Cheney Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cheney Elementary

2000 N FORSYTH RD, Orlando, FL 32807

https://cheneyes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Robin Broner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2018

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	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 (59%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: 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	
* 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

Cheney Elementary

2000 N FORSYTH RD, Orlando, FL 32807

https://cheneyes.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	81%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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
Broner, Robin	Principal	The principal leads the school and ensures all faculty and staff are working towards the school's mission and vision. She conducts formal observations to make sure all instructional employees are implementing the Marzano Instructional Framework. She utilizes data-based decision-making to ensure the students are provided a meaningful education. The principal is responsible for ensuring students are provided standards-based and differentiated instruction, as well as intervention services. She facilitates data meetings and school leadership team meetings to discuss student academic progress.The principal regularly communicates with stakeholders regarding the school and students' academic progress.
Silpe, Shane	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (AP) provides teachers with observations and feedback to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. He is in charge of discipline, facilities and emergency drills at our school and helps create a safe learning and working environment for all staff and students. The AP provides support to students, staff, and parents. This role is monitored through discussions during the leadership team meetings and sharing at PLC meetings.
Munoz, Heidi	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. She facilitates weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coach assists with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at risk." In addition, she assists in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. She routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. The instructional coach models lessons and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction. The coach is also an integral part of developing common assessments.
Malanga, Connie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The resource teacher is responsible for timely inventory and delivery of instructional resources to teachers. The CRT schedules, organizes, and maintains the testing calendar to ensure assessments are completed. She is the designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state assessments. She is responsible for collecting and analyzing data as well as generating data reports bimonthly to identify trends in instruction. The CRT schedules all professional development trainings, supports classroom instruction, and conducts peer feedback.
Quinones, Tania	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Quinones serves as the school liaison for ESE. She identifies specific students for ESE testing. She determines students that may need a behavior/discipline plan, identifies student for 504 plans, identifies students for re-evaluation. She facilities IEP team meetings with parents and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teachers. In addition, she facilitates child study team meetings. Mrs. Quinones also monitors and disaggregates ESE students reading/math data and maintains data and works closely with the school psychologist and school social worker.
	School Counselor	The school counselor serves as the schools mental health liaison. The school counselor provides social/emotional support to students.The school counselor facilitates social skills groups and individual counseling to students. The school counselor also facilitates character education lessons. The school counselor works closely with community resources and providing on-going support for teachers in implementing SEL-practices with their students.
Bigio, Charlene	Instructional Media	Ms. Bigio creates a schoolwide love for reading by developing and administering an integrated school library media program. She instruct students and staff in effective use of the media center, information and technology literacy skills, and use of equipment. She teaches literacy skills that are aligned with the standards. She provides leadership and guidance to teachers and students for effective reading strategies Develop knowledge of curriculum in all subject areas. Instruct teachers, administrators, and other staff in the use of new information technologies. Recommends and procures resources for staff for use in meeting their instructional objectives.
Williams, Lakeisha	ELL Compliance Specialist	As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Williams coordinates assessments for English Language Learners, oversees placements and supports in the general education classroom. She is responsible for monitoring and tracking ELL student performance in order to identify trends in instruction. She provides professional development trainings in accountable areas.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/20/2018, Robin Broner

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

425

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	17	72	62	76	72	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	388
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	13	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	8	19	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Thursday 6/24/2021

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	30	69	87	82	92	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	14	8	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	30	69	87	82	92	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	14	8	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	

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				53%	57%	57%	63%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	52%	53%	59%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	63%	63%	72%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	61%	62%	77%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	48%	51%	64%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	56%	53%	67%	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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

This data was derived from I-Ready diagnostic results. The progress monitoring tool is based of off the fall, winter, and spring diagnostic data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	44%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	44%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	51%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	51%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	50%
	English Language Learners	12%	0%	1%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	39%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	39%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	4%	0%	12%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	36%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	36%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	15%
	English Language Learners	1%	1%	1%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	58%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	58%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	66%
	English Language Learners	1%	24%	35%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	38%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	38%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	67%	33%
	English Language Learners	12%	24%	41%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	43%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	43%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	17%
	English Language Learners	10%	15%	19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	35%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	35%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	33%
	English Language Learners	f5%	11%	33%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	33%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	33%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	20%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	18%	29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	35%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	35%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	20%	20%
	English Language Learners	13%	29%	29%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	42%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	42%	45%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	21			29							
ELL	44	56	58	61	64		39				
ASN	86			93							
BLK	38	33		40	42		21				
HSP	43	38	50	54	46	29	37				
WHT	57	46		65	57		38				
FRL	42	37	39	49	49	43	36				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	26	32	33	48	55	42	13				
ELL	43	51	58	64	61	44	45				
BLK	60	80		83	79						
HSP	50	57	66	65	59	48	51				
WHT	47	47		71	58						
FRL	52	60	63	64	57	51	56				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	30	37	36	22	37	30					
ELL	46	54	57	62	72	68	27				
BLK	81	60		75	71						
HSP	57	54	59	72	79	66	66				
WHT	70	64		65	68		65				
FRL	64	57	61	72	80	71	69				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	57
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	90
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	
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	53
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	45
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?

