

Orange County Public Schools

Columbia Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Columbia Elementary

18501 CYPRESS LAKE GLEN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32820

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

Demographics

Principal: Katie Brinkman

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2013

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)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/9/2021.

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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Columbia Elementary

18501 CYPRESS LAKE GLEN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32820

<https://columbiaes.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	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/9/2021.

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
Pritts, Matthew	Principal	<p>Matthew Pritts, Principal: Responsible for teacher observations K-5, along with resource staff.</p> <p>Observations will be used to monitor classroom instruction, scope and sequence of standards, close reading strategies, and standards based tasks. Observation tool will be used to monitor frequency with informals, coaching, and formal observations being completed. He will also schedule and conduct monthly data meetings with 2nd-5th grade and quarterly with k-1st grade. Data chats will be based on iReady, common assessments, and other resources. Schedule will be used to establish dates for the meetings, type of data, and grade level targets. DPLC team lead will be another area of responsibility with instructional practices. Establish DPLC members and develop a schedule to meet to implement the DPLC information to school teams. Agendas and notes will be used to monitor the monthly meetings along with grade level evidence of DPLC implementation. Matthew Pritts will also be responsible for overseeing all school functions.</p>
Pressy, Robyn	Instructional Media	<p>Robyn Pressy, Media Specialist. She will be responsible for text book inventory, media circulation and updating, Accelerated Reader Program, and intervention support. She will maintain inventory through electronic tracking of materials to teachers and students. Reports will be pulled mid-year and weekly during the month of May to assist with inventory. Circulation will be monitored by pulling check out rates each quin along with invoices on new purchases for books and media resources. Accelerated Reader program will be school wide and tracked by class. Bi-monthly reports will be sent out to all staff to track progress. Recognition events throughout the year will be held for class participation and student progress. Intervention group will be tracked using data sheet for her 5 students. Part of the data will be shared monthly with leadership team to monitor progress and group performance.</p>
Sealey, Melissa	Instructional Coach	<p>Melissa Sealey, CRT: Responsible for MTSS, iReady progress monitoring, FSA assessments, curriculum materials, coaching, and DPLC. She will design a monthly schedule for individual teachers to meet for MTSS to discuss student progress. The schedule will be for 9 months that will include key team members. Schedule and MTSS notes will be used to monitor frequency and completion of task.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>iReady will be weekly with usage and progress monitoring tools. iReady reports will be pulled weekly, monthly, and beginning/mid/end of year to monitor iReady implementation. Curriculum will be shared with teachers and/or ordered to assist with instruction. Invoices and team planning will be evidence of tasks to assist with curriculum (Ex. New Science Curriculum). She will provide coaching observation connected with MTSS/FBS instruction to assist with monitoring lowest 25% ELA instruction. She will also be part of our school based DPLC team and assist teams by modeling lessons, assisting with resources, and/or planning. She will attend DPLC monthly meetings to assist with implementation and share ideas. Agenda and notes will be used to monitor.</p>
Minger, Nicole	School Counselor	<p>Nicole Minger, Guidance Counselor: She will support teachers and students who may need assistance with behavioral structures, support groups, or other assistance. She will also teach monthly character education lessons and recognize students monthly from each grade level. Character lessons will be scheduled with teams and shared with leadership team for updates. A support log will be used to track students needing small group support with frequency. She will also assist with new health CRM's being implemented district wide. She will be part of the SEL professional development team.</p>
Barbour, Debra	Dean	<p>Debra Barbour, Staffing/CCT: She is responsible for all IEP, 504, and CCT documentation. She will conduct meetings based on IEP dates, 504 renewals, and ELL guidelines. She will share meeting and updates weekly at leadership meeting. District compliance personnel will assist with monitoring staffing and CCT paperwork compliance monthly by sharing results of audit. She will meet weekly with MTSS coordinator to cross reference students needing support.</p>
Rosa, Arlene	Instructional Coach	<p>Arlene Rosa, Instructional Coach: Responsible for coaching teachers, DPLC team member, team planning, and intervention assistance. She will be working with k-5 during common planning times with reading instruction weekly. She will develop a schedule with teams to join weekly that will include common assessments, resources, plans to model lessons, and/or observe lessons for feedback. Focus will be ELA. Schedules and notes will be used to monitor planning and coaching cycles. She will</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>continue as DPLC lead for school team to assist with collaboration of our teams and monitor implementation. She will develop notes of our bimonthly meetings, collect grade level evidence, and provide reminders and assistance to our grade level DPLC leaders to monitor implementation of our school plan. She will also provide intervention assistance with one grade level with reading comprehension. She will track student data for lowest 25% ELA in 5th grade to monitor student performance on grade level and intervention progress.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/1/2013, Katie Brinkman

