

Orange County Public Schools

Dr. Phillips 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

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

Demographics

Principal: Autherene Leighvard

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

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)	35%
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: A (75%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (73%)
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

Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

<https://drphillipses.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 style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">29%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">55%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	A	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
Hargreaves, Alexis	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Coordinates all school-wide state and district assessment. Coaches teachers with instructional focus for Math and Science. Member of the MTSS team supporting Kindergarten, 2nd, and 5th grade teachers and students.
Rogers, Christine	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Meets weekly with the Leadership Team as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Oversees supervision of all personnel, instructional focus for all grade levels and subjects, and individual student progress, safety, and wellbeing.
Wallick, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Assigned to coach all teachers with pedagogy and instruction. Assists teams with developing common assessments and lesson plans as well as selecting complex texts to use for standards-based instruction. Member of the MTSS team supporting 1st, 4th, and 5th grade teachers and students.
Williams, Madeline	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Assigned to support all ELL students with proper placement and testing. Supports teachers with instruction to support ELL students achieve success. Coaches teachers will instructional focus for mathematics. Member of the MTSS team supporting 3rd grade teachers and students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/12/2019, Aurtherene Leighvard

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	128	110	112	135	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	17	12	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	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	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	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

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	81	110	108	122	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	9	17	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	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	81	110	108	122	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	9	17	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	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				80%	57%	57%	77%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	58%	58%	67%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	56%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	63%	63%	82%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				82%	61%	62%	74%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	48%	51%	63%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	56%	53%	88%	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	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading and Math was used for 1-5. PMA data was used for Grade 5 Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44%	51%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	49%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	33%	47%
	English Language Learners	29%	44%	61%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32%	49%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	46%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	27%	33%
	English Language Learners	29%	35%	52%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58%	78%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%	68%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	40%	50%
	English Language Learners	33%	54%	58%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	61%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	46%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	14%	38%
	English Language Learners	8%	48%	65%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51%	41%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	63%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	9%	15%
	English Language Learners	44%	32%	46%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22%	43%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	80%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	9%
	English Language Learners	13%	34%	37%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48%	59%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	38%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	20%	53%
	English Language Learners	37%	45%	55%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	35%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	21%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	1%	13%	47%
	English Language Learners	15%	28%	61%

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		49%	55%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged		34%	42%	46%
	Students With Disabilities		14%	21%	21%
	English Language Learners		31%	36%	46%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		34%	50%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged		16%	28%	54%
	Students With Disabilities		14%	7%	21%
	English Language Learners		33%	44%	64%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		69%	59%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged		49%	45%	66%
	Students With Disabilities		62%	47%	42%
	English Language Learners		62%	46%	55%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	35			26			33				
ELL	67	77	60	71	69	50	60				
ASN	91	79		88	64		88				
BLK	53	50		35	40		45				
HSP	68	57	57	73	68	53	62				
WHT	76	69		77	75		82				
FRL	63	51	55	63	63	46	54				
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	35	38	40	35	69	67	33				
ELL	76	73	74	83	81	76	72				
ASN	89	82		96	88						

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	62	48		59	74	69	54				
HSP	73	63	53	82	83	83	78				
WHT	86	76	70	86	81	63	80				
FRL	68	61	47	74	82	78	63				
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	25	43	41	44	65	67					
ELL	67	73	55	82	81	87	90				
ASN	93	82		96	82						
BLK	60	68		63	68						
HSP	72	69	44	80	69	55	84				
WHT	80	62	64	83	76	75	87				
FRL	65	57	43	70	62	50	78				

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	66
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	67
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	82
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	
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	58
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?

The lowest performing data component was SWD. Overall, the school saw a 7% decline in reading achievement and a 9% decline in math achievement. SWD ESSA subgroup was the lowest subgroup to reach proficiency.

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

Math showed the greatest decline: -9% in achievement, -15% in math learning gains, and -29% learning gains of the lowest 25%.