Based on data trends our students in the lowest quartile showed a significant decline of 27 percentage points in reading (67% to 40%) from 2019-20 to 2020-21. Additionally, our overall ELA reading scores decreased by 25 percentage points.

There was a lack of implementation and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement mathematical practices to include standards-based instruction, real-world applications, fluency and abstract thinking tasks with fidelity.

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

According to the 2020-2021 FSA, science proficiency declined by 18 percentage points (55% to 37%). In addition,our overall reading learning gains showed the greatest decline during the 2020-21 school year. We decreased by 25 percentage points (59% to 36%).

There was a lack of implementation of best practices for instructional accommodations; to include standards-based instruction, vocabulary, and abstract thinking tasks. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement a plan for remediation or enrichment.and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan.

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

There was a lack of implementation of best practices for instructional accommodations; to include standards-based instruction, vocabulary, and abstract thinking tasks. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement a plan for remediation or enrichment.and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan.

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

Based on i-Ready and FSA 2020-21 data trends, our math proficiency showed the most improvement. According to the mid-year i-Ready data, math proficiency was at 46%. The 2020-21 FSA math proficiency showed a gain of 9 percentage points at 55%.

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

A strategic action plan was implemented to increase student achievement in math. The action plan encompassed standards-aligned tasks and assessments, and coaching support. Students in the lowest quartile were targeted for intervention and extra instruction in math. Student data was monitored bi-monthly to identify trends and progress. A math intervention time was created to allow students to productively struggle through math problems. In addition, a re-assessment and re-teach plan was implemented during math instruction consistently.

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

In order to accelerate learning, purposeful common planning will need to be consistent. Implement a tutoring program that promotes acceleration. Implement standards-aligned tasks and assessments that are rigorous and student-centered. Additionally, we will implement a comprehensive re-teach and reassess plan.

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.

Guided Reading strategies
Math Strategies training (Acaletics, mathematical practices)
Data meetings
Caring School Community
Marzano's Instructional Practices
BEST Standards
Write Score
Common Planning (grade level PLC's)

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

We will continue to conduct bi-weekly data chats. In addition, we will also continue to conduct targeted walk-throughs with actionable feedback and implement purposeful professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2020-21 FSA data, achievement levels and learning gains decreased in reading during the 2020-21 school year. Reading proficiency decreased by 5 percentage points (53% to 48%). In addition, the overall reading learning gains decreased by 23 percentage points (59% to 36%) and reading lowest 25% decreased by 27 percentage points (67% to 40%).
Measurable Outcome:	Students will demonstrate mastery of ELA standards resulting in an increase of 12% overall proficiency (60%). In addition, ELA overall learning gains will increase by 26 percentage points (62%) and the lowest 25% learning gains will increase by 25 percentage point (65%).
Monitoring:	The administration will create a weekly monitoring schedule and provide ongoing written actionable feedback that is given to teachers. The administration and school-based leadership team will analyze progress monitoring data bi-weekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identity building trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Build background knowledge 2. Frontload academic vocabulary 3. Implement the core skills to utilize academic discourse to answer text-dependent questions: elaborate and clarify, support Ideas with examples, build on and/or challenge a partner's idea, paraphrase, and synthesize conversation points.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students' analysis of reasoning deepens their understanding of content knowledge and enhances long term retention, decision making, critical thinking and problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step 1- Facilitate ongoing professional development focused on the implementation of effective instructional strategies, standards-based instruction, close reading strategies, and text-dependent questioning.

Person Responsible	Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 2- Vocabulary strategies to support all students will be intentionally planned for during common planning. Strategies will include the use of visual representation, oral language, and scaffolds.

Person Responsible	Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 3- Implement structured bi-weekly data meetings to track and monitor student progress. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standards and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support subgroups and our ESSA priority.

