Orange County Public Schools

Deerwood Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 11

Planning for Improvement 18

Positive Culture & Environment 21

Budget to Support Goals 21

Deerwood Elementary

1356 S ECONLOCKHATCHEE TRL, Orlando, FL 32825

https://deerwoodes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Melanie May

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (72%)
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	

* 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 11

Planning for Improvement 18

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 21

Deerwood Elementary

1356 S ECONLOCKHATCHEE TRL, Orlando, FL 32825

https://deerwoodes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	72%

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

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
May, Melanie	Principal	Once a week the Leadership team meets as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Each team member has specific duties and responsibilities that contribute to the overall shared decision making process. She oversees the overall decision making process, as well as observe and evaluate the instructional staff. They also partake in weekly data meetings, common planning, MTSS, and PLCs. In addition she works directly with teachers as Instructional Leaders to develop and monitor best practices for academic instruction. Classroom walk-throughs are conducted to ensure instructional practices are aligned to the Florida standards.
Pagan, Mary	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach works closely with new teachers. She collaborates with grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. She also partake in weekly data meetings, common planning, MTSS, and PLCs. In addition The instructional coach collects the weekly data from each teacher on their common assessments. As well as assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning. The Instructional Coach also works with a small group of students to help foster academic progress.
LoTurco, Rebecca	School Counselor	The guidance counselor collaborates with the behavior specialist and MTSS coach to work together to support students with their social-emotional needs. She provides monthly guidance lessons for all K-5 classrooms and works directly with the teachers to support behavioral needs within the classroom. She is responsible for monitoring our students who are eligible for services through the McKinney-Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support for these families identified as homeless. The School Counselor also works with a small group of students to help foster academic progress.
Lean, Lori	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist monitors the accommodations provided to the ESE students and ensures their IEP plans are up to date and followed. The Staffing Specialist also works with a small group of students to help foster academic progress.
Allen, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher collaborates with grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. She assists them with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning. The CRT also partakes in weekly data meetings, common planning, MTSS, and PLCs. She is responsible for overseeing administration and compliance for all state testing. She assist with school scheduling and works with a small group of students to help foster academic progress.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, Melanie May

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.*

3

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

417

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	25	62	57	73	78	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	6	14	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	0	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

2020-21 - 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	29	59	78	78	85	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	14	11	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	

2020-21 - 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	29	59	78	78	85	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	14	11	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	0	1	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				71%	57%	57%	77%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	58%	58%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	52%	53%	59%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	63%	63%	74%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	61%	62%	55%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	48%	51%	39%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	56%	53%	65%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	63%	21%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

K-5 ELA - Iready Diagnostic
K-5 Math - Iready Diagnostic
5th Grade Science - PMA

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	38%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	35%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	13%
	English Language Learners	100%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	28%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	19%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	46%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	43%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	14%	13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%	22%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	15%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	48%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	39%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	29%
	English Language Learners	15%	23%	46%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	19%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	18%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	23%	46%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	42%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	33%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	20%
	English Language Learners	0%	18%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1%	17%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	12%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	20%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	27%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	42%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	33%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	18%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	22%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	19%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	15%
	English Language Learners	0%	7%	36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63%	58%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64%	55%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	43%	30%
	English Language Learners	29%	20%	31%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20**	**C & C Accel 2019-20**
SWD	31	17		18	17		15				
ELL	54	21		63	21		23				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	63			56							
HSP	69	38		67	34		43				
WHT	73	57		74	62		54				
FRL	69	40	20	66	30		48				

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	36	43	55	37	50	45	50				
ELL	57	62	73	63	67	64	48				
BLK	59	50		71	55						

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
HSP	62	59	67	66	60	59	51				
WHT	84	71	60	81	64	27	73				
FRL	63	60	59	66	62	54	56				

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	52	50		43	50		18				
ELL	74	76	77	59	44	29					
BLK	91			73							
HSP	68	59	61	65	47	38	53				
WHT	85	67	55	83	63	45	75				
FRL	71	62	61	68	51	38	57				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We continue to need additional support in our 5th grade ELA. We also need to focus on our lowest 25% for learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our 5th Grade ELL and SLD subgroups

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The difficulty of working in small groups for targeted supported.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd grade ELA and Math

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The teachers worked collaboratively. The teachers had a strong understanding of the content and were able to effectively teach.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continue working in differentiated groups to maximize what skills they need.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Emphasis on working in small student groups and monitoring data for its effectiveness,

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

There will be additional personnel to support small group instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Deerwood will support a culture and environment specifically relating to social emotional learning by providing programs and training to develop emotional awareness, empathy and responsible decision making.
Measurable Outcome:	Student FSA proficiency in ELA will improve from 71% to 75% by implementing social emotional learning with fidelity.
Monitoring:	Deerwood will monitor this area of focus through weekly lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and PLC discussions,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Deerwood will use a research-based social emotional curriculum to support lessons increasing emotional awareness, collaborative activities, and corresponding growth measures. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs and adult needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our selected resource is a proven evidence based curriculum that will focus on communication, goal setting, decision-making, empathy, team work, service learning and citizenship, bullying prevention, and college and career readiness.

Action Steps to Implement	
Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social emotional learning.	
Person Responsible	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)
Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies. Teachers will attend monthly training during pre planning to support social emotional learning.	
Person Responsible	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)
Teachers will implement SEL lessons using Harmony Curriculum to meet the social emotional needs of their students.	
Person Responsible	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)
Develop positive working relationships with students and families. Our guidance counselor will continue to work with families and pull small targeted groups of students based on targeted SEL need.	
Person Responsible	Rebecca LoTurco (rebecca.loturco@ocps.net)
Monitor, measure and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decision that enhance school improvement efforts.	
Person Responsible	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Deerwood will focus on standards based instruction in order to increase learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math. Learning gains for our lower quartile students decreased by 8% (47% to 39%) on FSA Math from tested year 2017- 2018 to 2018-2019. We will also focus on increasing proficiency in ELA. 2017-2018 FSA ELA proficiency data shows a drop of 6% points from 77% to71%
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase by 8% from 39% to 47% on 2021-2022 Math FSA, thus surpassing the state average by 1%. ELA proficiency will increase 7% from 71% to 78%. We will monitor our progress through classroom walkthroughs, iReady progress monitoring and common assessment data.
Monitoring:	Deerwood will use a data tracking sheet for common assessments and spend time monthly disaggregating data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Deerwood will use data-based decision making to drive instruction, consistently monitoring academic growth and providing relevant interventions in Math monitored through the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We selected this strategy to support both the planning process for and delivery of standards based scaffolding to reach mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development, coaching and support to 3-5 teachers in planning for differentiating instruction through small group math.	
Person Responsible	Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)
Analyze data with 4th and 5th grade teachers to identify students in the lowest 25% and ESSA subgroups in order to support differentiated instruction.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Allen (jennifer.allen@ocps.net)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Deerwood Elementary reported 2.8 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools across the state we fall into the very high category.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Deerwood will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, Deerwood will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our principal, school counselor, 1 primary, 1 intermediate, behavior specialist and an ESE teacher will attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for our school's stakeholders, based on our school and community needs. Our leadership team will collaborate with stakeholders, through School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy

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**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	0000	100-Salaries	1601 - Deerwood Elementary	General Fund		$500.00
			Notes: Extra planning for SELL team members			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	0000	100-Salaries	1601 - Deerwood Elementary	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: Planning			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$1,500.00**