complex text, which will result in increased student achievement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Through common planning and the use of backwards design teacher will focus on evaluating activities and assessments to ensure they are aligned to the standard, as well as incorporating strategies to yield high student cognitive engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** During the 2018-2019 school year the school focused on backwards design for common planning and common assessments aligned to the standard. Overall the school saw an increase in student performance.

#### Action Steps to Implement

The school's leadership team will plan and facilitate professional development on standards aligned tasks, using content specific resources, complex text for all classrooms, evaluating and revising student tasks are aligned to grade level standards, and differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

Focus on planning purposeful student engagement strategies to yield high student cognitive engagement in face-to-face and/or digital setting.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

Provide support and coaching to new/novice teachers in addition to struggling teachers, with implementation of reading strategies.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Leadership and teachers will structure, implement, and monitor a Multi Tiered Title System of Supports (MTSS) to close the achievement gap between minority subgroups and the student population.

**Measurable Outcome:** Using the MTSS process to monitor appropriate intervention and strategies, we will narrow the achievement gap in reading and mathematics for our ESE, Black and Hispanic students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Nicole Hargrett (nicole.hargrett@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** By using the MTSS process and using data to inform instruction, teachers will be able to plan to meet student needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** During the 2018-2019 school year, the school focused on implementing MTSS process to provide appropriate student interventions. While there were increases in several areas of student performance there is still a need to close the achievement gap.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Instructional coaches will provide support throughout the school year during PLC, data meetings, and targeted professional development as needed.

**Person Responsible** Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Teachers will monitor student progress in response to interventions, communicate to all stakeholders, and make adjustments as needed.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Hargrett (nicole.hargrett@ocps.net)

Focus on small group instruction in centers to differentiate instruction and FBS to address specific learning needs.

**Person Responsible** Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Intense focus on analyzing data trends by whole school and subgroups.

**Person Responsible** Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

All staff will build relationships with students to motivate struggling students and provide support; implementation of PBIS; implementation of strategies from DPLC.

**Person Responsible** Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

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

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	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 how strategies are incorporated into daily lesson plans to build relationship and culture in the classroom.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Incorporating strategies and lessons which focus on building and sustaining a culture of social and emotional learning at our school we will see an increase in student's survey response data on the Cognia survey.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The SELL Site team will use the distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all studnets.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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 assessment, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. School Site Team Meeting for planning school based professional learning opportunities.
2. Survey/Observation for baseline data - needs assessment.
3. Professional Learning
4. Classroom visits to monitor strategies/implementation.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

NA

**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.

Establishing and maintaining positive relationships with families is essential to student academic performance and overall school improvement. Dr. Phillips Elementary is fortunate to have a high level of family involvement with our Parent Teacher Association (PTA) , during evening events and with volunteers during the school day. The PTA works diligently to provide support for the educational and recreational needs of the school. Our volunteers assist teachers within the classroom, work with individual students or small groups, promote school spirit, and provide support in other areas of the school where there is a need.

Mrs. Rogers, the principal, provides vitally important information via the Connect Orange phone message system as required and/or necessary for parents. Monthly newsletters are sent to families by the principal to assist with maintaining school and home communication as well as to share information about upcoming events. Parents are encouraged to become ADDitions volunteers so that they can assist in the classroom and attend field trips.

Parents are provided opportunities to become involved in their child's academic education. Quarterly parent newsletters and parent resources are translated into Spanish and Portuguese to assist parents.

Parent information nights for specific content areas, Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) testing, and "Preventing the Summer Slide" are opportunities for parents to help their children find success through partnership with the school.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend all meetings that pertain to their child's education, such as PTA, School Advisory Council (SAC), Exceptional Student Education (ESE), MPLC, parent/teacher conferences and any individual meetings scheduled to support the academic and/or behavior placements.

Parents provide input on BPIE Assessment results. Parents are invited to MTSS Tier 3 meetings, as well as, the school communicating Tier 2 interventions. The school also sends out the MTSS brochure to parents.

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

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

## **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$6,120.00
---	--------	--	------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		140-Substitute Teachers	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$6,120.00
			Notes: Up to three TDY paid planning days.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$4,015.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		239-Other	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$2,500.00
			Notes: IXL purchased to support students in Math.			
		239-Other	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$1,515.00
			Notes: Capit Reading License to support students in reading.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:						\$10,135.00