Castleview Elementary

leadership

analysis

students

Florida

college and career

mission

school improvement

ambitious

family and community involvement

striving   achievement

teaching   relationships

success   areas of focus

resources

instruction

needs assessment   strategic planning   collaboration   vision   learning   supportive environment   growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

https://castleviewes.ocps.net

Demographics

Principal: Jonathan Rasmussen

Start Date for this Principal: 1/23/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	43%
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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
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.](http://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

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

https://castleviewes.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 KG-5	No	30%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21
Grade	

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
Helton, Julie	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Clark, Mary	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment and a positive behavior system; overseeing the exceptional student education program; and other duties as assigned by the principal.
Knickerbocker, Courtney	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach supports new teachers (those who are new to the profession as well as those who are experienced, yet new to the school). She provides instructional support to teachers through professional development in the form of workshops, planning, and coaching cycles. She assists teachers with reviewing data from common assessments to inform the next steps for instruction.
Lynch, Amanda	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist is responsible for ensuring that students in exceptional education programs are properly supported. She works with district, school and family stakeholders to ensure that all timelines and requirements of federal law related to exceptional student education are met.
Kaufman, Simone	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Compliance Specialist ensures that all English Language Learners are properly supported so that they have access to comprehensible instruction. She also ensures that all testing, paperwork and meetings are held in order to meet federal and state requirements.
Woodcock, Heather	School Counselor	The School Counselor provides social and emotional instruction and support to all students and staff through teaching lessons in the classroom, promoting character education and hosting small groups for specific needs.
Czerniejewski, John	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist provides access to reading and research material through the media center, as well supports the technology and textbook resources for the school.
Moehle, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	The Interventionist supports the MTSS process with teachers via training and meetings, as well as teaches small group interventions and progress monitoring for students in MTSS tier 2 and tier 3.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/23/2019, Jonathan Rasmussen

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

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

744

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

7

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

11

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	7	120	113	140	105	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	2	30	26	22	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/28/2021

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	10	115	133	100	139	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	2	28	27	12	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	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	2	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	10	115	133	100	139	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	2	28	27	12	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	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	2	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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					57%	57%		56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					58%	58%		55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	53%		48%	48%
Math Achievement					63%	63%		63%	62%
Math Learning Gains					61%	62%		57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					48%	51%		46%	47%
Science Achievement					56%	53%		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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
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 Diagnostic Assessment was used to compile the reading and math data below. The Orange County Public Schools Science Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA) was used to compile the science data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28/92 30%	36/101 36%	57/108 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/45 27%	13/46 28%	22/49 45%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7 0%	0/9 0%	2/9 22%
	English Language Learners	6/40 15%	9/44 20%	20/48 42%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22/93 24%	37/102 36%	58/108 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/45 20%	13/46 28%	23/49 47%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7 0%	2/9 22%	1/9 11%
	English Language Learners	7/40 18%	8/45 18%	21/48 44%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/131 27%	53/134 40%	73 139 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/46 13%	11/46 24%	18/47 38%
	Students With Disabilities	1/12 8%	1/12 8%	1/12 8%
	English Language Learners	6/38 16%	8/42 19%	16/42 38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/131 13%	42/133 32%	64/137 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/46 4%	7/46 15%	17 47 36%
	Students With Disabilities	0/12 0%	0/12 0%	1/12 8%
	English Language Learners	4/38 11%	7/41 17%	11/42 26%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	31/91 34%	57 101 56%	67/103 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/40 33%	23/42 55%	27/42 64%
	Students With Disabilities	0/6 0%	2/8 25%	2/8 25%
	English Language Learners	10/35 29%	19/40 48%	21/41 51%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	2/91 2%	23/101 23%	45/103 44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/40 0%	9/42 21%	16/42 38%
	Students With Disabilities	0/6 0%	0/8 0%	0/8 8%
	English Language Learners	1/35 3%	7/40 18%	16/41 39%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	30/124 24%	54/128 42%	54/130 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/52 17%	19/51 37%	18/53 34%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11 9%	0/12 0%	1/12 8%
	English Language Learners	5/52 10%	18/55 33%	12/56 21%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	12/122 10%	32/129 25%	65/130 50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/52 6%	7/52 13%	18/53 34%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11 9%	1/12 8%	4/12 33%
	English Language Learners	3/51 6%	8/56 14%	20/56 36%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/112 16%	30/118 25%	47/119 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/46 13%	9/48 19%	11/48 23%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7 0%	0/7 0%	0/7 0%
	English Language Learners	7/52 13%	12/57 21%	16/56 29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/111 6%	36/118 31%	59/114 52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/46 2%	9/48 19%	18/45 40%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7 0%	0/7 0%	0/5 0%
	English Language Learners	5/53 9%	10/57 18%	19/55 35%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/113 80%	88/114 77%	88/117 75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/40 65%	25/41 61%	28/41 68%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6 33%	2/6 33%	0/6 0%
	English Language Learners	35/54 65%	33/54 61%	34/54 63%

