

Orange County Public Schools

Bay Meadows Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bay Meadows Elementary

9150 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32836

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

Demographics

Principal: Joann Dorries

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bay Meadows Elementary

9150 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32836

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>32%</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>61%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		B	B	B

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
Mays, Gerai	Principal	4th Grade, 5th Grade, KG, ESE Curriculum Oversight PTA, SAC Liaison Budget Oversight School Security, ERT Lead SEL Team Lead
Hinton, Tami	Assistant Principal	1st Grade, 2nd Grade, 3rd Grade, Specials, Classified Discipline Facilities Skyward, Grading Duty Schedules Field Trips
Gael, Amy	Instructional Coach	School-Wide Testing CRT Interns, Mentors Monthly Newsletter District Contact for Reading/Social Studies Curriculum Textbooks MTSS, PLCs and Coaching for KG, 3rd and 4th Grades
Fillenwarth, Mandy	Magnet Coordinator	Science Instruction and Data District Contact for Math/Science Curriculum STEAM/Magnet Oversight Makerspace Contact MTSS, Coaching and PLCs for 1st, 2nd, and 5th Grades

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Joann Dorries

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

0

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

675

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

3

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	123	112	126	102	115	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	18	12	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	1	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

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	109	126	105	117	107	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	13	15	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	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	6	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	109	126	105	117	107	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	13	15	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	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	6	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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				72%	57%	57%	67%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	58%	58%	46%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	53%	25%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	63%	63%	76%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	61%	62%	66%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25%	48%	51%	34%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	56%	53%	67%	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	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	63%	14%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

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.

The iReady diagnostics for Fall, Winter and Spring, as well as PMA data, was used to compile this report.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	72	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	58	72
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	0
	English Language Learners	13	50	63
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	63	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	54	63
	Students With Disabilities	67	33	0
	English Language Learners	25	38	38

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37/40%	64/65%	78/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/44%	19/59%	23/72%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/40%	1/20%
	English Language Learners	3/19%	6/38%	7/44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/38%	58/63%	77/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/38	16/50%	25/78%
	Students With Disabilities	2/40%	2/40%	1/20%
	English Language Learners	2/13%	4/25%	4/25%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70/64%	78/72%	91/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/55%	18/55%	27/82%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/14%	2/29%
	English Language Learners	16/53%	15/50%	20/67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33/30%	65/60%	82/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/18%	13/39%	22/67%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/14%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	6/20%	15/50%	20/61%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49/50%	55/56%	56/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/38%	17/40%	17/40%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	3/25%	4/33%
	English Language Learners	5/26%	5/26%	5/26%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29/30%	52/53%	63/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/24%	15/36%	19/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/17%	4/33%
	English Language Learners	5/26%	7/37%	10/53%

Grade 5				
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63/61%	75/73%	84/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/56%	23/72%	26/81%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	0/0%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	7/37%	10/53%	14/74%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	49/48%	68/66%	81/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/44%	18/56%	20/63%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	7/37%	8/42%	10/53%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Science	All Students	88/87%	83/81%	83/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/77%	23/74%	24/69%
	Students With Disabilities	2/40%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	12/63%	10/59%	11/55%

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	8			22							
ELL	48	56		53	69		50				
ASN	84	78		84	78		81				
BLK	57			33							
HSP	64	73		58	68		64				
MUL	67			53							
WHT	80	80		74	63		91				
FRL	60	77	58	52	48	23	66				
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	7			21							
ELL	57	67	64	60	45	35	58				

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	85	78		81	70		76				
BLK	42	25	20	35	20	27	17				
HSP	63	52	57	59	43	23	55				
MUL	82			64							
WHT	80	72	50	80	50		66				
FRL	59	57	53	50	38	23	51				
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	7	29	25	13	14	18					
ELL	57	52	13	63	59	36					
ASN	88	69		89	88		85				
BLK	27	29	25	40	29	15					
HSP	64	43	13	71	67	36	80				
WHT	70	44	46	85	68	50	68				
FRL	48	36	23	57	54	27	50				

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	57
---	----

English Language Learners	
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	81
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	65
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	60
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	78
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?

