**Orange County Public Schools** 

# **Eagle Creek Elementary**



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

## **Eagle Creek Elementary**

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://eaglecreekes.ocps.net/

## **Demographics**

Principal: Patricia Cells

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | No   |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 30%  |
| 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 (68%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: A (75%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | rmation*   |
| 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:

- 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 19 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

## **Eagle Creek Elementary**

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://eaglecreekes.ocps.net/

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID I |          | 2020-21 Title I School | l Disadvan | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | School   | No                     |            | 24%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I     | • •      | Charter School         | (Reporte   | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation | No                     |            | 75%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ory      |                        |            |  |
| Year                              | 2020-21  | 2019-20                | 2018-19    | 2017-18  |
| Grade                             |          | A                      | A          | Α  |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Cells,<br>Patricia  | Principal              | -Provides a common vision for the use of data based decisionmaking, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups   |
| Byrne,<br>Michael   | Assistant<br>Principal | -Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS  |
| Bielski,<br>Heather | Instructional<br>Coach | -Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction -Facilitates all district and state assessments -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP -Provides guidance with K-12 Math Plan |
| Scully,<br>Jessica  | Reading<br>Coach       | -Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities -Common Planning -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met      |

| Name                    | Position Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Velarde,<br>Sonia       | School<br>Counselor             | -Provides support for healthy emotional and social development strategies and programs -Assist/ train teachers in resources for the new elementary health course -Conduct individual and small group counselling -Implement and participate in individual, family, and school crisis intervention -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP |
| Dencker,<br>Heather     | Staffing<br>Specialist          | -Facilitates and supports data collection activities -Assists in data analysis -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP - Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP                |
| Laliberte,<br>Katherine | Instructional<br>Media          | -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Facilitates professional development -Manages school social media accounts -Assists in planning grade level field trips that align with standards -Manages K-5 Literacy program   |
| Seda<br>Cruz, Luz       | ELL<br>Compliance<br>Specialist | -Supports ELL students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance -Facilitates and supports data collection activities -Assists in data analysis -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP  |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Patricia Cells

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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

### Total number of students enrolled at the school

693

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

17

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

**Demographic Data** 

### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 7           | 100 | 101 | 134 | 124 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 597   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 2           | 13  | 10  | 17  | 7   | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

#### 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                                 |    |     |     |     | Grad | le Le | vel |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | K  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4    | 5     | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 19 | 139 | 166 | 158 | 183  | 160   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 825   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 11 | 7   | 8   | 10  | 7    | 8     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 1     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 1     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 3    | 20    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1    | 17    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | ade | Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

| la dia atau                               | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                                 | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 19          | 139 | 166 | 158 | 183 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 825   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 11          | 7   | 8   | 10  | 7   | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 51    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 3   | 20  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 18    |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
|                                      |   | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 13    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| lu dia stan                         | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Tatal |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10    | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 75%    | 57%      | 57%   | 77%    | 56%      | 56%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 72%    | 58%      | 58%   | 64%    | 55%      | 55%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 61%    | 52%      | 53%   | 51%    | 48%      | 48%   |  |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 79%    | 63%      | 63%   | 80%    | 63%      | 62%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 72%    | 61%      | 62%   | 67%    | 57%      | 59%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 45%    | 48%      | 51%   | 48%    | 46%      | 47%   |  |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 71%    | 56%      | 53%   | 87%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03        | 2021     |        |          | -                                 |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 72%    | 55%      | 17%                               | 58%   | 14%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 67%    | 57%      | 10%                               | 58%   | 9%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -72%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 67%    | 54%      | 13%                               | 56%   | 11%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -67%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            | MATH              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade      | Year              | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03         | 2021              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            | 2019              | 77%    | 62%      | 15%                               | 62%   | 15%                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Cor | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04         | 2021              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                   | MATH     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade             | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                   | 2019     | 72%    | 63%      | 9%                                | 64%   | 8%                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Cor        | mparison | -77%   |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05                | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                   | 2019     | 74%    | 57%      | 17%                               | 60%   | 14%                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |          | -72%   |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                   | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade             | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05                | 2021    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                   | 2019    | 65%    | 54%      | 11%                               | 53%   | 12%                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 Diagnostic data was used to progress monitor students for the 2020-2021 school year.

