Chickasaw Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chickasaw Elementary

6900 AUTUMNVALE DR, Orlando, FL 32822

https://chickasawes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Xhuljeta Gjini

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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

Chickasaw Elementary

6900 AUTUMNVALE DR, Orlando, FL 32822

https://chickasawes.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	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	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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
Ledesma, Bethany	Principal	Bethany Ledesma is the instructional leader of our school. She provides on-going support to staff and students. With her guidance and direction, the leadership team is able to find solutions that best support our students and teachers in reaching success. She is an advocate for our school; she motivates and encourages staff, parents, and students to work collaboratively to achieve academic excellence. Her primary goal is the all-around success of our students, staff, and school.
Brancato, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Danielle Brancato is the assistant principal and works as an instructional leader while ensuring that operational functions of the school are at the highest level at all times to guarantee that students have the best learning environment possible. She assists in coordinating schedules, works closely with teachers through the PLC process, and monitors data to target areas needed for growth throughout the school year. She also evaluates teachers and provides specific feedback in areas of growth using the OCPS Instructional Framework.
Adames, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Cynthia Adames is the curriculum compliance teacher and will provide all teachers with ESOL information and strategies to reach the needs of all students that are learning a second language. She will also provide a direct intervention for students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade that are new in the country with limited English. She monitors the Tier 3 ESOL students to ensure they are receiving the right curriculum and intervention to obtain achievable goals. She provides the parents with guidance, materials, and websites to support ELL students at home.
Bogosian-Boutwell, Paula	School Counselor	Paula Bogosian-Boutwell provides a comprehensive guidance program with a focus on prevention and intervention in accordance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Act. Students and families will also have access to school and community resources through the guidance program.
Ebersole, Linda	Other	Linda Ebersole provides support to teachers and students to effectively minimize behavior disruptions to help create a safe environment for all students. She also coordinates and sponsors the Science SECME Team and Science Fair.
Kiem, Melanie	Instructional Media	Melanie Kiem helps support the global school goals by working to help students develop their literacy, critical thinking, and social skills as they learn how to access, assess, and use information as life-long learners. Through the use of the school integrated Accelerated Reader program, she helps build enthusiasm for reading and other content areas. She strives to turn the students into lovers of reading and avid seekers of knowledge.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zayas, Emilie	Teacher, K-12	Emilie Zayas is a resource teacher with a focus on curriculum. Her duties include working with teachers to coordinate interventions for students who are struggling in reading or mathematics. She facilitates data meetings with teachers to review progress monitoring data and make decisions for instruction, including the students in the lowest 25%. Another responsibility includes working with small groups of students to increase their reading proficiency and close gaps. She utilizes the Leveled Literacy Intervention system with these groups to track and improve reading proficiency and comprehension.
Bryant, Lauren	Staffing Specialist	Lauren Bryant is the staffing specialist and her duties include monitoring student progress toward interventions and using data, along with a team, to determine eligibility for the exceptional student education program, including students that are gifted, students with disabilities, and the lowest 25%. She also facilitates meetings between parents, teachers, school and district representatives, to ensure that students, including the lowest 25% are receiving Individual Education Plans, 504 plans, health plans, and/or accommodations to make progress toward grade level curriculum.
Olsen, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Tiffany Olsen supports the teachers with instructional practices through coaching conversations, modeling, guided peer observations, professional development, and data analysis so that teachers can best support all students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/5/2020, Xhuljeta Gjini

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

455

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	26	75	84	106	95	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	496
Attendance below 90 percent	16	22	25	40	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	1	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/21/2021

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	63	82	100	102	106	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	27	27	32	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	14	17	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	63	82	100	102	106	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	27	27	32	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	14	17	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				59%	57%	57%	56%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	58%	58%	49%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	52%	53%	38%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	63%	63%	53%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	61%	62%	32%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	48%	51%	18%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	56%	53%	56%	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	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	61%	63%	-2%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	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.

