Orange County Public Schools

# Lucious And Emma Nixon Academy Charter

**2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Lucious And Emma Nixon Academy Charter

### 1780 MERCY DR, Orlando, FL 32808

### https://nixonacademyorlando.org/

## Demographics

## Principal: Deidre Law

Start Date for this Principal: 1/17/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: D (32%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade |
| **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** | CS&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

# Lucious And Emma Nixon Academy Charter

## 1780 MERCY DR, Orlando, FL 32808

## https://nixonacademyorlando.org/

## 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 KG-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 100% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|
| Grade | D | D |

## 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.

The mission of Lucious & Emma Nixon Academy Charter School is to foster pride in all students by achieving an optimum level of development and mastery in the cognitive, effective, and psychomotor domains through the STEAM education model.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Lumpkin, Ardonnis | Principal | • Manage programs, activities and functions consistent with school policy and priorities.<br><br>• Assume responsibility and accountability for planning, developing and implementing with and through the staff, programs, activities and functions designed to achieve school goals and school priorities.<br><br>• Analyze programs, activities and functions under his/her supervision to identify disparities between "what is" (current condition) and "what ought to be" (desired condition) and working with and through people to develop plans to eradicate the disparities as they relate to school goals and district priorities.<br><br>• Supervise and evaluate designated teachers and staff in terms of their performance and responsibilities in the achievement of school goals and district priorities.<br><br>• Work with teachers and staff to identify problems and issues (disparities) for which they may need expertise and support services for their own training and development to effectively address the problems and issues (disparities).<br><br>• Visible in his/her school community and is recognized as an educational leader who is responsive to the school's and community's needs.<br><br>• Serve as a member of the school's Leadership Team and participate in the school's planning, development and evaluation.<br><br>• Perform classroom walk-throughs to manage instructional support and alignment of professional learning.<br><br>• Collaborate with teachers to ensure that achievement gaps are identified and capable of closing gaps amongst all sub-groups. Monitor data of all students and hold meetings with all instructional staff to support all students.<br><br>• Responsible for compliance and supports for ELL and ESE students through visits and monitoring their progress.<br><br>• Provide instructional coaching and mentoring for staff to support and grow teachers' pedagogy. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Friday 1/17/2020, Deidre Law

**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.*
0

**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.*

0

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

6

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: D (32%)<br><br>2017-18: No Grade<br><br>2016-17: No Grade<br><br>2015-16: No Grade |
| **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** | CS&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 | 20 | 17 | 25 | 18 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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**

Wednesday 11/4/2020

## 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 | 28 | 34 | 35 | 34 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 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 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Grade Level** | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 28 | 34 | 35 | 34 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Grade Level** | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 28% | 57% | 57% | 0% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 45% | 58% | 58% | 0% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 52% | 53% | 0% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 20% | 63% | 63% | 0% | 61% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 33% | 61% | 62% | 0% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 48% | 51% | 0% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 0% | 56% | 53% | 0% | 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 | 26% | 55% | -29% | 58% | -32% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 33% | 57% | -24% | 58% | -25% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 33% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 56% | -56% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** | |
| 03 | 2019 | 25% | 62% | -37% | 62% | -37% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 9% | 63% | -54% | 64% | -55% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 60% | -60% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 53% | -53% | |
| | 2018 | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| BLK | 19 | | | 11 | 20 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | | | 26 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| 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 |

## 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) | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 32 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 126 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |

| Native American Students | |
|---|---|
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 17 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 26 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

**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 Math data component (20%) showed the lowest level of student performance. However that data component could not be compared and contrasted to previous year's student performance because this was the first year the school enrolled students in testing grades; thus there is no data to compare it to.

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

The school is unable to compare and contrast to previous year's student performance because this was the first year the school enrolled students in testing grades; thus there is no pervious year's data available to determine the greatest decline from the prior year.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The Math data component (20%) showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There is no historical trend data to compare it to, however contributing factors are viewed as follows:

- Students matriculating from early childcare centers with poor school readiness skills
- Lack of academic supports at home
- Inexperienced school leadership
- Novice teachers without the prerequisite classroom management skills to effectively manage and ameliorate
students struggling and or disruptive students

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

Amongst the data received, the ELA data component (28%) showed the highest level of student performance. Again, due to it being the first year the school tested FSA grades, there is no data to compare it to in order, to contrast improvement.

