Castle Creek Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Castle Creek Elementary

1245 N AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://castlecreekes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Alyson Muse

Start Date for this Principal: 5/25/2016

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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

Castle Creek Elementary

1245 N AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://castlecreekes.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		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
Johnson, Monica	Principal	Educational leader of the school; Oversees all data and student growth; Oversees all social/emotional learning and positive behavior programs with the administrative team; Family, parent and community liaison; Oversees budget and financial processes for the school; Oversees legal issues; Works with SAC and stakeholders to develop the School Improvement Plan and to implement and analyze progress. Member of the SELL team.
Velazquez, Ruth	Assistant Principal	Oversees BEST benchmarks; Oversees all inventory for all areas (technology, textbooks, materials, property); Oversees physical plant; Oversees school safety; Oversees transportation; Oversees safety dismissal procedures; Oversees Attendance.
Camacho Moody, Maria	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for all teachers; Oversees data room; Coordinates data conversations with faculty; Oversees acceleration. Oversees Professional Development with the Principal.
Northway , Sarah	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum Resource Teacher - oversees all curriculum and materials; Oversees intervention materials for all teachers; Testing coordinator; Textbook and materials manager.
Sullivan, Michelle	Other	Coordinates all academic Multi-Tiered student programs; Coordinates parent and teacher meetings to determine individualized programs for students performing academically below grade level.
Craig, Laura	Behavior Specialist	MTSS Behavior coordinator; Coordinates positive behavior/characteristics house system for all students and staff; Meets with teachers and parents to develop positive behavior plan.
Manzano, Karen	School Counselor	School Mental Health coordinator ;Works with school-wide positive behavior program; Coordinates school SELL program and plans SEL professional development; Coordinator of threat assessments. MTSS Mental Health Coordinator.
Rosado, Alicia	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Compliance for all students; Teacher contact and coordinator for ELL accommodations for lesson plans.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 5/25/2016, Alyson Muse

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

620

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

2

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

2

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	68	86	112	100	117	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	9	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	3	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	12	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 6/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	31	92	123	101	117	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	24	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	10	1	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	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	5	3	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	0	0	0	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	31	92	123	101	117	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	24	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	10	1	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	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	6	4	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	0	0	0	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				55%	57%	57%	57%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	53%	44%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	61%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	61%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				22%	48%	51%	31%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	56%	53%	60%	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	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	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.

Castle Creek utilized IReady data from the Fall, Winter and Spring to progress monitor Tier1, 2 and 3 instructional standards to provide instruction, intervention and mediation.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	52	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	26%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	33%
	English Language Learners	6%	12%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	40	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	18%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	33%
	English Language Learners	6%	6%	18%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	38	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	17%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	43%
	English Language Learners	6%	4%	14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	31	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	14%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	29%	29%
	English Language Learners	7%	7%	10%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	56	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	28%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	30%
	English Language Learners	14%	4%	23%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	33	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	0%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	0%
	English Language Learners	5%	13%	14%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	32	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	14%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	4%	0%	25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	33	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	8%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	16%	8%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	36	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	12%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	18%
	English Language Learners	9%	12%	22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	38	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	0%	16%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	23%	9%
	English Language Learners	4%	18%	25%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	50	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	42%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	21%	20%
	English Language Learners	54%	40%	52%

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	3	20		13	21		8				
ELL	37	62	50	40	38		48				
ASN	100			82							
BLK	48	50		40	50		38				
HSP	40	39	38	38	25	12	38				
MUL	62			62							
WHT	54	41		62	47		65				
FRL	37	38	27	33	18	13	34				
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	5	29	30	14	28	21					
ELL	38	39	31	47	39	15	43				

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
ASN	95	69		100	62						
BLK	52	51	47	54	43	25	56				
HSP	47	48	39	52	50	21	51				
WHT	65	53	23	66	55		74				
FRL	48	45	43	49	46	25	46				
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	3	19	22	19	30	30					
ELL	32	47	41	41	37	32	29				
ASN	92	94		96	94						
BLK	50	39	25	46	47	36	45				
HSP	53	56	54	56	52	33	52				
WHT	58	56	37	67	53	20	71				
FRL	51	50	44	55	52	29	53				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	91
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	34
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	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	31
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?

