Orange County Public Schools

Hunters Creek Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 17

Positive Culture & Environment 21

Budget to Support Goals 22

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://hunterscreekes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 17

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 22

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://hunterscreekes.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	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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
Urdaneta, Fresia	Principal	The principal job duties include managing all aspects of the organization. Some of the responsibilities include: * Work with district-level administrators, superintendents, faculty, and staff to ensure the smooth running of schools * Work with the leadership team and teachers to set performance goals * Hiring and evaluating staff * Visiting classrooms and providing constructive feedback * Prepare budget * Coordinating student master schedules and staff schedules * Oversee the development of curriculum * Ensure school board policies are followed * Tracking of all student progress in all content areas
Patterson, Ellen	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * Works closely with teachers to provide effective constructive feedback * Guides teachers through the coaching cycle * Follows up on instructional modifications based on feedback * Support grade level team leader during professional learning community meetings * Plans and provides professional development to staff * Collect and analyze grade level data to develop instructional strategies to increase student achievement
DePriest, Christie	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * Works closely with teachers to provide effective constructive feedback * Guides teachers through the coaching cycle * Follows up on instructional modifications based on feedback * Support grade level team leader during professional learning community meetings * Plans and provides professional development to staff * Collect and analyze grade level data to develop instructional strategies to increase student achievement
Huertas, Zaida	School Counselor	The school guidance counselor supports the social emotional growth of our students by coordinating professional development for instructional staff and collaborating with school staff, parents and the community to create a safe and respectful learning environment. Job duties include: * Help students attain an optimum level of personal and social adjustment * Supports the implementation of the adopted social emotional program, Sanford Harmony * Consult with parents, teachers, administrators, and supporting agencies concerning the needs and abilities of students

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		* Communicate effectively with all members of the school district and community * Work effectively with community organizations * Support the value of education
Rivera, Milagros	Assistant Principal	Job duties include managing the school and its human and material resources. Produce evidence of effective teaching and all student learning. * Work with the leadership team and teachers to set performance goals * Hiring and evaluating staff * Visiting classrooms and providing constructive feedback * Prepare budget * Coordinating student master schedules and staff schedules * Oversee the development of curriculum * Ensure school board policies are followed * Tracking of all student progress in all content areas
Aviles-Colon, Ginnette	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is responsible for working cooperatively and effectively with colleagues, including the ability to nurture a professional learning community of adult learners. * Works closely with teachers to provide effective constructive feedback * Guides teachers through the coaching cycle * Follows up on instructional modifications based on feedback * Support grade level team leader during professional learning community meetings * Plans and provides professional development to staff * Collect and analyze grade level data to develop instructional strategies to increase student achievement
McMurtry, Leanda	Assistant Principal	Job duties include managing the school and its human and material resources. Produce evidence of effective teaching and all student learning. * Work with the leadership team and teachers to set performance goals * Hiring and evaluating staff * Visiting classrooms and providing constructive feedback * Prepare budget * Coordinating student master schedules and staff schedules * Oversee the development of curriculum * Ensure school board policies are followed * Tracking of all student progress in all content areas

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Bradley Martin

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	115	106	127	146	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	721
Attendance below 90 percent	10	13	12	11	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	130	136	155	152	175	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	15	6	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	25	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	130	136	155	152	175	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	15	6	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	25	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	70%	57%	57%	75%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	58%	68%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	63%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	77%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	62%	74%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	70%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	56%	53%	63%	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	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	63%	4%	64%	3%
	2018	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
	2018	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	23	33	17	28	35	21					
ELL	62	59	47	70	61	39	48				
ASN	79	90		85	50						
BLK	60	46		60	46						
HSP	69	61	49	75	62	36	62				
WHT	76	68		84	75		77				
FRL	61	57	48	69	61	36	53				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	24		40	41						
ELL	54	57	47	72	74	67	42				
ASN	80	83		100	100						
BLK	50	53		59	60						
HSP	69	63	50	79	77	68	67				
WHT	77	68		89	79	70	78				
FRL	61	59	47	78	75	64	60				

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	29	48	47	50	86	81	10				
ELL	58	72	73	69	76	71	42				
ASN	83	69		83	77						
BLK	58	62		50	43						
HSP	73	69	65	74	74	75	63				
WHT	79	67	64	84	77	69	74				

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
FRL	66	66	66	70	70	67	48				

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	64
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	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
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	76
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	53
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	63
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	76
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	59
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 performance component on the FSA was mathematics learning gains for the bottom 25 percent. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the lack of mathematics intervention, decline in student attendance for Saturday school, inconsistency with mathematics

centers, and utilizing data to inform instruction. Our data reflected a trend in both fourth and fifth grade learning gains with a decline of 11 points, which indicates that this is an area of improvement.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was fifth grade mathematics. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the lack of mathematics intervention, decline in student attendance for Saturday school, inconsistency with mathematics centers, and utilizing data to inform instruction.