|                       |                               | Grade 1 |        |        |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                  | 42/30%  | 63/44% | 95/65% |
| English Language Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 7/12%   | 20/34% | 32/56% |
| ,                     | Students With Disabilities    | 1/7%    | 2/13%  | 6/40%  |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners  | 4/13%   | 10/30% | 17/50% |
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                  | 24/17%  | 57/40% | 86/59% |
| Mathematics           | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 6/11%   | 18/32% | 30/53% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities    | 3/20%   | 6/40%  | 7/47%  |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners  | 3/9%    | 9/28%  | 14/42% |

|                          |   | Grade 2               |                            |                             |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                  | Winter                     | Spring                      |
|                          | All Students  | 33/20%                | 68/41%                     | 94/56%                      |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged  | 8/14%                 | 17/29%                     | 28/48%                      |
|                          | Students With Disabilities  | 0/0%                  | 0/0%                       | 2/10%                       |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 3/5%                  | 11/20%                     | 20/35%                      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                  | Winter                     | Spring                      |
|                          | All Students  | 17/10%                | 56/34%                     | 80/48%                      |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged  | 3/5%                  | 16/28%                     | 20/34%                      |
|                          | Students With Disabilities  | 0/0%                  | 1/5%                       | 1/5%                        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 2/4%                  | 16/29%                     | 19/33%                      |
|                          |   | Grade 3               |                            |                             |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                  | Winter                     | Spring                      |
|                          | All Students  | 47/29%                | 72/43%                     | 98/57%                      |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged  | 15/23%                | 22/34%                     | 32/48%                      |
|                          | -   |                       |                            |                             |
|                          | Students With Disabilities  | 0/0%                  | 2/17%                      | 4/33%                       |
|                          |   | 0/0%<br>5/12%         | 2/17%<br>12/27%            | 4/33%<br>15/33%             |
|                          | Disabilities<br>English Language  |                       |                            |                             |
|                          | Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students                            | 5/12%                 | 12/27%                     | 15/33%                      |
| Mathematics              | Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 5/12%<br>Fall         | 12/27%<br>Winter           | 15/33%<br>Spring            |
| Mathematics              | Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically               | 5/12%<br>Fall<br>7/4% | 12/27%<br>Winter<br>36/22% | 15/33%<br>Spring<br>101/58% |

|                          |  | Grade 4 |         |         |
|--------------------------|--|---------|---------|---------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter  | Spring  |
|                          | All Students                             | 47/26%  | 71/38%  | 84/44%  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged               | 16/21%  | 26/33%  | 32/42%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 0/0%    | 2/20%   | 2/20%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 4/6%    | 15/20%  | 18/23%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter  | Spring  |
| Mathematics              | All Students                             | 18/10%  | 44/23%  | 94/50%  |
|                          | Economically Disadvantaged               | 4/5%    | 12/15%  | 38/49%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 0/0%    | 0/0%    | 3/30%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 3/4%    | 13/17%  | 26/35%  |
|                          |  | Grade 5 |         |         |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter  | Spring  |
|                          | All Students                             | 30/19%  | 49/30%  | 59/36%  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged               | 10/14%  | 13/19%  | 18/25%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 0/0%    | 0/0%    | 1/9%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 4/7%    | 8/14%   | 11/18%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter  | Spring  |
|                          | All Students                             | 20/13%  | 46/29%  | 76/47%  |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged               | 3/4%    | 9/13%   | 25/35%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities               | 0/0%    | 0/0%    | 0/0%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 3/5%    | 11/19%  | 20/34%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter  | Spring  |
|                          | All Students                             | 127/77% | 117/73% | 129/80% |
| Science                  | Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 49/67%  | 44/63%  | 53/77%  |
| ι                        | Disabilities                             | 7/58%   | 5/38%   | 5/56%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners             | 40/67%  | 34/58%  | 39/68%  |