Person Responsible	Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 4- Maintain and monitor the effectiveness of a structured process to be used for interventions, which includes a tracking system to collect consistent data to meet the identified needs of students, aligned to our subgroups and our ESSA priority (students with disabilities).

Person Responsible Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2021, FSA math data indicated that there were declines in overall proficiency by 14 percentage points (69% to 55%), learning gains (13 percentage points, 62% to 49%), and learning gains of the lowest quartile (12 percentage points, 49% to 37%). These results demonstrate an urgent need to adjust instructional practices and to implement structured progress monitoring throughout the school. Teachers will effectively integrate mathematical practices to include standards-based instruction, real-world applications, fluency and abstract thinking tasks.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will demonstrate mastery of math standards resulting in an increase of math overall learning gains to 65 percentage points and the lowest 25% learning gains will increase to 60 percentage points on the 2021-22 FSA.
Monitoring:	The administration will create a weekly monitoring schedule and provide ongoing written actionable feedback that is given to teachers. The administration and school-based leadership team will analyze progress monitoring data bi-weekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identity building trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Frontload academic vocabulary 2. Utilize Backward Design Model when planning for math instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By using the Backward Design Model, teachers will intentionally plan for standards-based instructions. They will also purposefully embed vocabulary throughout instruction.

Action Steps to Implement	
Action Step 1- Implement math small group interventions that include a strategic remediation and reassessment plan for all targeted math standards.	
Person Responsible	Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)
Action Step 2- Facilitate weekly common planning with an intense focus on targeted standards-based instruction through the use of collaborative structures and metacognitive strategies.	
Person Responsible	Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)
Action Step 3- Implement structured data meetings to track and monitor student progress in math. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support.	
Person Responsible	Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)
Action Step 4- Students will have opportunities to apply real-world math concepts through rigorous lessons, web simulations, and hands-on math activities. A before and after school math acceleration will	

be offered.
Curriculum will focus on pre-teaching upcoming math standards, vocabulary, and process skills.

Person Responsible	Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. The academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. In addition, the adults will be able to make connections and build their confidence as it relates to social and emotional learning and awareness.
Measurable Outcome:	There will be a 10% increase in parents, students, and teachers completing the Cognia survey data. Also anticipated impact of a culture and climate will increase overall student achievement by 5% in all content areas. ELA achievement will increase to 60% and math achievement will increase to 62%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action based on data, student needs, and adult needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will plan and implement ongoing professional development to improve practices that support social and emotional learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to build and create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students school-wide, it is critical to foster the development of the competencies that relate to the CASEL approach. Through a distributive leadership model, we will enhance opportunities to strengthen team dynamics and improve student success.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will implement the Caring School Community curriculum school-wide.

Person Responsible	Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Facilitate ongoing professional development focused on the implementation of effective SEL strategies.

Person Responsible	Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students.

Person Responsible	Robin Broner (robin.broner@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.

In the 2019-2020 school year, Cheney Elementary reported 0.8 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the high category, ranked as number 875 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. Zero drug/public order incidents were reported. Zero property accidents were reported. Less than 10 incidents of in-school and/or out-of-school suspensions were recorded resulting in a ranking of number 1 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. The primary focus that will be monitored in the upcoming school year is supporting teachers with Tier 1 behavioral systems to proactively intervene and de-escalate misbehaviors. This will be evidenced in classroom walkthrough feedback, coaching, and formal observation feedback. A key component of this system will be promoting SEL-based practices, purposefully scheduled time to support a positive classroom culture built on acceptance, relationships and understanding.

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, Cheney Elementary 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, we will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through professional develop, we will utilize a common language that encompasess the CASEL Core Competencies and the Caring School Community curriculum resource school-wide. This will support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect interpersonal and intrapersonal skills to support student success.

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

Our SEL core team will work with the SEL school site team to implement professional learning for school stakeholders. Additionally, teachers will embed and implement the Caring School Community curriculum within their daily instruction. This curriculum will focus on social and emotional learning and provide lessons on diversity and inclusion, empathy and critical thinking, communication, problem solving, and peer relationships. The school counselor will also provide individual, group and class lessons that are geared

towards social emotional learning. We will incorporate a SEL corner in monthly family newsletters to involve parents and the community in creating a positive inclusive school culture.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3610	500-Materials and Supplies	0711 - Cheney Elementary	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: Write Score and I-Ready workbooks (LAFS)			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3610	500-Materials and Supplies	0711 - Cheney Elementary	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: I-Ready workbooks (MAFS)			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00
					Total:	$15,000.00