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 analyzing the FSA data, we found that our mathematics data showed the biggest gap when compared to the state average. Proficiency in third grade mathematics had a difference of sixteen percent above the state average. Overall, English Language Arts did show the greatest positive difference when compared to the state averages. Third and fourth grade English Language Arts also showed a positive gap of eight percent when compared to the state average.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was third grade mathematics compared to the previous year. The actions that contributed to this improvement was due to effective and consistent collaboration within the third grade Professional Learning Community (PLC).

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

Upon reflecting on the EWS data, an area of concern is our students with disabilities.

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

1. Deconstructing standards
2. Blueprinting assessments / backward lesson planning
3. 30 minutes of whole group instruction followed by 30 minutes of mathematics centers
4. Analyzing data to drive instruction and intervention
5. Reteach and reassess based on data

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on learning gains from Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) a direct focus needs to be placed on student subgroups in both English Language Arts and mathematics in order to increase individualized student growth.
Measurable Outcome:	With continued focus on teacher collaboration within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), teachers will increase the effectiveness of meeting the need of subgroups while planning instruction. Our focus subgroups are students with disabilities (SWD), English Language Learners (ELL), Hispanics and African American. This will increase individualized student growth in Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) learning gains for English language arts, mathematics, and science in all subgroups by 3 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Fresia Urdaneta (fresia.urdaneta@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will analyze student subgroup data in order to plan to incorporate culturally responsive text in culturally relevant instruction. Ongoing multicultural activities will happen within the classroom throughout all content area; for example, multicultural fair, research based projects, celebrating Hispanic and African American month. Through teacher collaboration within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) teachers will share strategies that drive effective differentiated standards-based instruction (whole/small group).Within the classroom teachers will set expectations and goals with all students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers meet weekly within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to analyze subgroup data to determine areas of deficiency within the standard and plan effective differentiated instruction. Implementation will be monitored through lesson plans, student work, instructional resources, data collection, classroom observations, and school-wide activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development- culturally relevant instruction
2. Collaborative lesson planning
3. Community resources
4. Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC)

Person Responsible	Fresia Urdaneta (fresia.urdaneta@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on learning gains from Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), a direct focus on academic discourse targeting oracy to develop writing strategies needs to be placed in all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Through continued professional development, teachers will increase the effectiveness in using academic discourse in all content areas. PLCs will collaborate to develop writing strategies including a focus on academic vocabulary, differentiate small group instruction, and continue the implementation of Close Reading Strategies. This will lead to an increased number of students demonstrating proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) English Language Arts from 70 percent to 75 percent (overall), 48 percent to 53 percent for the lowest 25 percent of students in ELA, and on the Science Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT) an increase from 66 percent to 70 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leanda McMurtry (leanda.mcmurtry@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The instructional team will facilitate professional development sessions for teachers throughout the school year. Classroom teachers will plan, teach, and facilitate opportunities for students to use academic discourse to support writing across all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of academic discourse will be monitored through lesson plans, data collection, peer observations, and classroom observations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership Team Book Study- Leading Well; Lucy Calkins
2. Text dependent and writing professional development
3. Grade level PLC collaboration on writing
4. Data driven mini lessons
5. Conferring with students
6. Small group instruction

Person Responsible	Fresia Urdaneta (fresia.urdaneta@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus aligns with the upcoming work in support of our district's Social Emotional Learning (SEL) through our Social and Emotional Learning & Leadership Team. This allows us to build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with all 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 school's needs that were identified with the implementation of the Student Needs SEL Survey. This survey was administered to all Kindergarten through 5th grade students. It contained both quantitative and qualitative questions. The survey identified that our school's areas of needs are as follows: - Students building positive relationships with peers and adults - Building a sense of student empowerment in their learning
Measurable Outcome:	We will see improvement in our school's Early Warning Systems indicator data, with a focus on decreasing absenteeism and students scoring level one on state assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zaida Huertas (zaida.huertas@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. We will monitor this through implementation 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 and student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to achieve sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the social and emotional well-being of our students. To create this type of culture with our students, it is critical to embrace 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	
Student Mentor Program	
Person Responsible	Zaida Huertas (zaida.huertas@ocps.net)
Monitoring instructional staff's implementation of social emotional learning through content areas	

Person Responsible	Fresia Urdaneta (fresia.urdaneta@ocps.net)

Providing students with social emotional lessons

Person Responsible	Zaida Huertas (zaida.huertas@ocps.net)

Implementation of professional development for social emotional learning

Person Responsible	Zaida Huertas (zaida.huertas@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

School Advisory Council (SAC) money will be utilized to fund a reading tutoring program for third through fifth-grade students who scored in the bottom quartile on the FSA or below the 25th percentile on i-Ready for 2017-18 school year for third-grade students. Certified teachers will tutor groups of no more than 10 in 45-minute sessions twice a week after school. This supplemental instruction will strengthen reading skills and strategies for these
students, which will result in increased student achievement.

Coffee Chats (teachers)
Principals Round Table- Chat and Chew
MPLC
TWDL Parent Advisory
PTA
Teacher-Parent Conference Night (a minimum 2 times a year)
Parent Information Night
Kindergarten Orientation
TWDL Tours
Cheer Committee

Soul Food Mentoring
Positiviti Jr
Words of Wisdom

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**