

Orange County Public Schools

William S Maxey Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

William S Maxey Elementary

602 E STORY ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://maxeyes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Sean Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

William S Maxey Elementary

602 E STORY ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://maxeyes.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>90%</p>

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
Davis-Wilson, Carletta	Principal	Principal, Carletta Davis-Wilson: The principal leads the school and ensures all faculty and staff are working towards the school's mission and vision. She conducts all formal observations to make sure all instructional employees are implementing the Marzano Instructional Framework. She utilizes data-based decision-making to ensure the students are provided a meaningful education. The principal is responsible for ensuring students are provided standards-based and differentiated instruction, as well as intervention services. She facilitates data meetings and school leadership team meetings to discuss student academic progress. The principal regularly communicates with stakeholders regarding the school and students' academic progress.
Young, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Tara Young: The resource teacher is responsible for timely inventory and delivery of instructional resources to teachers. The CRT schedules, organizes, and maintains the testing calendar to ensure assessments are completed. She is the designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state assessments. She is responsible for collecting and analyzing data as well as generating data reports bimonthly to identify trends in instruction. The CRT schedules all professional development trainings, supports classroom instruction, and conducts peer feedback.
Louis, Irarissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Demetries McPherson and Instructional Coach, Irarissa Louis: The instructional coaches ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. They facilitate weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coaches assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at-risk." In addition, they assist in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. They routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. Instructional coaches model lessons and support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction. Coaches are also an integral part of developing common assessments.
McPherson, Demetries	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Demetries McPherson and Instructional Coach, Irarissa Louis: The instructional coaches ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. They facilitate weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coaches assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at-risk." In addition, they assist in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. They routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. Instructional coaches model lessons and support the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction. Coaches are also an integral part of developing common assessments.		
Horne, Christine	Other	ESOL Compliance Specialist, Christine Horne: As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Horne coordinates assessments for English Language Learners, oversees placements and supports in the general education classroom. She is responsible for monitoring and tracking ELL student performance in order to identify trends in instruction. She provides professional development trainings in accountable areas.
Urquhart, Michelle	Other	Behavior Specialist, Dr. Michelle Urquhart: As a Behavior Specialist, Dr. Urquhart facilitates the MTSS Behavior Team. The Behavior Team establishes school-wide procedures designed to meet district and State objectives. This includes creating a safe, inclusive learning environment for all students; especially those with special needs as well as general education students needing behavior intervention support. Dr. Urquhart is responsible for monitoring and tracking behavioral data for ESSA subgroups in order to determine school needs. Additionally, as the school's designated Title I Contact, Dr. Urquhart works directly with the Parent Engagement Liaison to implement the objectives outlined in the Parent and Family Engagement Plan.
Saulsby, Maria	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Maria Saulsby: The guidance counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. As a member of the Child Study Team, Mrs. Saulsby provide intervention to families and students identified as needing intervention for truancy. She is the liaison for families needing academic, behavioral, and/or mental support services. She assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children considered "at-risk." The guidance counselor facilitates IEP meetings and is a member of the MTSS team. The guidance counselor is responsible for modeling and monitoring implementation of health lessons grades K-5.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Sean Brown

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.*

6

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

348

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

4

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	21	60	71	78	52	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
Attendance below 90 percent	4	12	9	15	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	5	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

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	36	71	70	62	69	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	362
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	7	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	36	71	70	62	69	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	362
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	7	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				66%	57%	57%	66%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	58%	58%	77%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	52%	53%	84%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				77%	63%	63%	74%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	61%	62%	62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	48%	51%	65%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	56%	53%	45%	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	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	81%	63%	18%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
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 used to compile the data is iReady and district Science Progress Monitoring Assessment. Student data results for each iReady diagnostic period is reported as end of year view.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	38	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	31	51
	Students With Disabilities	14	29	57
	English Language Learners	6	11	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	19	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	13	38
	Students With Disabilities	0	29	43
	English Language Learners	6	17	22

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	26	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	26	37
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners	6	6	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	12	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	17	12
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	6	6	6

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	33	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	29	48
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	60
	English Language Learners	5	30	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	20	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	10	23
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	20
	English Language Learners	0	15	25

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	10	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	11	16
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	10
	English Language Learners	5	5	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	7	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	9	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20
	English Language Learners	5	5	21
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8	13	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	17	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	50
	English Language Learners	0	19	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	13	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	17	32
	Students With Disabilities	0	60	50
	English Language Learners	7	19	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	39	41	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	43	62
	Students With Disabilities	40	75	50
	English Language Learners	33	33	60

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	33			43							
ELL	46	60		63	53		38				
BLK	56	65		53	35		45				
HSP	50	59		63	47		44				
WHT	64			82							
FRL	56	68		58	46		46				
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	68	38		53	38						
ELL	53	61	54	63	61	45	31				
BLK	65	62		85	71		63				
HSP	62	65	60	67	66	50	47				
FRL	63	66	69	73	67	63	59				
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	42	71		58	71						
ELL	49	73	80	47	48						
BLK	73	78		79	64		50				
HSP	57	76	75	63	58	70	27				
FRL	65	77	88	75	64	71	46				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	51
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	51
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	73
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In ELA, as a school, students need extra support in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension of informational & complex text. Students have shown improvement in the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics. There is a need for increased opportunities for students to practice fluent reading throughout the school day to build stamina and fluency.