The i-Ready diagnostic results from the beginning-of-the-year, middle-of-the-year, and end-of-the-year diagnostic assessment were used as the progress monitoring tool for both reading and math in all grade levels. For fifth grade science, Performance Matters was used as the progress monitoring tool in the fall, winter, and spring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/72= 17%	20/73= 27%	24/76= 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/26= 18%	16/56= 29%	18/58= 31%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7= 0%	0/7= 0%	0/7= 0%
	English Language Learners	2/23= 9%	3/23= 13%	2/23= 9%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7/72= 10%	12/73= 16%	26/76= 34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/56= 5%	8/56= 14%	20/58= 34%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7= 0%	0/7= 0%	0/7= 0%
	English Language Learners	3/23= 13%	2/23= 9%	4/23= 17%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	6/97= 6%	17/97= 18%	28/98= 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/69= 4%	13/70= 19%	21/71= 30%
	Students With Disabilities	0/11= 0%	2/11= 18%	2/12= 17%
	English Language Learners	2/55= 4%	5/54= 9%	11/54= 20%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	2/97= 2%	11/97= 11%	19/98= 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/69= 3%	6/70= 9%	12/71= 17%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11= 9%	2/11= 18%	2/12= 17%
	English Language Learners	0/55= 0%	6/54= 11%	7/54= 13%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	7/9= 8%	20/90= 22%	32/90= 36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/69= 3%	10/69= 14%	21/69= 30%
	Students With Disabilities	0/13= 0%	0/13= 0%	0/14= 0%
	English Language Learners	2/37= 5%	5/37= 14%	8/37= 22%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	0/90= 0%	5/90= 6%	9/90= 10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/69= 0%	2/69= 3%	4/69= 6%
	Students With Disabilities	0/13= 0%	0/13= 0%	0/14= 0%
	English Language Learners	0/37= 0%	1/37= 3%	3/37= 8%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	8/102= 8%	20/103= 19%	27/105= 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/77= 8%	17/78= 22%	20/79= 25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/19= 0%	1/19= 5%	2/20= 10%
	English Language Learners	0/41= 0%	1/41= 2%	4/42= 10%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	5/101= 5%	7/103= 7%	21/106= 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/76= 5%	5/78= 6%	15/80= 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1/19= 5%	0/19= 0%	1/20= 5%
	English Language Learners	0/41= 0%	0/41= 0%	4/42= 10%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	4/79= 5%	11/80= 14%	19/80= 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/54= 6%	5/55= 9%	12/55= 22%
	Students With Disabilities	0/12= 0%	0/12= 0%	0/12= 0%
	English Language Learners	2/33= 6%	2/33= 6%	4/34= 12%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	3/80= 4%	5/80= 6%	10/80= 13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/55= 4%	3/55= 5%	6/55= 11%
	Students With Disabilities	0/12= 0%	0/12= 0%	0/12= 0%
	English Language Learners	1/33= 3%	1/33= 3%	2/34= 6%
Science	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	36/80= 45%	26/75= 35%	35/80= 44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/49= 37%	13/46= 28%	17/51= 33%
	Students With Disabilities	3/12= 25%	0/11= 0%	1/11= 9%
	English Language Learners	10/32= 31%	7/31= 23%	13/32= 41%

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	5			8	17		8				
ELL	39	41	27	26	37	55	21				
BLK	52			36							
HSP	44	47	40	30	30	46	34				
WHT	57			33							
FRL	40	40	33	28	31	53	30				
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	22	39	40	22	33	31					
ELL	44	52	49	52	51	47	36				
BLK	67	73		67	53						
HSP	57	52	50	61	56	51	51				
WHT	54	29		56	50		42				
FRL	57	51	49	58	54	38	53				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	7	18	19	14	15	6	18				
ELL	34	46	44	40	24	11	24				
BLK	66	50		55	35		58				
HSP	54	50	44	53	32	21	52				
WHT	56	42		50	32		80				
FRL	55	49	38	54	31	19	55				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
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	48
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

All grade levels showed growth in ELA and math progress monitoring when comparing Beginning of the Year to Middle of the Year to End of the Year. However, final percentages showing proficiency were all below 40%. Math is our lower core content area. Students With Disabilities remains our lowest subgroup for both ELA and math.

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

Both ELA and math data show a need of intense focus as both show very low proficiency. Overall ELA achievement shows 29% proficiency (grades 3-5) on progress monitoring assessments which is a drop when compared to 2019 FSA scores showing 59% proficient in ELA. Overall math achievement shows 14% proficiency (grades 3-5) on progress monitoring assessments which is a drop when compared to 2019 FSA scores showing 62% proficient in math.

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

Contributing factors include continued attendance issues which were related to the Covid pandemic. Many families also struggled with the virtual learning platform despite continued help from school staff. Students started the year with deficits from the previous year when schools switched to online learning due to the pandemic. Vocabulary and gaps in content knowledge continue to be areas of concern. Students need small group instruction so that teachers can target gaps in their understanding.

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

Unfortunately none of the components showed improvements when comparing progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments. All grade levels (1-5) did show improvements on progress monitoring assessments when comparing Beginning of the Year to End of the Year data.

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

Despite major barriers to learning, our teachers found ways to still pull students into small groups for targeted instruction if they were virtual.