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	25			29							
ELL	63	71	72	68	58	50	57				
ASN	92			92							
BLK	58			50							
HSP	66	63	67	65	63	47	58				
WHT	82	67		84	56		87				
FRL	64	59	62	65	59	38	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

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

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	63
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	61
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	92
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	54
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	59
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	72
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	56
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 Students With Disabilities (SWD), English Language Learner (ELL), and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroups consistently performed lower than all students in both English language arts and mathematics. The smallest subgroup, SWD, was the lowest performing. Fourth

and fifth grade students performed lower than the primary grades in ELA, but performed higher in mathematics.

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

The data components needing the most improvement are Students With Disabilities, English Language Learners and the Hispanic subgroups in ELA and mathematics. All students need to improve in text based writing. Fourth grade ELA showed no improvement from mid-year to end-of-year assessment.

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

Contributing factors included a lack of face-to-face instruction/in person learning for many of the students due to the Covid-19 pandemic and parents' choice of learning modality, interrupted schooling due to quarantines; and a lack of instructional focus on subgroups. Actions to be taken are to have renewed focus on the subgroups that have the greatest need for improvement, increase teacher training, and stronger implementation of differentiated instruction.

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

Because Castleview Elementary opened in August 2019 and there were no state assessments during that year, there are no FSA comparative data. Based on IReady Reading and Math data, all grade levels and subgroups improved from beginning to end of the year, except for fourth grade ELA which remained the same.

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

Daily classroom walkthroughs during intervention and small group times were a consistent practice throughout the school year and actionable feedback was provided. Coaching cycles were completed throughout the year with a focus on providing interventions and enrichment to students based on common assessment and diagnostic data. We saw an increase in our overall and subgroup data because of this focused practice.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will need to focus on differentiation and scaffolding during whole and small group instruction. Additionally, an interventionist will be pulling students based on screeners, diagnostic results and Tier III data. This year we will also have before and after school acceleration groups which will focus on pre-teaching upcoming standards.

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.

Our professional development calendar this year is focused on helping teachers provide differentiated and scaffolded instruction in whole group and small groups, as well as focusing on strategies to support ELL students.

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

New services implemented this year to ensure sustainability include a dedicated math intervention time in the daily schedule, the hiring of a dedicated interventionists and a before and after school acceleration program.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will continue to work on strengthening our culture and environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning at our school with adults and students. Student Panorama data indicated that school safety is an area for potential growth, with 75% of students responding favorable to this domain.
Measurable Outcome:	By June of 2022, the percentage of third through fifth grade students favorably answering the Panorama survey question, "How often do you worry about violence at your school" will increase from 57% to 75%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor the number of bullying and harassment discipline referrals that are completed at school as well as the number of threat to others discipline referrals that are written. As students gain social/emotional skills and understand the impact they have on the feelings of others, the number of bullying or harassment and threat referrals will be reduced.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This school year we will begin to implement SEL lessons focused on empathy as well as problem solving skills in all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After reviewing our Panorama survey data, it is evident that this is an area for improvement. Students indicated that violence is a concern at school, and the majority of discipline referrals are a result of a threat. Often times, threats are made as a joke or when a student is angry. Using strategies that help students understand how their words impact others will reduce the amount of threats that we have. Additionally, teaching problem solving strategies to our students will encourage students to use their words when they become angry or frustrated.

Action Steps to Implement

Teach specific social and emotional learning lessons focused on empathy and problem solving skills.

Person Responsible	Heather Woodcock (heather.woodcock@ocps.net)

Teach students appropriate coping skills to use when frustrated, along with quarterly Code of Conduct reviews.

Person Responsible	Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)

Provide social/emotional lessons and activities for teachers to infuse in daily lessons to assist students with self awareness and relationship skills.

Person Responsible	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Monitor progress toward the goal of reducing discipline referrals each quarter.

Person Responsible	Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Castleview Elementary School reported 3.6 incidents per 100 students in the 2019-2020 school year compared to 1.0 incidents per 100 students statewide. The majority of these incidents fell under the category of Threats/Intimidation. 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 decrease behavioral referrals and threats.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, Castleview will decrease the number of behavioral referrals by 10%, from 76 referrals from the 20-21 school year to 68 referrals by the end of the 21-22 school year. By June 2022, Castleview will decrease the number of threat assessments by 10%, from 29 threats from the 20-21 school year to 26 threats by the end of the 21-22 school year.
Monitoring:	In order to monitor these measurable outcomes throughout the year, our school will utilize the following – • Classroom Walkthrough trend data • Threat Assessment Team logs • Quantitative and qualitative data from students, staff, and families using school counseling needs assessments conducted at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will use distributive leadership to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families. Classroom guidance lessons using resources such as Child Safety Matters will be implemented each month.
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

The Social-Emotional Learning and Leadership Team (SELL), consisting of primary and intermediate teachers, the school counselor, the art teacher and the principal will attend quarterly district training to learn strategies for implementing SEL across the school.