In Math, as a school, students need extra support in the areas of numbers & operations and fact fluency.

Based on the data from the 2019 FSA, the ELL subgroup has the lowest achievement in ELA and the SWD subgroup has the lowest achievement in Math.

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

Based on the data from the 2018 - 2019 FSA, the data component that showed the greatest need for improvement was the lowest 25% for ELA and Math. Reading and Math achievement for the lowest 25% of students was 59%. Progress monitoring data also indicates a need for improvement in this area.

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

Contributing factors include:

- *Students lack a deep understanding of foundational concepts in numbers & operations in the primary grades
- *There has been limited opportunities for fluency practice & automaticity
- *Limited small group instruction in mathematics
- *There are large gaps in learning for intermediate students who are performing more than two grade levels below

The new actions that are needed to address this area of improvement include adding a specific block of time for small group mathematics instruction, engagement activities to support math fluency, and professional development to support teaching pedagogy. For students who are performing more than two grade levels below, intervention support will be provided through the MTSS process. Students

data will be tracked and discussed during MTSS PLCs to monitor progress towards closing the achievement gap.

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

The 2018-2019 FSA data component that showed the most improvement was ELA for students with disabilities (SWD). In 2018, overall achievement was 48% compared to 68% in 2019.

The Black subgroup showed the largest point increase amongst other subgroups (30 points) when comparing 2020-2021 iReady BOY diagnostic to EOY diagnostic.

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

Students utilized strategies such as SMART 7, Close Reading, and chunking in order to process and comprehend complex texts. In addition to ESE support facilitation services, students received differentiated learning tasks during centers and Foundational Basic Skills (FBS). Students with Disabilities also benefited from receiving their accommodations with fidelity, as stated in their IEP.

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

In addition to the strategies that have proven to be successful, we will closely monitor and discuss student data to identify and address specific deficits. During data meetings, teachers will develop an action plan to address the needs for the identified student performance levels. Deficits will be addressed during small group instruction and push in/out support. Additionally, each intermediate student will have and use a data journal to ensure that they are taking accountability for their learning and are aware of their progress. All classes K-5 will have a fluid data display to increase accountability, set goals, and accelerate learning. Engagement strategies will be implemented and utilized during daily instruction to support students' discourse and understanding of content.

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.

The professional development (PD) opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders are a PD where teachers will be shown how to analyze and disaggregate data. Classroom data and grade level data will be analyzed to identify trends per class and across the grade level. Another PD that is needed is on vertical alignment across grade levels to ensure mastery of standard in addition to expectations of previous and upcoming grade level. Lastly, teachers will receive a refresher PD on engagement strategies and collaborative structures.

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

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement, students will receive additional push in support by an interventionist to accelerate learning. Pull out intervention groups will take place weekly and will be provided by Reading Endorsed staff. Additionally, during PLCs, teams will purposely plan for reading and math small groups, ensuring that resources match the needs of the students. Lastly, we will continue to provide project based enrichment opportunities for students that have mastered grade level standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that of students in Grade Four scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to improve overall ELA achievement For the 2022 FSA ELA, data will show an increase of three percentage points from 56% to 59%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by conducting weekly data chats during grade level PLCs to discuss instructional trends and student progress. Teachers will be observed during classroom instruction and provided actionable feedback. Coaching support will be provided through the coaching cycle for teachers who need additional support with instructional strategies. Students will track their progress on common assessments and iReady diagnostics to help them identify areas for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use differentiated learning tasks during centers and teacher led small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected because differentiated instruction allows teachers to maximize the growth of all students by meeting them where they are regardless of their abilities, strengths, and weaknesses.

Action Steps to Implement

Content area coaches will facilitate weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards based instruction with embedded opportunities for scaffolding and support is evident. Differentiated centers will be purposely planned for to meet the needs of the focus subgroups.

Person Responsible Irarissa Louis (irarissa.louis@ocps.net)

Ensure the 90 minute reading block contains statutory requirements including 6 components of reading (as noted in Florida’s Formula for success).