### **Subgroup Data Review**

|           |             | 2021      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 25          |           |                   | 56           |            |                    | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 51          | 67        | 70                | 62           | 65         | 59                 | 47          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 91          |           |                   | 91           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 61          |           |                   | 76           |            |                    | 60          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 67          | 72        | 70                | 71           | 64         | 54                 | 63          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 86          | 68        |                   | 83           | 79         |                    | 83          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 63          | 72        | 66                | 69           | 66         | 58                 | 56          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 22          | 46        | 60                | 25           | 38         | 42                 | 25          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 60          | 72        | 62                | 71           | 71         | 48                 | 54          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 87          | 86        |                   | 90           | 86         |                    | 92          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 84          | 76        |                   | 78           | 67         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 71          | 72        | 62                | 75           | 72         | 49                 | 64          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 79          | 69        |                   | 85           | 67         |                    | 76          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 65          | 68        | 57                | 69           | 67         | 49                 | 56          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 23          | 33        | 25                | 13           | 29         | 18                 | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 65          | 66        | 56                | 71           | 66         | 56                 | 73          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 89          | 65        |                   | 89           | 91         |                    | 100         |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 79          | 68        |                   | 62           | 41         |                    | 75          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 71          | 63        | 50                | 79           | 67         | 57                 | 84          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 86          |           |                   | 93           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 79          | 66        | 62                | 85           | 65         | 38                 | 90          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 68          | 65        | 57                | 74           | 58         | 48                 | 79          |            |              |                         |                           |

## **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  | 68  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    |     |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |  |  |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 75  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 547 |  |  |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8   |
| Percent Tested   | 98% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 45  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 62  |
| 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   | 91  |
| 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                                | 66  |
| 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  | 67  |
| 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 |
|  |     |

| Multiracial Students   |     |  |  |
|--|-----|--|--|
| 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   | 79  |  |  |
| 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                                | 66  |  |  |
| 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?

2020-2021 data is not available; therefore, 2018-2019 FSA is still being considered for the 2021-2022 school improvement plan. Our school grade level data is above state and district averages in ELA, Math, and Science. However, our students with disabilities subgroups show the lowest achievement in reading and math.

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

Based on Eagle Creek's 2019 Math FSA data, Tier 1 students, including our highest achievers, made adequate growth or excelled. However, the lowest 25% of students did not make the same amount of growth as compared to 2018 Math data including a downward trend in this area indicating the greatest need for improvement. Furthermore, our 2020-2021 progress monitoring data indicates that students with disabilities continue to underperform.

## 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 lowest 25% of students did not make the same amount of growth as compared to 2018 Math data including a downward trend in this area. A contributing factor to the slight decrease in performance was an intense focus on reading interventions versus math interventions. Also, during the 2020-2021 school year, students were offered different learning platforms, Launch Ed and hybrid

models, making mathematics instruction less hands-on. Thus, during the upcoming school year, we will implement math interventions. During this time, teachers will focus on foundational skills and any prerequisite standards in order to close achievement gaps.

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

For the 2018-2019 school year, the data component which showed the most improvement was Eagle Creek Elementary's ELA learning gains. Also, based on the 2020-2021 progress monitoring data, English Language Learners showed the greatest improvement in reading proficiency out of the subgroups.

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

New actions that the school took in this area to foster improvement was implementation of the PLC cycle when planning for reading interventions. This cycle included data analysis, problem solving, and plans for improvement at each assessment period. During the 2020-2021 school year, we will continue to engage in coaching cycles and provide valuable feedback to teachers to take their instruction to the next level. In PLC, we will continue to use backwards design lesson planning.

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

Eagle Creek Elementary will be implementing intensive math interventions focused on foundational skills. Also, in order to foster improvement we will Implement the PLC cycle for planning math interventions. This cycle will include data analysis, problem solving, and plans for improvement at each assessment period. We will continue to focus on SELL, UDL and Cultural Responsive teaching strategies.

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.

For the 2021-2022 school year we will continue to provide our Cub Club program. This program helps teachers in their first three years of teaching learn about OCPS initiatives, engage in coaching cycles, and learn about various classroom strategies to help them be successful. These sessions are opened up to the entire instructional staff. In the 2020-2021 school year, all instructional staff participated in an instructional round of UDL training. This training helped us learn new ways to engage students, represent content, and create strategic, and goal-directed learners. We continue to implement two district initiatives: SELL and Culturally Responsive Teaching.

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, we are creating very intentional Instructional Focus Calendars. Each teacher will have a data binder to track student progress and achievement. They will then conduct data chats with their students to celebrate growth and set goals throughout the school year. In addition, math intervention time built into the schedule for all grade levels. By focusing on math foundational skills during intervention time, will help us build sustainability of improvement in this school year and beyond.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### **Areas of Focus:**

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Eagle Creek elementary will integrate resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally with the support of families and the community. A specific focus will be geared toward students performing in the lowest 25th percentile in reading.

## Measurable Outcome:

Eagle Creek will focus on ELA scores for students performing in the lowest 25% percentile. In addition, Eagle Creek will see an overall increase in proficiency by 3%. Furthermore, the Panorama survey will reflect a positive school climate and sense of belonging among our student population.