Castle Creek attendance has historically impacted student learning. Over ten percent (fluctuates by year)of student population has had more then 20 days absent which reduces their chances of making the learning gains toward grade level. IReady data demonstrates that ELL and SWD students have a higher rate of failure and less learning gains due to truancy. However it does demonstrate that we are closing achievement gap in reading and math.
ESE
2019-2020: ELA +15%; Math +16%
2020-2021: ELA +48%: Math +52%

ELL
2019-2020: ELA + 41%; Math +38%
2020-2021: ELA +43%; Math +51%

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

According to IReady, FSA and ESSA the population that demonstrate the most need is the SWD and ELL.

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 is a correlation between student attendance and student learning gains. Students with Early Warning indicators that include attendance and low achievement are 50% less likely to show learning gains (SWD and ELL). This indicates that strengthening a system to address truancy of targeted students will impact future learning and student achievement.

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

Reading and math data from IReady demonstrated improvement in 2018-2019 for ELL and SWD student in the lowest 25% based on the data points indicated from BOY to MOY and MOY to EOY, but the FSA and state ESSA results did not correlate to the data point trajectory.

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

The small group instructional model was implemented in all subjects throughout the school day. Teachers increased the use of exit slips to focus on reteaching the standards in small groups within a

day of the whole-group instruction, based on student needs with an emphasis on fluidly of classroom groups.

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

Castle Creek will continue to focus on small group instruction. Placement of students in classes is based on student needs and teaching styles, using common assessment data and IReady data to place students with teachers who have strengths in the area of student weakness. The school will focus on ACCELERATION strategies during intervention and tutoring. There will be weekly focus on student attendance to address truancy.

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: 1) attendance policies and school attendance plan, 2) ACCELERATION strategies implementation, 3) SEL lessons through Health class, 4) DESSA training for school wide individual student mental health, 5) SELL professional development by the team

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

Castle Creek has implemented a school-wide positive SEL house social emotional program, Weekly classroom walkthroughs will continue to focus on small group and individualized instruction. Weekly PLC data and planning meetings and monthly professional development with use of google sheet exit slips to monitor faculty understanding of staff development, Monthly monitoring of Deliberate Practice reflections will be a monitoring tool for professional development implementation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SELL and mental health are the two areas of focus established by the district.
Measurable Outcome:	We will Increase in social emotional support groups for students by 50% from the previous school year. Students in SEL support groups will show a full year academic growth in Reading and Math.
Monitoring:	The Guidance Counselor and the MTSS Behavioral Resource Coordinator will progress monitor students in the mental health Tier 2 and Tier 3, which will serve as the targeted mental health students. Progress monitoring will include attendance, participation in weekly groups, reducing the number of mental health issues that disrupt learning and academic achievement of a full year learning growth in ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Manzano (karen.manzano@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Historical administrative has been data collected by teachers and the administrative team though individual parental conferences. Teacher input in conjunction with professional development on SEL has provided guidance to enhance additional professional development and programs to address student mental health and decision-making. Eighty-two percent (82%) of students with documented mental health issues showed a decline in iReady scores from the 2020-2021 school year MOY to EOY scores in ELA and Math or both.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The district expectation is to provide students with mental health and social/emotional support as they return face to face from COVID virtual learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance counselor will check with targeted students daily to monitor their emotional and academic status.

Person Responsible	Karen Manzano (karen.manzano@ocps.net)

Schedule will be provided to help guidance counselor implement additional small/individual support daily.

Person Responsible	Karen Manzano (karen.manzano@ocps.net)

Guidance counselor will collaborate on DESSA mental health measures with teachers to focus on fluid support of students.

Person Responsible	Karen Manzano (karen.manzano@ocps.net)

The MTSS Behavior Resource Coordinator will work with the guidance counselor and staff to provide monthly mentorship for targeted students.

