Pineloch Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pineloch Elementary

3101 WOODS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

https://pineloches.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Gerai Mays

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2017

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: C (43%) 2017-18: C (49%) 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	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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

Pineloch Elementary

3101 WOODS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

https://pineloches.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	96%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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
Price, Stacey	Principal	Instructional leader for school.
Gaspar, Maria	Assistant Principal	Assist principal with instructional leadership of school.
Castro, Kim	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Coordinates assessments, curriculum materials, events and professional development.
Cooper, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach for ELA and Math, K-2. Also serves as lead mentor for new teachers.
Guardascione-Wolf, Lisa	Math Coach	Instructional coach for Math and Science, 3-5.
Plowdeniz, Valerie	School Counselor	School counselor for campus. Provides support for mental health initiatives.
Shatto, Julia	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach for ELA and Writing, 3-5.
Oskin, Hilary	Instructional Media	Media Specialist and digital technology support for campus.
Melecio, Frances	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ensures compliance with all ESOL initiatives.
Weidner, Sarah	Staffing Specialist	Ensures compliance for students with IEP's and/or 504 plans.
Brown, Ranita	Dean	Provides support for behavioral initiatives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/15/2017, Gerai Mays

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
58

Total number of students enrolled at the school
670

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
1

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	55	134	129	119	99	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	8	43	46	63	50	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
One or more suspensions	2	10	3	21	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	29	42	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	6	2	12	7	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/27/2021

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	150	151	137	116	141	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	804
Attendance below 90 percent	7	29	32	25	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	6	7	12	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	3	3	8	32	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	150	151	137	116	141	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	804
Attendance below 90 percent	7	29	32	25	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	6	7	12	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	3	3	8	32	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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				39%	57%	57%	45%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	58%	58%	59%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	52%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	63%	63%	51%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				41%	61%	62%	52%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	48%	51%	45%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	56%	53%	42%	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	27%	55%	-28%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	63%	-23%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady was used to complete grade level data for reading and mathematics. Science progress monitoring assessment data was used for that subject.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/20%	26/24%	48/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/20%	26/24%	48/39%
	Students With Disabilities	1/.8%	1/.9%	1/.8%
	English Language Learners	8/7%	4/4%	11/9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/16%	18/17%	40/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/16%	18/17%	40/33%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	7/6%	4/8%	9/11%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/13%	26/24%	35/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/13%	26/24%	35/31%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1/.8%	9/8%	12/11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6%	13/12%	35/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/6%	13/12%	35/35%
	Students With Disabilities	1/.9%	0	0
	English Language Learners	5/4%	4/4%	15/15%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22/23%	28/31%	32/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/23%	28/31%	32/33%
	Students With Disabilities	1/1%	0	1/1%
	English Language Learners	5/5%	10/11%	9/9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/2%	8/9%	26/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/2%	8/9%	26/27%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	1/1%	10/10%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/18%	24/19%	35/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/18%	24/19%	35/26%
	Students With Disabilities	2/1%	1/.7%	5/4%
	English Language Learners	5/4%	7/6%	13/9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/9%	26/21%	40/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/9%	26/21%	40/29%
	Students With Disabilities	1/.7%	3/2%	4/3%
	English Language Learners	5/4%	12/10%	19/14%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/15%	20/21%	27/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/15%	20/21%	27/26%
	Students With Disabilities	2/2%	1/1%	2/2%
	English Language Learners	5/5%	6/6%	10/10%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/9%	19/20%	38/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/9%	19/20%	38/37%
	Students With Disabilities	2/2%	3/3%	3/3%
	English Language Learners	1/1%	6/6%	12/12%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34/33%	30/31%	32/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/33%	30/31%	32/31%
	Students With Disabilities	2/2%	2/2%	3/3%
	English Language Learners	1/1!	2/2%	5/5%

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	2	35	27	7	33						
ELL	22	43	47	22	38	33	21				
BLK	23	41	50	27	27	22	18				
HSP	22	39		20	35		35				
FRL	24	47	53	27	34	29	37				

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	14	33	40	11	15	20	20				
ELL	31	50	54	42	43	37	29				
BLK	34	46	57	32	38	33	32				
HSP	42	55	59	51	44	33	43				
WHT	80			70							

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
FRL	38	48	62	38	40	31	32				

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	24	40	25	20	40	50	25				
ELL	32	51	47	48	52	48	24				
BLK	45	61	52	44	53	47	39				
HSP	43	56	54	60	53	39	43				
WHT	80			80							
FRL	47	59	52	51	52	44	43				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	33
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	
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	32
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	31
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 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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
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?