Although we were successful with raising achievement levels consistently from fall to spring in each grade level, the proficiency levels of our economically disadvantaged, ESE and ELL students were consistently below average. Those subgroups did show growth as the year progressed, but not at the same rate as their counterparts.

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

Proficiency and growth/gains for our ESE and ELL students demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

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

The contributing factors to this need were insufficient targeted interventions for students who were performing below grade level.

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

We had the most significant improvements in 3rd and 5th grade (overall percentages) based on progress monitoring assessments in both Reading and Math.

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

We increased the quality of collaborative planning, refined the PLC process, and had periodic grade level data meetings with administrators and academic coaches.

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

We will implement more targeted interventions in reading and math across grade levels. We will also focus more keenly on gains and proficiency differences between demographics in each grade level.

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 are providing regular check-ins per grade level with the assigned MTSS contacts. We are also incorporating ESE training into our Professional Development plan for this school year.

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

We will make our MTSS process ingrained and automatic so that students receive the instruction that they need according to their differentiated levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
 - Students in the lowest 25% will make gains as they make connections inside and outside of the classroom
 - Parent engagement will increase as a result of a stronger culture due to SEL

Measurable Outcome: As a result of this intervention, the rate of students with an attendance rate below 90 percent will decrease to 8% or below.

Monitoring: Attendance report monitoring monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum.

Person Responsible Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction.

Person Responsible Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey.

Person Responsible Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: By the end of the year, ELL, ED and ESE students trailed the overall proficiency average by as much as 40% in some grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of this intervention, at least 65% of the lowest 25% of students will make a year's learning gain on the state Math assessment.

Monitoring: Monitoring of iReady diagnostics and Standards Based Unit Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tami Hinton (tami.hinton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative groups of educators need to own and analyze data regularly to assess how students are responding to classroom instruction, and be instructionally agile enough to make adjustments based on student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct individual data chats for math with teachers at the close of each nine weeks with administrator and MTSS coach.

Person Responsible Amy Gael (amy.gael@ocps.net)

Conduct grade level data discussions after each iReady diagnostic to discuss math achievement by subgroup.

Person Responsible Tami Hinton (tami.hinton@ocps.net)

Structure weekly PLCs in such a way that the Standards based assessment is discussed at the beginning of each unit, to ensure the instruction and monitoring aligns.

Person Responsible Mandy Fillenwarth (miranda.fillenwarth@ocps.net)

Regular administrative walkthroughs of math intervention block with feedback in iObservation.

Person Responsible Tami Hinton (tami.hinton@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: By the end of the year, ELL, ED and ESE students trailed the overall proficiency average by as much as 40% in some grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of this intervention, at least 65% of the lowest 25% of students will make a year's learning gain on the state ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Monitoring of iReady diagnostics and Standards Based Unit Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative groups of educators need to own and analyze data regularly to assess how students are responding to classroom instruction, and be instructionally agile enough to make adjustments based on student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Structure walk-to reading interventions across all grade levels to provide differentiated reading instruction four times weekly.

Person Responsible: Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Individual teacher data chats each nine weeks, to discuss progress of T2 and T3 MTSS, ESE, and ELL students.

Person Responsible: Amy Gael (amy.gael@ocps.net)

Grade level data chats after each iReady diagnostic to discuss progress of subgroups.

Person Responsible: Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Structuring of PLCs for backwards planning, to ensure standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Mandy Fillenwarth (miranda.fillenwarth@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.

Bay Meadows ranked 1,342 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. We had 34 incidents out of 680 students, which is 5% and is considered high. The statewide elementary school rate is 1%. We had 1.6 suspensions per 100 students which is lower than the state rate of 3.9. The school will use SEL and school wide positive behavior support to decrease the number of student-to-student discipline incidents.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Two parent representatives were added this year to the SEL Site Team, and survey data will be regularly collected and monitored to gauge parent involvement. Parent will be informed of SEL lesson content and initiatives/PBIS incentives regularly and encouraged to support it at home. Our Partners in Education will also play a role in supporting SEL initiatives on campus.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00