Person Responsible	Laura Craig (62884@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA learning gains in the lowest 25% of students in Reading and Math are below district, learning community and state averages. The 2020-2021 lowest 25% of learning gains in ELA was 35% and in Math was 21%. The 2018-2019 lowest 25% learning gains in ELA was 38% and in Math was 22%.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will increase learning gains in the lowest 25% of students in both reading and math to 55% measured through FSA..
Monitoring:	Tier 1 instruction will include two PLC planning days per week. Lesson plans will focus on aligning student tasks to the standard. Common assessments, weekly iReady lessons and iReady diagnostic will measure growth. Daily and weekly walkthroughs and observations will provide actionable feedback to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will plan lessons with the common assessment, standards, test specs, and strategies to align to lessons. Students will use tiered lessons in FBS and Intervention groups to improve skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The core tier 1 lessons and pace of lessons does not move students in the lowest 25% to the outcome of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

Students in the lowest 25% of the 4th and 5th grade will be identified through data.

Person Responsible Maria Camacho Moody (maria.camachomoody@ocps.net)

PLC lesson planning will be monitored two days per week for lessons that are standards-based for whole group and for small group activities.

Person Responsible Maria Camacho Moody (maria.camachomoody@ocps.net)

A weekly plan of walkthroughs and observations will be implemented to monitor that lessons are being taught with the intent that they are written and that teachers receive actionable, next step feedback.

Person Responsible Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading proficiency on the FSA test dropped from 55% to 47% proficiency from the 2019 to the 2021 tests. The 2021 iReady BOY Reading scores for grades K-5 show 26% of students are on grade-level, 48% of students are one year below in Reading and 27% of students are two or more years below in Reading.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in grade 3 - 5 will increase proficiency to 55% on the FSA testing. Students in grade K - 5 will increase proficiency in reading to 55% by the EOY iReady Diagnostic test.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will occur in PLC planning to focus on Tier 1 instruction. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will result in actionable feedback to teachers. Common assessments will be monitored at the end of each until.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common assessment data will show the number of students who are proficient in each standard. Proper scaffolding of materials and activities and small group support from resource teachers will monitor student improvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common assessment data shows the weaknesses of individual students to allow for additional support toward moving to reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan lessons two times per week.

Person Responsible	Maria Camacho Moody (maria.camachomoody@ocps.net)

Daily and weekly class walkthroughs and observations will be followed by next-step feedback for teachers.

Person Responsible	Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)

Common assessment data will be analyzed to determine the needs for struggling students in reading.

Person Responsible	Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@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.

The areas of concern in the area of discipline are: 1) The mental-health related behavioral/ discipline issues that arise with students, and 2) the lack of eligibility to have a behavior specialist to address the behavioral and mental issues. During the 2021-2022 school year, Castle Creek ES will have full time trained MTSS Behavioral Resource Teacher to address behavioral issues that arise before implementing discipline. We will add MTSS Mental Health to our Guidance Counselor duties. These areas will be progress monitored weekly to support student needs.

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.

Castle Creek implements a house system that focuses on celebrating greatness, promotes team work and taking pride in our school as it builds the students character. We implement the house system to build leadership, responsibility and positive decision making that will help students build pathways to their future. The students celebrate greatness of their peers, school and staff members. The system helps build team camaraderie across grade levels and positive interactions of the staff and students. Each house has their own name based on diversity by using a different language that represents our population.

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

The primary stake holders that will impact the vision to ensure every student has a promising and successful future are the schools administrative team, team leaders, instructional staff, classified staff, PIE, SAC and of course the community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$750.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3610	239-Other	1612 - Castle Creek Elementary	General Fund		$750.00
			Notes: SEL staff and parent guides from OCPS ICMs and purchased based on district approval.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	7200	500-Materials and Supplies	1612 - Castle Creek Elementary	General Fund		$0.00
			1612 - Castle Creek Elementary			$0.00
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$1,250.00**