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

Due to the pandemic LaunchEd (hybrid classes and online classes) were a factor, in addition to teachers being limited to what instructional practices were implemented due to social distancing, and FBS/Enrichment blocks did not rotate as done in years past. New actions for the present school year will allow teachers to implement high yield student engagement strategies, in addition to implementing grouping for FBS/Enrichment as implemented in past years, as well as centers and small groups in reading and in math.

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

The greatest improvement was in math achievement.

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

The area we saw the least impact was science. A contributing factor was implementing test style questions, test taking strategies, and incorporating virtual and hands on activities. The 5th grade team also implemented a standards based review using data to determine standards needing re-teach and review.

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

In order to accelerate learning, students will be grouped for FBS/Enrichment based on learning needs for reading and math for targeted intervention. Teachers will also utilize acceleration model to pre-teach vocabulary in reading and math and support students with foundation skills.

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.

During pre-planning all teachers will be provided a foundational training to understand the acceleration model and begin planning using the model for reading and math. As the leadership team monitors the implementation of acceleration professional development will be provided to support the model of instruction.

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 sustain improvement teachers will be provided a paid planning day (budget providing) to review and reflect on instructional practice from this year in order to improve upon for the following year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Leadership and teachers will structure, implement, and monitor a Multi Tiered Title System of Supports (MTSS) to close the achievement gap between minority subgroups and the student population.

Measurable Outcome: Using the MTSS process to monitor appropriate intervention and strategies, we will narrow the achievement gap in reading and mathematics for our ESE, Black and Hispanic students.

Monitoring: Our specific subgroups will be monitored through PLC data meetings. Grade level teachers will review previously compiled assessment data as well as analyze the performance of students in specific subgroups. Leadership and teachers will discuss next steps including differentiating instruction and monitoring for student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: By using the MTSS process and using data to inform instruction, teachers will be able to plan to meet student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: During the 2021-2022, school year, the school focused on implementing the MTSS process to provide appropriate student interventions. While there were increases in several areas of student performance there is still a need to close the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaches will provide support throughout the school year during PLC, data meetings, and targeted professional development as needed.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Teachers will monitor student progress in response to interventions, communicate to all stakeholders, and make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Focus on small group instruction in centers to differentiate instruction. FBS and Math Intervention will be used to address specific learning needs.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Intense focus on analyzing data trends by whole school and subgroups.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

#2. 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 how strategies are incorporated into daily lesson plans to build relationships and culture in the classroom.

Measurable Outcome: Incorporating strategies and lessons which focus on building and sustaining a culture of social and emotional learning at our school we will see an increase in student's survey response data on the Cognia survey.

Monitoring: Student responses on the Cognia Survey

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The SEL Site team will use the distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Also, all staff and students will participate in a House System where all staff and students are sorted at random and earn points for academic as well as social and emotional achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessment, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Action Steps to Implement

School Site Team Meeting for planning school based professional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

Survey/Observation for baseline data - needs assessment.

Person Responsible Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

Professional Learning

Person Responsible Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

Classroom visits to monitor strategies/implementation.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

House System

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@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.

Based on the data from Safe Schools for Alex, Dr. Phillips Elementary School ranked very High for violent incidents. The highest indicator was students making threats or intimidation. For the 2021-2022 school year, DPES is implementing a house system to support school culture and environment. SEL is also being incorporated into health lesson plans to support students. To help support students choosing appropriate words, teachers are implementing talking stems to help shape positive student discussion and interactions.

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.

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.

Establishing and maintaining positive relationships with families is essential to student academic performance and overall school improvement. Dr. Phillips Elementary is fortunate to have a high level of family involvement with our Parent Teacher Association (PTA) , during evening events and with volunteers during the school day. The PTA works diligently to provide support for the educational and recreational needs of the school. Our volunteers assist teachers within the classroom, work with individual students or small groups, promote school spirit, and provide support in other areas of the school where there is a need.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$25,441.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	Other		\$6,391.00
			<i>Notes: Story Works/Scholastic News</i>			
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$4,750.00
			<i>Notes: IXL accounts for math support.</i>			
	5000	590-Other Materials and Supplies	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$750.00
			<i>Notes: Britannica</i>			
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	1591 - Dr. Phillips Elementary	General Fund		\$13,550.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Plus</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$25,441.00