Metrowest Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Metrowest Elementary

1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

https://metrowestes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Sherry Donaldson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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

Metrowest Elementary

1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

https://metrowestes.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	No	88%

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 to 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
Gjini, Xhuljeta	Principal	Direct and manage the instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at the campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, the success of instructional programs, and the operation of all campus activities.
Owens, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and campus level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities and services.
LeSuer, Brandon	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as part of the Leadership Team and be responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity. He or she works as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning. The Instructional Coach focuses on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding about researched-base effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers.
McGhee, Adriane	Curriculum Resource Teacher	To improve teacher quality and provide job-embedded professional development for elementary classroom teachers and administrators in order to improve student achievement, grades K-6.
Ventura, Christine	Attendance/Social Work	Provide comprehensive school social work services to parents, students and school staff, addressing barriers that limit a student from receiving full benefit from their educational experience. Respond to referrals from school administration, parents, teachers, the Student Support Team, the Special Education Committee and others by providing direct services and by assisting families in accessing appropriate community resources.
Pearson, Jamie	Staffing Specialist	Provide comprehensive school social work services to parents, students and school staff, addressing barriers that limit a student from receiving full benefit from their educational experience. Respond to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		referrals from school administration, parents, teachers, the Student Support Team, the Special Education Committee and others by providing direct services and by assisting families in accessing appropriate community resources.
Delgado, Chamaris	Other	This employee is responsible for providing curriculum support systems for students, teachers, and administrators.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/11/2019, Sherry Donaldson

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.*
1

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
42

Total number of students enrolled at the school
565

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.
10

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	13	84	105	105	81	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	6	28	25	23	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	1	1	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

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	20	105	88	111	115	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	7	22	9	14	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	20	105	88	111	115	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	7	22	9	14	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	57%	57%	51%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	58%	58%	49%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	52%	53%	51%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	63%	63%	50%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	61%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	48%	51%	34%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	56%	53%	46%	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	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready diagnostic assessment.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	35	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	36	54
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	28
	English Language Learners	16	27	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	31	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	26	38
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	28
	English Language Learners	16	38	44

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	40	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	36	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	16	25
	English Language Learners	12	37	57
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	36	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	25	45
	Students With Disabilities	8	16	16
	English Language Learners	15	35	52

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	37	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	37	41
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	33	48
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	32	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	28	34
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	14
	English Language Learners	3	52	51

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	22	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	15	12
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	4
	English Language Learners	40	30	26
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	24	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	12	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	19	19
	English Language Learners	0	26	36

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	35	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	33	30
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	0
	English Language Learners	22	29	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	27	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	25	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	23	24	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	47	44
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	16	72		20	33						
ELL	40	78		43	45		38				
ASN	55			67							
BLK	30	34		27	25	30	12				
HSP	46	70		45	46		43				
WHT	59	67		66	87		64				
FRL	29	38	70	35	34	10	31				
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	13	42		21	31						
ELL	46	53	45	49	52	30	50				
ASN	87			73							

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
BLK	48	57	53	41	45	33	32				
HSP	53	53	43	49	49	31	62				
WHT	60	57		64	64		59				
FRL	49	56	46	45	48	36	43				

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	18	42		29	37		27				
ELL	36	54	65	38	51	45	15				
ASN	80	80		80	80		82				
BLK	47	43	50	45	43	32	34				
HSP	51	54	48	43	40	32	44				
MUL	46			77							
WHT	60	44		57	53		58				
FRL	49	46	50	46	44	33	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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	90%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	48
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	61
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	65
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	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?

Across all areas, we have seen a decline in our data. In ELA and Science we have seen a 14% decline and in Math an 11% decline. The decline was due in part to using a whole-group approach to teaching and not focusing on small group differentiation.

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

Our area of decline was with the lowest 25% in ELA.

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

The teams were using the whole group approach for instruction versus a small group approach for instruction.
There was also an inconsistency in monitoring the data.

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

Our area for most improvement was ELA learning gains. This increase is due to the fourth-grade team that implemented new instructional strategies after professional development in November. This team also took the data, analyzed and monitored it throughout the remainder of the year. This remained true for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

The teams were using the whole group approach for instruction without opportunities for a small group approach for instruction.There was also an inconsistency in monitoring the data.

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

The strategy that we are going to focus on is differentiated, small group instruction and specific data conversations regarding subgroups along with action plans for improvement.

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.

We will provide job-embedded professional development to the staff on small group instruction. Professional development will also occur by grade level so we are focused on the specific developmental stage of students.