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

The EWD data from Part 1(D) does not indicate any areas of concern (it show all zeros) which is probably due to this being the first year the school is testing FSA grades. However looking at internal data that identify possible areas of concern, I would identify "attendance below 90 percent enrolled" and "course failure of ELA" of areas that need addressing

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

1. Veteran school leadership to establish a strong structured academic culture
2. Recruitment and retention of highly effective teachers
3. Recruitment of additional paraprofessionals to assists teachers/students with phonics & phonemic awareness

4. Concentration on MTSS
5. Student Intervention and remediation

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Instructional Leadership is the root from which all academic fruit is harvested. It dictates the academic agricultural process and impacts both the fidelity and fruitfulness of instructional processes and outcomes. It was identified as a critical needs area after noticing that leadership was trying to plant academic seeds in a untilled instructional field. The unstructured campus climate was unstable and did not support consistent student growth and predictable educational outcomes. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The school wants to increase it ELA Achievement from 28% to 40% and its Math Achievement data from 20% to 40% as well |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Ardonnis Lumpkin (ardonnis.lumpkin@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | READING:<br>- Grades 4-5 uses Journey's Literacy Toolkit<br>- Grade 3 uses Journey's Reading Toolkit<br>- I-Ready<br><br>MATH:<br>-Student growth will be monitored through I-Ready progress monitoring as well as teacher observation based on lessons.<br><br>- Go Math Intervention Tool-kit<br>- I-Ready Supplemental Lessons that require frequently monitored lessons |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The reading and math strategy indicated are researched based and are both identified as a best practice. |

## Action Steps to Implement

READING:
All students will receive literacy instruction in an uninterrupted 90-minute reading block utilizing the core series, Journey's. The literacy block will include whole group, guided instruction, differentiation through literacy centers and targeted small group instruction based on student achievement levels (determined by I-Ready diagnostic). Students will receive additional instruction from classroom teachers using supplemental practice activities from I- Ready Teacher Took-Kit, Journey's Literacy Toolkit, or Journey's Reading Toolkit based on diagnostic and ongoing assessment results. Journey's Intervention Toolkit will be used during small group sessions

Literacy skills will be incorporated cross-curricula. Grade level appropriate literacy standards will also be reinforced in in other content area classes such as Social Studies and Science classes.

| **Person Responsible** | Ardonnis Lumpkin (ardonnis.lumpkin@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

MATH
Hands-on center activities will be implemented as a means of connecting abstract concepts through the use of manipulatives and problem solving
Remedial math instruction will be provided through the core series, Go Math. Go Math Intervention will be used during small group sessions

| **Person Responsible** | Ardonnis Lumpkin (ardonnis.lumpkin@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**STUDENT INTERVENTION & REMEADIATION**

**READING**
**Tutoring: Students in target grades scoring a level 1 or 2 in Reading and/or as being in the lower quartile will receive afterschool tutoring sessions in a small group setting. Tutorials will take place twice each week for 90 minutes each session. Students will be grouped based on areas of deficiency identified through I-Ready Progress Monitoring data. Instruction will focus on comprehension and vocabulary strategies such as vocabulary development through word maps, utilizing context clues and implicit instruction on word parts such as prefixes and suffixes and root origins.**

**MATH**
**Tutoring: Targeted afterschool tutoring will be provided in Math for students with previous retentions, and students performing below grade level on I-Ready diagnostic assessments. Students will receive targeted instruction utilizing Triumph Learning Coach materials. Students unable to attend tutoring sessions, will receive small group instruction during class.**

## 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.

The school has had a recent public relations crisis that has created some doubt regarding the positive culture/environment that exist on campus.

However moving forward a positive school climate will be approached with the same three systematic pillars as all undertakings are on campus, which is Strategy, Discipline, and Time. The "Strategy" is to openly extend ourselves to all potential stakeholders (pupils, parents, professional, partners, providers and politicians) in a manner that promotes positive interactions and outcomes. This strategy sits on clear and communicated expectations regarding our mission/ goals as it relates to the academic and aspirational advocacy and advancement of all children in our care. The simple moto of "No Excuse, No Exceptions,

Learning Comes First" resounds and abounds. The intimacy of our small school campus (169 students) gives us the opportunity to better understand the needs and nuances of each child. That sense of awareness coupled with a sense of equal and fair care is hoped to positively metastasize throughout the campus environment as we move forward. How we demand dignity and respect from each other and hold others accountable for their attitudes, aptitudes and actions makes a difference.

The "Discipline" of the aforementioned three pillars is to stay the course and remain true to the spirit of the strategy despite any resistance or insistence to change the philosophy. The details of the strategy might have to be adjusted to meet situational factors that arise (such as shifting from face to face instruction during the pandemic to online instruction) but the spirit of the strategy (which should be developed in collaboration with stakeholders) must endure.

The "Time" component is what's necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the positive culture that we're trying to establish. It gives us the the ability to intermittently reevaluate implementation measures and progress monitor action steps.

### 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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | $0.00 |
|---|--------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | Total: | $0.00 |