Person Responsible Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure:
 Students are appropriately identified.
 Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.
 Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team’s findings.

Person Responsible Maria Saulsby (maria.saulsby@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social and emotional learning (SEL) enhances students’ capacity to integrate skills, attitudes, and behaviors to deal effectively and ethically with daily tasks and challenges. Students apply their knowledge, attitudes, and skills to develop and achieve goals related to their academics, social-emotional and mental health well being. As a Title I and Trauma Sensitive school, Maxey ES students benefit from targeted interventions using a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). Students demonstrated needs in the areas of problem solving, self esteem development, and the application of appropriate social skills.

Students who are able to self regulate and manage their emotions will attend to learning within the academic environment; therefore, increasing the performance for the bottom 25% of students.

Measurable Outcome: The specific measurable outcomes we plan to achieve will be evidenced by the anticipated impact of culture and climate on student achievement. This outcome will be illustrated by a decrease in the number of students receiving support at Tier II and Tier III.

Currently, fifteen students receive Tier II SEL support and five students receive SEL support at the Tier III level. Our goal is to decrease the number of students in each tier by 10%.

Monitoring: Guidance referrals will be utilized to collect and monitor data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy that will be utilized is distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaborations in order to build academic expertise with all students.

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. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults 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 team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

Action Steps to Implement

Our school will plan 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 culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations.

Person Responsible Michelle Urquhart (michelle.urquhart@ocps.net)

Classroom observations will be utilized to identify trends and monitor implementation of SEL strategies.

Person Responsible Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains showed the lowest performance being 59%. Progress Monitoring Data from the 2020-21 school year also indicated need as 57% of our students school-wide displayed proficiency on the EOY i-Ready Diagnostic. Focusing on increasing the learning gains of the Lowest 25% will lead to an increase in learning gains, overall math proficiency, and help reduce the achievement gap within this population of students.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to improve Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains on the statewide assessment from 59% to 65%. Additionally, on i-Ready, is to increase overall math proficiency from 57% to 65%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by teachers will be observed during mathematics whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will be provided actionable feedback by the observer. During weekly grade level PLCs, student data on formative and summative assessments will be analyzed for class and grade level trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs the focus group. Teachers will monitor and track student progress toward proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected to bridge the achievement gap by meeting students at their individual level while providing scaffolds and support where needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Content area coaches will facilitate weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards based instruction is evident. Purposeful planning will be implemented for the lowest 25% of students.

Person Responsible Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

Intervention will be provided to the lowest 25% of students biweekly. Summative assessments will be collected on a weekly basis. Formative assessment data will be analyzed for acceleration purposes.

Person Responsible Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Maxey Elementary School is ranked 860 out of 1,395 schools statewide and 26 out of 126 schools in Orange County Public School District for incidents that occur on campus. There are three categories for incidents that may occur at school. These three categories include: Violent Incidents, Property Incidents, and Drug/Public Order Incidents. Maxey Elementary has had a total of three Violent Incidents, (one for bullying, one for physical attack, and one for threats/intimidation) with an enrollment of 406 students which converts to .74 percent for the Incident Rate in the 2019-2020 school year. The ranking ranges from Very Low to Very High to include five categories: Very Low, Low, Moderate, High, and Very High. Maxey Elementary has a ranking of High for the three incidents that occurred in 2019-2020.

To decrease incidents of bullying, physical attack, and threats/intimidation, Maxey will continue a school-wide focus on social emotional learning to include Social Skills Instruction, Restorative Practices, Kindness Initiatives, and Positive Behavior Support. The Behavior Intervention Team, comprised of a Guidance Counselor, Behavior Specialist, Student Support Resource Teacher, Principal, and Social Worker, will monitor trends of school discipline data to assess school culture and environment in order to determine needed interventions and action steps to increase key core competence areas of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.

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.

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, principal, and a mental health designee attends 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 school stakeholders, based on school and community needs.

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

As we build momentum towards enhancing student learning, Maxey Elementary School will continue to develop positive relationships with parents, families, and the community by creating a warm, nurturing, and safe environment that meets the needs of all students. We will achieve this welcoming experience by ensuring that all members of the Maxey family understand their role and responsibility in the school-home partnership.

Additionally, it is imperative that all stakeholders are able to contribute to the development and implementation of school improvement strategies, therefore ensuring that our goals are inclusive, equitable, and of benefit to our students. To foster school-home collaboration and engagement, Maxey Elementary encourages stakeholders to engage in volunteer and partner opportunities. Information is provided in multiple languages in order to sufficiently inform stakeholders, match needs and interests, and involve partners that share a common value. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation of services and to gather feedback to help determine next steps to improving school culture and environment.