Killarney Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Killarney Elementary

2401 WELLINGTON BLVD, Winter Park, FL 32789

https://killarneyes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Mark Wiekowski

Start Date for this Principal: 2/17/2020

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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (64%)
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

Killarney Elementary

2401 WELLINGTON BLVD, Winter Park, FL 32789

https://killarneyes.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	74%

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
Wieckowski, Mark	Principal	Mark Wieckowski will serve as the instructional leader at Killarney. Dr. Wieckowski will assist, support, and observe teachers with their data-driven decisions making skills to ensure that all students are meeting or exceeding academic and social/emotional expectations.
Wysong, Donna	Instructional Coach	Donna Wysong will serve as the Instructional Coach for the school. Ms. Wysong will also support teachers with enhancing instructional strategies using data to meet the needs of each learner.
Rowe, Carlton	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Carlton Rowe will serve as the school's Curriculum Resource Teacher, Science Coach and Behavior Resource Teacher. Mr. Rowe will support teachers by being a social/emotional learning resource and science coaching utilizing data to support instructional strategies.
Camp, Michelle	School Counselor	The School Counselor, Michelle Camp will be responsible for the social emotional wellness of the learners. Through the use of small group instruction and classroom support to teachers Ms. Camp will provide a developmental, systematic comprehensive program addressing the academic, and interpersonal/social needs of all students.
Cannon, Dawn	Staffing Specialist	Dawn Cannon will serve as the school's Staffing Specialist. Ms. Cannon will also support teachers with enhancing instructional strategies using data to meet the needs of learners with disabilities. Additionally, Ms. Cannon provides compliance support for teachers who service our ESE population.
Goulbourne, Shellise	Reading Coach	Shellise Goulbourne will serve as the school's Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Interventionist. Ms. Goulbourne will meet with teachers to discuss student progress monitoring in Tiers II & III and provide instructional strategies to support struggling students.
Gutch, Brandi	Instructional Technology	Brandi Gutch will serve as the school's Medial Specialist and Digital Coach. Ms. Gutch will support teachers with enhancing instructional strategies using the digital curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 2/17/2020, Mark Wiekowski

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.*
5

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Total number of students enrolled at the school
382

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

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	69	72	70	82	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	16	13	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	1	11	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

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	17	69	72	70	83	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	16	13	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
3	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	1	8	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									**Total**
Number of students enrolled	17	69	72	70	83	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	16	13	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									**Total**
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	8	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									**Total**
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				52%	57%	57%	59%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	58%	58%	60%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	52%	53%	58%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	63%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	61%	62%	76%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	56%	53%	66%	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	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	53%	3%
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 progress monitoring tool that was used to collect grade level data:
1st: I-Ready Math and Reading Diagnostic
2nd: I-Ready Math and Reading Diagnostic
3rd: I-Ready Math and Reading Diagnostic
4th: I-Ready Math and Reading Diagnostic
5th: I-Ready Math and Reading Diagnostic; District Progress Monitoring Assessments (Science Only)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	4%	6%	5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	3%	5%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	0%	4%	2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	6%	3%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	0%	17%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	16%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	10%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	8%	6%	7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	3%	5%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	31%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	32%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	0%	11%
	English Language Learners	11%	22%	40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	18%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	7%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	11%
	English Language Learners	13%	33%	20%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	35%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	27%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	10%	9%
	English Language Learners	17%	14%	14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	14%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	9%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	17%	17%	29%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	21%	17%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	10%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	25%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	25%	14%	24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	7%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50^	50%	25%
Science	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	50%	26%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	19%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	17%	29%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	33%

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	13			12							
ELL	43			50							
BLK	25	25		25	31		22				
HSP	39			41							
WHT	36			32							
FRL	24	13		25	30		14				
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	29	57	67	38	57		50				
ELL	58	60		67	60		80				
BLK	48	59	50	48	66	65	53				
HSP	55	59		63	69		74				

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	51	79		71	71		69				
FRL	50	64	68	61	71	62	67				
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	25	45	46	46	71	54					
ELL	38	60		75	73						
BLK	56	60	60	56	76	61	61				
HSP	47	59		60	75						
WHT	66	59		74	73		78				
FRL	58	62	68	61	75	58	68				

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	218
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	88%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	51
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	
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	26
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	45
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	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25
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?