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

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)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students

	Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	29	70	80	103	92	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	6	12	14	19	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

Monday 7/20/2020

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	60	76	103	84	104	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	13	4	9	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	7	1	2	7	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	2	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	

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	60	76	103	84	104	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	13	4	9	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	7	1	2	7	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	2	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	

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	72%	57%	57%	67%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	58%	56%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	41%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	78%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	75%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	48%	51%	61%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	67%	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	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	70%	55%	15%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	63%	8%	64%	7%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
	2018	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	16	40	43	35	38	40					
ELL	45	63	64	69	89	83	55				
ASN	92			92							
BLK	88	85		82	77						
HSP	63	60	54	74	74	63	69				
MUL	70			80							

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
WHT	74	67	56	80	72	59	78				
FRL	62	61	49	72	69	63	70				
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	17	58	58	34	56	53					
ELL	47	60		47	40						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	60	43		70	64						
HSP	75	66	60	79	78	60	74				
MUL	75			92							
WHT	64	64	63	75	69	54	83				
FRL	60	64	61	71	68	57	73				
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	13	33	38	37	58	57	15				
ELL	55	53		61	67						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	65	57		79	79		67				
HSP	62	54	38	74	76	62	57				
MUL	92			85							
WHT	65	61	48	78	77	63	67				
FRL	56	50	42	68	69	60	57				

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	70
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	68
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	92
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	83
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	67
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	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	65
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.

Based on 19-20 iReady MOY, our ESE subgroup performed at 12% proficiency in ELA and at 24% proficiency in Math on iReady 19-20 MOY. Historically, our FSA results pinpoint SWD as our lowest subgroups in proficiency.

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

Based on previous year data, our ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains declined from 59% to 52% (-7%). The decline represented about 5 student difference within the subgroup. Several of these students are also within our SWD subgroup. We continued similar systems with our students that included small groups, tutoring, and monitoring. Attendance levels of our tutoring program from many of our students was below expectation. We had a few new students as well enroll with the lowest 25% subgroup. Monitoring them earlier is key along with providing additional supports quicker to increase learning at a quicker pace.

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.

Based on previous year data, our ESE subgroup had the largest gap. Both ELA and Math were trends with wider gaps between the state and school. Learning Gains for our ESE students are around 50%. We are struggling to get ESE students proficient and higher on state assessments. Earlier intervention and focused FBS is key for learning gains and future on target performance.

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

Based on iReady 19-20 ELA BOY tier 1 we were at 41% proficient in K-5 and at MOY 19-20 we were at 64%. We went from 18% at risk to 8% in ELA. Based on iReady Math 19-20 BOY tier 1 we were at 27% proficient in K-5 and at 19-20 MOY we were at 57%. We went from 15% at risk to 6% in Math.

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

Our SWD proficiency in both ELA and Math are areas of concern. All other areas have limited or no gap compared to state or district scores. SWD proficiency is a challenge for our school currently. We are moving students (based on Learning Gains). However, many SWD students are not reaching proficient levels in our testing grades. Our monitoring and MTSS is critical for success in this area.

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

1. SWD ELA Proficiency
2. SWD Math Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Columbia will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture for social and emotional learning, we anticipate an increase in student achievement in our ESSA subgroup.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of establishing a culture for social and emotional learning and the new SELL initiative, we anticipate an increase in attendance by 5% and increase of 5% in learning gains within our ESSA subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Minger (nicole.minger@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using distributive leadership and social emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order foster the whole child. Our school will plan and implement cycles of professional learning using the district SELL plan 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, classroom observation, and school environment observation. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by the data we collect.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve this task it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through 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

The leadership team will provide strategies, resources, and support to teachers in order to assist them while making connections between social and emotional learning and instruction strategies.