Continued struggle with foundational reading and math skills at all grade levels. Limited growth for our ELL students. No growth for our SWD.

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

Foundational reading and math skills across all grade levels and subgroups need improvement.

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 included: large number of students in virtual instruction during Pandemic and high rates of absenteeism. Need to address gaps in foundational reading and math skills across all grade levels.

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

There were drops in student achievement in every school grade component in 2021.

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

Not applicable.

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

Strategies will be implemented to address gaps in foundational skills while teaching grade-level standards. Intervention supports will be implemented for all students. Strategies for ELL and SWD subgroups will be implemented.

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 learning opportunities will focus on literacy, math, ELL, SWD and intervention resources.

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

Additional services will include: intervention blocks for reading and math; pull out and push in intervention supports; after school supports and increased progress monitoring practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To improve core instruction in reading and mathematics to ensure alignment with the depth and rigor of the standard. Due to the large numbers of students struggling with foundational skills in reading and mathematics, core instructional practices must be implemented. We will also focus on strengthening small group instruction and intervention supports.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable goals for this area of focus include: *50% of students will be proficient in Reading and Math as evidenced by iReady or FSA. *Proficiency rates for Black students will increase by 10 points in reading and math as evidence by iReady or FSA. *Proficiency rates for SWD will increase by 20 points in reading and math as evidenced by iReady or FSA.
Monitoring:	1. Weekly classroom visits with feedback 2. Data chats with PCL's following standards-based unit assessments 3. Individual teacher data chats (quarterly) 4. Weekly monitoring of iReady lesson pass rates 5. Weekly monitoring of iReady report groups (bubble and gap students, ESE students)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will engage in processing content through collaborative interactions with other students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to effectively construct meaning, they must be actively engaged in processing of information by interacting with the teacher, students and the content.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize iReady diagnostic data to determine instructional resources needed
2. Utilize instructional frameworks for reading and math to support core and small group instruction
3. Provide professional development to support effective instructional practices in ELA, Math, Science, ELL, SWD
4. Provide ongoing feedback regarding effective instructional practices through weekly classroom visits
5. Monitor student performance through data chats with grade-level teams and individual teachers

Person Responsible	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

	#2. 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:
Measurable Outcome:	Student Data (SEL Competencies 3-5) *Increase self-management to 50% *Increase social awareness to 50% Teachers and Staff (SEL Survey) *Increase belonging to 60% *Increase professional learning about SEL to 50% Family Members (Family Survey) *Increase barriers to engagement to 90% **Increase school climate to 85%
Monitoring:	Data will be monitored through: *Culture & Climate data indicators *Qualitative data from students, staff, and families
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Price (stacey.price@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:	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

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum
Ensure a school team receives training on implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum
Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum
Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Person Responsible Valerie Plowdeniz (valerie.plowdeniz@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 73% of students scored below level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). On the BOY iReady Diagnostic Assessment, data indicated that 90% of students scored below grade level in reading. (Grades K-2)
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 14 percentage points from 27% to 41%. The EOY iReady Diagnostic will show an increase of at least 35 percentage points from 10% to 45% in Reading (Grades K-2)
Monitoring:	iReady Diagnostic Assessments and Growth Monitoring SIPPS Mastery Assessments Classroom Walkthroughs District Standards Based Unit Assessments District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments Heggerty Assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	the selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. The strategies and resources were selected because they address the identified need and show a proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize PLC's to review student assessment data and weekly lesson plans
2. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback to impact instructional practices
3. Ensure the 90 minute reading block is implemented as required
4. Utilize standards based unit assessments to plan small groups and differentiated learning
5. Provide professional learning opportunities to strengthen literacy instruction
6, Utilize research-based programs for reading intervention

Person Responsible Stacey Price (stacey.price@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.

We have developed a "watch list" to enable us to closely monitor our students who struggled with behavioral issues during the 2020-21 school year. Our primary areas of focus this year will be threats to self and others, and the social emotional needs of our students. We will be participating in the PBIS pilot project beginning this year.

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.

Teachers will communicate regularly with families to support the social, emotional and academic needs of our students. Monthly PTA meetings and quarterly SAC meetings will provide opportunities for community input and feedback to improve our school. Multicultural events will be held to celebrate the rich diversity of our 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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**