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

Teachers will be able to return to more traditional small group teaching during core content blocks. This will allow them to deliver core content first and then target students who still have gaps in their understanding. We will also continue to focus on ways to develop teachers' abilities in writing and also expand on how to incorporate more writing into all content areas. We will also continue our focus on Social Emotional Development to address the needs of students that may have developed as a result of the pandemic.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development in writing including the general writing process, as well as writing across content areas. They will also receive professional development with regards to Social Emotional Learning and how to focus on the students' needs so they can focus on academics.

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

Schedule changes have been made to include an intervention block for both ELA and math in grades K-2 and one of each in grades 3-5. This allows us to truly target the student's largest area of need and provide direction intervention during those blocks.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: - to increase attendance in school - to improve student behaviors and focus for instruction - to increase parent and family knowledge of school and district resources that can be used to support students both academically and socially
Measurable Outcome:	After integrating and monitoring resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning, we expect for all students to have 90% or better school attendance. Discipline referrals will decrease and student achievement measured by FSA will increase from the previous year. Furthermore, 50% of families will attend at least one parent and family school sponsored workshop.
Monitoring:	Attendance and student discipline data will be monitored through Early Warning Systems. i-Ready diagnostic data will be utilized to monitor student academic progress. Attendance at parent and family workshops will be tracked through the use of sign-in sheets at each event.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families. Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Resources/Criteria: 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

Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction

Person Responsible   Paula Bogosian-Boutwell (paula.bogosian-boutwell@ocps.net)

Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum

Person Responsible   Paula Bogosian-Boutwell (paula.bogosian-boutwell@ocps.net)

Create flexible events and opportunities for families (e.g. different times throughout the day, face to face, virtual, pre-recorded sessions, multiple languages)

Person Responsible   Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture

Person Responsible   Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus is specific to improving the writing skills of all students. Writing is incorporated into all subjects and is essential to student success.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of a focus on schoolwide writing, 62% of 3rd-5th grade students will achieve proficiency on the ELA Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Monitoring:	Writing skills will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, quarterly writing prompts, student writing samples, exit slips from professional development, and instructional framework ratings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Thinking Maps - Write from the Beginning training will be conducted for teachers to utilize during instruction. This strategy will provide teachers and students with a more specific process for writing as well as how to utilize writing in all content areas when responding. This strategy will also assist our fragile subgroup of Students with Disabilities by providing a mapped way of planning for writing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Thinking Maps are a tool that is already used schoolwide but hasn't been utilized as a focus for writing instruction throughout all subject areas. The students have some background knowledge of the maps and how to use them and will be able to apply that knowledge towards writing to help plan and formulate organized writing. 2020-2021 i-Ready EOY data for our SWD subgroup showed a 5% proficiency in ELA and 4% proficiency in Math. Thinking maps will assist our SWD population with organizing critical content throughout all subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify a specific 30 minute block of time for writing

Person Responsible	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Conduct quarterly progress monitoring

Person Responsible	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Incorporate cross-curricular writing experiences into lessons

Person Responsible	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Utilize Thinking Map rubrics to score writing samples and make decisions about next steps for future lessons

Person Responsible	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

Conduct professional development to include vertical planning and student samples

Person Responsible	Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

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.

When comparing data on SafeSchoolsForAlex.org, Chickasaw received a very high rating by having 1.74 violent incidents per 100 students in 2019-2020. There were 11 out of 631 violent incidents on campus, comprised of harassment, physical attack, and threat or intimidation. This number was lower than Orange County, which had an incident rate of 2.87 and higher than the state of Florida incident rate of 0.88 per 100 students. Monthly behavioral leadership team meetings will occur during the 2021-2022 school year. Data from discipline referrals, observations, behavioral plan tracking sheets, and threat assessments will be analyzed and monitored during the meetings. In addition, through the professional development and focus on social and emotional learning, teachers will learn new ways to provide support to students, thus decreasing the amount of behavioral incidents on campus.

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, all schools 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, schools 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. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, 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 staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Chickasaw Elementary has a Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) who provides resources and support to all families so they can fully participate in their child's education. She works closely with the guidance counselor and social worker to identify needs of families to provide workshops on needed topics.

The site based Social Emotional Learning and Leadership team will provide professional development to all school staff this year to help them integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally.

A Multicultural Night will take place where all countries represented at Chickasaw Elementary will present and provide information to all families. This encourages families to take pride in all of the various nationalities and cultures at the school.

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				$74,892.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1141	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	General Fund		$74,892.00
			Notes: Guidance Counselor Salary			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$17,156.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1141	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	Title, I Part A		$6,677.00
			Notes: Write from the Beginning and Beyond Response to Text materials and training			
	1141	692-Computer Software Non-Capitalized	0831 - Chickasaw Elementary	Title, I Part A		$10,479.25
			Notes: Accelerated Reader Schoolwide License, STAR Reading, and MyON Reader			
					Total:	$92,048.25