Person Responsible Arlene Rosa (arlene.rosa@ocps.net)

The DPLC team will provide professional learning opportunities to teachers on how to integrate academics and social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible Arlene Rosa (arlene.rosa@ocps.net)

Observations will be conducted by the leadership team and teachers will take part in peer driven observations to monitor instructional strategies. Data collected will be monitored through informal observations and iObservation.

Person Responsible Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@ocps.net)

SAC and newsletters will provide parents information regarding instructional strategies and social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA subgroup is an area of focus because the data shows that this subgroup is growing in proficiency at a much slower rate than all other areas of our school. In 2018-19, we did not meet the federal guidelines of 41% proficiency and in 2019-20, the MOY iReady results show that only 12% of our grades 3-5 students were at proficiency. Typically, these students are in Tier 3 of the MTSS process so intervention with strategic and consistent measures along with timely feedback is critical to the success of the ESSA subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of implementing targeted instruction and intervention, our ESSA subgroup will increase in proficiency in iReady. On the EOY iReady for 2020-2021, this group will show a proficiency rate of at least 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to effectively move our proficiency levels in the ESSA subgroup, we must strengthen our MTSS system.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As the majority of our ESSA students are in either Tier 2 or 3 of the MTSS process, our MTSS procedures play a vital role in their success rates. It is important for all members to regularly collaborate and work as a team to ensure the most optimal learning environment for success. The system must also include a more conscientious approach to data collection and analysis with a proactive strategy rather than a reactive strategy. This would lend itself to the MTSS problem solving framework. This would include the use of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning. Early intervention is key for the success of our ESSA subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase effectiveness of the MTSS program, including FBS, progress monitoring, data analysis. The MTSS team will collaborate with teacher and ESE team to create an environment of proactive versus reactive support using the decision making process. Grades K-1 will complete a DRA 3x per year to add an additional data point for their students. Grades K-2 will complete fact fluency checks weekly to add additional data points.

Person Responsible Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Increase intentionality of close reading and small group instruction. The leadership team will continue to lead PLC's on close reading and discuss strategies for ESSA students to help them gain a greater level of understanding of the concept being taught. Teams will continue to collaborate on effective strategies for close reading and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Increase fidelity of tutoring attendance and instruction. The CRT will monitor tutoring attendance monthly and will meet with tutoring teachers to discuss data.

Person Responsible Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Intentional iReady monitoring by Admin to ensure students are meeting typical growth expectations and working towards the stretch growth goal.

Person Responsible Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Ensure that teachers are trained in Digital Learning and the Canvas platform.

Person Responsible Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Increase ELA and Math fluency. Grades K-1 will complete a DRA 3x per year to add an additional data point for their students. Grades K-2 will complete fact fluency checks weekly to add additional data points.

Person Responsible Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

As a result of these action steps and strategies, we expect to see less truancy and behavior concerns and a significant improvement in grades.

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.

It truly does take a village to reach all children. Communication is paramount when enlisting and increasing parent and community involvement. Each school year, a Stellar Customer Service (SCS) Plan is developed and/or reviewed with a focus on the registration process. The SCS plan incorporates steps to clarify and correct communication as well as streamlines the steps in the registration process by providing computer access to potential parents.

The PTA and SAC are other strong avenues that build the relationships and offer a bridge of communication to the community. "Meet the Teacher" and the "Boo Hoo Breakfast" offer parents the time to connect with the school and staff. Other ways Columbia ES connects with the parents and community include: Parent/Student Handbook, ProgressBook and Progress Reports, Report Card Conference Night, Announcements on the Marquee, School Messenger phone calls, Extended Day, Open House, Carnival, Quarterly Newsletter, and Parent-Teacher Conferences. We have also recently added social media to our repertoire with Facebook and Twitter.

We also have a number of Partners in Ed that are involved in the school. Some of the needs they address

are providing supplies to the students and staff, volunteering in areas of need, providing incentives for students, and providing a support system by mentoring at risk students.

In order to advance awareness of college and career readiness, as well as tie in the broader stakeholders, the students participate in Project Lead the Way, Teach-In, and the UCF Education Day (if available).

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1100	140-Substitute Teachers	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Use of substitutes to assist with PD for teams</i>			
	1100	500-Materials and Supplies	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		\$1,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1100	100-Salaries	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		\$1,200.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring Program</i>			
Total:						\$7,200.00