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

We will conduct classroom walk-throughs to ensure that small group learning is taking place. Actionable feedback will be provided for teachers on a weekly basis to help them improve their craft.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The hypothetical outcome data from the 2021 ELA FSA, showed an overall proficiency level of 40% which is a 13% drop from the previous data. The hypothetical data from the 2021 Math FSA, which showed an overall proficiency level of 41% is a drop of 10% from the previous data. The hypothetical outcome data from the 2021 NGSSS Science test showed an overall proficiency level of 36% which is a 12% drop from the previous data.
Measurable Outcome:	Reading overall proficiency will increase from 40% to 45%. Math overall proficiency will increase from 41% to 45%. Science overall proficiency will increase from 36% to 41%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this through common planning, the data chats during PLCs after each common assessment and diagnostic assessment, as well as walkthroughs and classroom observation with actionable feedback. Teachers will monitor student data through the use of a data binder which will be a living document that is reviewed in PLCs and during data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use small group differentiated instruction during the ELA and Math blocks. Small groups will be ability grouped, based on student data. Groups will be monitored and instructional adjustments will be made.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will target student achievement by providing scaffolded support aligned with individualized academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

We will provide professional development for teachers in small group instruction and best strategies for differentiation.

Person Responsible	Chamaris Delgado (chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net)

Administration and coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions within PLCs monthly focused on scaffolded support for our lowest quartile, and data discussions creating small groups for instruction, monitoring of small group instruction, and social-emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Chamaris Delgado (chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches will provide ongoing support using the coaching cycle including modeling lessons. Coaches will work with the administration to drive change and will be monitored throughout the process by ongoing debriefings and a coaching logs.

Person Responsible	Chamaris Delgado (chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net)

We will monitor this through the data chats after each i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.

Person Responsible	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Learning Gains for our SWD students by 5%. SWD learning gains in ELA will increase from 17% to 22% and overall achievement will increase from 13% to 20%. SWD learning gains in Math will increase from 17% to 22% and overall achievement will increase from 21% to 30%. This rationale is based on the 2019 FSA and NGSSS data.
Measurable Outcome:	Our SWD subgroup in ELA was 13% on grade level and 17% made learning gains. In Math, we had 21% on grade level and 17% made learning gains. This group has not met the ESSA index and they are our focus group for the school year. based on the 2019 data.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this by focusing on IEP ongoing data analysis of i-Ready, and common assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Pearson (jamie.pearson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In response to ESSA subgroup data, the Acceleration Model will be used for both reading and math with targeted groups of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Acceleration Model provides students with a preview of what is ahead in the curriculum. This increases student confidence and eagerness when learning the core curriculum as they are more successful with prior knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

We will provide professional development on Acceleration. This professional development focuses on, authentic cognitive engagement, and vocabulary strategies.

Person Responsible	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)

Administration and Coaches will provide ongoing collaborative discussions within PLCs weekly focused on, culturally relevant learning, scaffolded support for our SWD students, and data discussions regarding the Acceleration Model and the transfer of knowledge to core instruction.

Person Responsible	Jamie Pearson (jamie.pearson@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches will provide ongoing support using the coaching cycle and modeling lessons specifically for teachers that support SWD.

Person Responsible	Chamaris Delgado (chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net)

We will monitor this through the data chats after each i-Ready diagnostic assessment as a leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.

Person Responsible	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: * Responsible Decision Making * Self Awareness
Measurable Outcome:	By providing a clear vision on improving instructional practices through collaborative work among all teachers, and establishing clear and measurable goals, we will aim for an increase of 5% in student achievement
Monitoring:	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. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data
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. 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

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

| **Person Responsible** | Christine Ventura (christine.ventura@ocps.net) |

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based
instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

| **Person Responsible** | Matthew Owens (matthew.owens@ocps.net) |

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The hypothetical outcome 2021 ELA FSA, showed an overall proficiency level of 40% which is a 13% drop from the previous data. An additional area of focus will be reading fluency.
Measurable Outcome:	Reading overall proficiency will increase from 40% to 45%.
Monitoring:	We will complete monthly fluency checks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly fluency checks in reading. Data chats with teachers about the trends observed in the fluency checks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will target student achievement by providing scaffolded support aligned with individualized academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

We will provide professional development for teachers in how to conduct a fluency check and use the data
for differentiated instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Chamaris Delgado (chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net) |

We will monitor this through the data chats after each fluency check as a
leadership team, as well as classroom observation with actionable feedback.

| **Person Responsible** | Xhuljeta Gjini (xhuljeta.gjini@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.

While we only had 23 incidents on campus they resulted in 45 days of suspension. The first area of concern is physical attacks.As a school, we have our behavior team working diligently with these students to curve the number of physical attacks that are occurring. The second area of concern is intimidation. Our Social Worker will work with students on de-escalation strategies. By implementing de-escalation strategies we will curve the number of offenses that are occurring.

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 teacher 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 school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. Scholl leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determination next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy.

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

At MetroWest all stakeholders; staff, students, parents and the community have a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Our staff engages with students through social-emotional learning as well as wellness activities. Our School Social Worker works with students and staff throughout the campus. She leads small groups, wellness activities and works with the community in a monthly wellness newsletter. The staff works with parents outside of the classroom at school events and through community partnerships.