Person Responsible Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

The SELL Team will meet with a larger School Site Team to share what is learned in the quarterly districtwide trainings and determine how they can implement strategies to meet school needs.

Person Responsible Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

The SELL Site Team will provide training to the staff to assist them with learning strategies for infusing social and emotional learning throughout each day.

Person Responsible   Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

The SELL Team will conduct learning walks throughout the school to collect data and determine progress toward implementing SEL throughout the building.

Person Responsible   Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

The Panorama student, staff and parent survey will be given and compared with the data from the 2020-2021 school year to determine improvement and next steps.

Person Responsible   Mary Clark (mary.clark@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Differentiated instruction is needed to address the needs of ALL students at Castleview. The Students With Disabilities (SWD), English Language Learner (ELL), and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroups consistently performed lower than all students in both English language arts and mathematics. The smallest subgroup, SWD, was the lowest performing. Fourth and fifth grade students performed lower than the primary grades in ELA, but performed higher in mathematics. Less than 50% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains on FSA Mathematics.
Measurable Outcome:	The achievement gap between SWD and non-SWD students will decrease by 5% overall. The achievement gap between ELL and non-ELL students will decrease by 5% overall. The achievement gap between ED and non-ED students will decrease by 5% overall. At least 65% of the lowest 25% of students will make a learning gain on FSA Mathematics.
Monitoring:	Standards based unit assessments will be administered at the end of each ELA and Math unit. Data will be analyzed in PLCs and next steps for instruction will be determined. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will provide strategy implementation data to inform coaching and professional development. IReady diagnostic assessments will be given three times per year. Data from the beginning-of-year (BOY) and middle-of-year (MOY) assessments will be compared and analyzed in teacher data meetings to determine next steps for instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction based on students' needs, strengths and interests is the evidence-based strategy being implemented to effect change within the subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was chosen to better respond to the varying needs of students. Multiple measures of data were used to determine students for MTSS tiers, pull out resource support, support facilitation within the classroom, bilingual paraprofessional support, materials utilized for instruction, and more.

Action Steps to Implement

Continuously review multiple measures of data to determine students' needs for instruction.

Person Responsible	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Ensure that all support systems remain fluid such that as students improve or regress, they are provided the level of support that they need.

Person Responsible	Julie Helton (julie.helton@ocps.net)

Provide training and materials for differentiated instruction in ELA and math.

Person Responsible	Julie Helton (julie.helton@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.

Castleview Elementary School reported 3.6 incidents per 100 students in the 2019-2020 school year compared to 1.0 incidents per 100 students statewide. The majority of these incidents fell under the category of Threats/Intimidation. Discipline data will be analyzed each week to determine areas in need of support and improvement. The leadership team will convene to provide support plans for students and classrooms in need. Discipline incidents provide a window into a school's culture; therefore, we will continuously monitor the data, providing retraining of staff and students when necessary.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

All Castleview students and staff are sorted into one of four houses. Our house system encourages students to be proud of their school and work hard to earn points for their house. High expectations are placed on all students allowing them to reach their maximum potential. Each week the house leader is announced, and each quarter the overall house winner receives the "Kingdom Cup" along with bragging rights. Families and the community participate in the joy that our house system provides our school community. Our staff members and students wear their house gear on Wednesdays and eat lunch with mixed grade levels in order to foster relationships across the school community.

Castleview Elementary encourages staff to engage in professional learning and fosters an environment of shared leadership. Our staff frequently engages in professional learning and brings that learning back to the school. They actively participate in committees of interest along with supporting clubs and before and after school extra curricular activities.

Our stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate in our monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings where community input supports decision making at our school. During these meetings school wide data is discussed along with budgetary decisions and student and school needs. Additionally, our Parent and Teacher Organization (PTO) meets monthly to plan school and community events. Parent input is provided and the PTO votes on school-wide activities. Castleview welcomes and encourages visitors to volunteer or become a Partner in Education. We welcome stakeholders to be active members in our school community.

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

Castleview Administrative Leadership Team: Provide the overarching goals for the school year as well as model positive relationships and attitudes, and monitor the culture and environment on a daily basis. A positive school culture includes all stakeholders being involved--staff, parents, students and community members.

Instructional Leadership Team: Assist teachers in implementing positive behavior support structures and modeling positive relationships and attitudes.

All staff: Implement positive behavior support structures with students and celebrate positive behaviors with parents. Staff will include parents in activities and communicate about their child's successes.

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: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**