In examining the FSA data and the 2020-21 Progress Monitoring data, the overall trend demonstrates a lack of proficiency in both ELA and Math. This lack of proficiency is observable throughout all subgroups and grade levels.

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

The ELA and Math proficiency levels between 2018 and 2019 dropped several percentage points (ELA dropped 7%; Math 4%). This also impacted nearly all subgroups. This is confirmed with the 2020-21 Progress Monitoring data provided by the i-Ready diagnostics. The highest percentage of proficiency demonstrated in every grade level among the Spring diagnostics is 37% in ELA and 28% 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?

At the start of the 2020-21 school year, we had 30% of our student return to the campus in a face-to-face instructional model. The remaining students were virtual which posed a challenge for our teachers as many had a mixed instruction class. After the second semester, students began to return to campus. During the fourth quin, 80% of the students had return to face-to-face instruction.

During the 2021-22 school year, we are hiring four dedicated Interventionists to help support our struggling students in grades 1st-5th. The focus both in reading and math will be providing remediation on fundamentals skills.

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

The 2019 FSA data demonstrated that all subgroups were below the ESSA 40% threshold for improvement. The ELL subgroup demonstrated 20% improvement from the 2018 FSA ELA data.

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

During that 2019 year, the focus of the school-wide focus was on increasing the ELA data for the English Language Learners. These students were pulled during interventions by various leadership team members who provided remediation to these students.

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

As we move forward into the 2021-22 school year, the focus will be on increasing overall proficiency in ELA and Math. The targeted students will be in our Free and Reduced Lunch, English Language Learners and students with Disabilities subgroups.

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.

Professional development activities for the school over the coming year will focus on implementing instructional strategies for our subgroups within core instruction. The topics will include creating academic rigorous tasks; standards alignment to the daily lesson targets; utilizing summative assessments as a guide for instruction; small group instruction; academic discourse; and rigorous questioning.

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

The school is hiring four Interventionists who will be providing direct remediation to students within our various subgroups during core instruction in math and ELA. These resources will push into classes and provide small group instruction that focus on the prerequisites of current grade-level standards and any necessary fundamental skills. They will be guided by our coaches who will provided the targeted lessons for the students. The groups will be monitored and will be flexible with students moving in and out of the intervention groups.

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 increase the proficiency levels in ELA and Math. Additionally, The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, 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 district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.
Measurable Outcome:	Killarney will utilize the data found in the Alex Incident/SESIR data indicator data. We will look to decrease the number of suspension to below the state rate 1 per 100 students.. Additionally, we will utilize the Panorama School survey to measure our outcomes. For the 2020-21 school survey, 65% of the students surveyed had a feeling of belonging to the school community. This was below the district's 71%. Killarney would look to increase this percentage to above the district's average to 75% for the 2021-22 school year.
Monitoring:	Killarney will utilize the Panorama School survey to monitor outcomes. Additionally, classroom walk through data collected during the day will provide trend data. Finally, discipline data will be collected daily and analyzed weekly looking for trends that may need attention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlton Rowe (carlton.rowe@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

1. Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum - Caring School Community.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

2. Provide teacher training on implementation of a school-wide SEL program.

Person Responsible Michelle Camp (michelle.camp@ocps.net)

3. Monitor implementation within classrooms through the use of walk throughs.

Person Responsible Carlton Rowe (carlton.rowe@ocps.net)

4. Provide ongoing Professional Development to support teachers with the implementation of the Caring School Community.

Person Responsible Michelle Camp (michelle.camp@ocps.net)

5. Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement. Seek methods to minimize the barriers to increase family engagement with the program.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

6. Administer Panorama School Survey to determine success of program.

Person Responsible Michelle Camp (michelle.camp@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on previous FSA data, Killarney will need to increase Math proficiency. The i-Ready Progress Monitoring data supports this for the 2020-21 school year. Students need to demonstrate master for the elementary school foundational skills in order to be successful in high level math subjects.
Measurable Outcome:	Math Proficiency for 2019 was at 59%. Killarney ES will increase FSA Math proficiency achievement levels for 3rd - 5th for 59% to 64% on the 2022 Math FSA.
Monitoring:	Student will receive monthly growth monitoring on i-Ready for Math to track progress. This data will drive intervention instruction prior to the i-Ready diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Killarney ES will be implementing Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office's Acceleration Program as part of our after school tutoring program for struggling students where they are front-loaded key vocabulary and concepts for upcoming standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies were chosen to support our students who fall into the yellow band of the i-Ready diagnostic. These students are close to grade-level but have gaps. The Acceleration Strategy has a proven record of data for moving these specific students to grade-level in a short amount of time.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Students will be identified as being one grade level or less below their current grade level using the Beginning of the Year i-Ready Math diagnostic.

Person Responsible	Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

2. Identified teachers will be trained on the Acceleration Program provided by Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office representatives.

Person Responsible	Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

3. During the week, students will received instruction utilizing the Acceleration Program provided by Intervention teachers.

Person Responsible	Donna Wysong (donna.wysong@ocps.net)

4. Student will receive monthly growth monitoring on i-Ready for Math to track progress.

Person Responsible	Donna Wysong (donna.wysong@ocps.net)

5. Student groups will be fluid based on the monthly progress monitoring allowing more students to be targeted for the program.

Person Responsible	Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on previous data, Killarney will need to increase ELA proficiency. ELA Proficiency for 2019 was at 52%. The i-Ready Progress Monitoring data supports this for the 2020-21 school year. It is a critical need due to the fact that elementary school foundational skills are the cornerstone for academic achievement in higher-level ELA courses. On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that (50% or more) 67% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).
Measurable Outcome:	Killarney ES will increase ELA proficiency achievement levels for 3rd - 5th from 33% to 57% on the 2022 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Student will receive monthly growth monitoring on i-Ready for ELA to track progress. This data will drive intervention instruction prior to the i-Ready diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. This instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence. Killarney ES will be implementing Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office's Acceleration Program during our intervention times for struggling students where teachers front-load key vocabulary and concepts for upcoming standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies were chosen to support our students who fall into the yellow band of the i-Ready diagnostic. These students are close to grade level but have gaps. The Acceleration Strategy has a proven record of data for moving these specific students to grade level in a short amount of time.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be identified as being one grade level or less below their current grade level using the Beginning of the Year i-Ready ELA diagnostic.

Person Responsible	Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

2. Identified teachers will be trained on the Acceleration Program provided by Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office representatives.

Person Responsible	Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

3. A daily rotation schedule will be created for these students during Fundamental Basic Skills, FBS, (grade-level intervention time) that feeds into the trained Acceleration Program teachers.

Person Responsible	Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

4. Students will receive monthly growth monitoring on i-Ready. for ELA to track progress.

Person Responsible	Donna Wysong (donna.wysong@ocps.net)

5. Student groups will be fluid based on the monthly progress monitoring allowing more students to be targeted for the program.

Person Responsible   Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@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.

Using the 2019-20 data provided from the Safe School for Alex, Killarney reported 2.3 incidents per 100 students which is greater than the state rate of 1 per 100 students for elementary schools. Killarney reported a total of 10 suspension for the year which is below the state rate. Behavior and discipline data will be recorded daily. The data will be reviewed weekly by the leadership team. Student Support Resource Teacher will provide strategies for teachers regarding behavior and discipline.

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.

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

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.