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through classroom walkthrough, evaluations, data monitoring monthly for tier 1, bi-weekly for tier 2, and weekly for tier 3. Grade levels will participate in data reviews at each tier and complete problem solving notes to determine specific actions. At each assessment period, data reviews will include monitoring of progress based on the last assessment cycle, and additional steps will be taken to ensure student success.

## Monitoring:

Person responsible for

[no one identified]

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy: Close reading strategies with text dependent questions, MTSS tiered support through the use of evidence based interventions, before school tutoring programs, resource teacher support, careful data analysis and problem solving, action plans, monitoring of results, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Eagle Creek will implement a variety of strategies to ensure we meet the needs of our students performing in the lowest 25th percentile. We will continue to support all levels of instruction through the implementation of the Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) initiative. Eagle Creek will monitor and adjust the MTSS process (tiered support) through the use of evidence based interventions, before school tutoring programs, careful data analysis, problem solving, creation of action plans, monitoring of results, and implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies. As a school we will continue to strive to meet the demands of our changing population through culturally responsive approaches and an intense focus on connecting academics with social emotional learning.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

- 1. Backward design/ common planning Leadership team (August 2021 ongoing).
- 2. Coaching observations Leadership team (August 2021 ongoing).
- 3. Data analysis all stake holder groups (August 2021 ongoing).
- 4. Weekly PLC meetings- Leadership team (August 2021 ongoing)
- 5. Job embedded professional development- Instructional coach, administration
- 6. Before and after school tutoring programs- teachers, leadership team (October 2021- April 2022)
- 7. MTSS professional development/ progress monitoring (August 2021 ongoing)
- 8. Implementation of district approved reading programs (iReady, Learning A to Z, SIPPS) -(August 2021 ongoing)

Person Responsible

Patricia Cells (patricia.cells@ocps.net)

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

## Area of Focus

Description and

To support and meet the needs of students falling into the lowest 25th percentile by providing multiple opportunities to expose students to content and close achievement gaps.

### Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is an increase in math scores for students performing in the lowest 25% percentile by four percentage points increase in learning gains. A one point increase in overall math proficiency will occur as well.

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through classroom walkthrough, evaluations, data monitoring monthly for tier 1, bi-weekly for tier 2, and weekly for tier 3. Grade levels will participate in data reviews at each tier and complete problem solving notes to determine specific actions. At each assessment period, data reviews will include monitoring of progress based on the last assessment cycle, and additional steps will be taken to ensure student success.

**Monitoring:** 

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

## Evidencebased Strategy:

Eagle Creek will implement a variety of strategies to ensure we meet the needs of our students performing in the lowest 25th percentile. We will continue to support all levels of instruction through the implementation of the Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) initiative. Eagle Creek will monitor and adjust the MTSS process (tiered support) through the use of evidence based interventions, before school tutoring programs, data analysis, problem solving, creation of action plans, monitoring of results, and implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies. As a school we will continue to strive to meet the demands of our changing population through culturally responsive approaches and an intense focus on connecting academics with social emotional learning.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: The rationale for selecting these strategies is to increase student exposure to grade level content and monitor progress/ adjust instruction as needed to close achievement gaps. We will monitor the implementation of UDL strategies to ensure that our students that are receiving special education services are making adequate academic progress throughout the school year. Additionally, we will continue support our students through creating a culturally responsive environment in which all staff members exhibit high levels of cultural competency.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

- 1. Backward design/ common planning Leadership team (August 2021 ongoing).
- 2. Coaching observations Leadership team (August 2021 ongoing).
- 3. Data analysis all stake holder groups (August 2021 ongoing).
- 4. Weekly PLC meetings- Leadership team (August 2021 ongoing)
- 5. Job embedded professional development- Instructional coach, administration
- 6. Before and after school tutoring programs- teachers, leadership team (October 2021- April 2022)
- 7. MTSS professional development/ progress monitoring (August 2021 ongoing)
- 8. Implementation of district approved math programs (iReady, Reflex math) (August 2021 -ongoing)

#### Person Responsible

Patricia Cells (patricia.cells@ocps.net)

#### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

In review of Eagle Creek Elementary SafeSchoolsforAlex.org data you see that the school ranked 313 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. The school had two incidents that were considered "violent incidents." The school has identified a team of professionals that will lead the school in the implementation of Social Emotional Learning throughout the school day and is implementing a CHAMPS program for lunchroom and hallway expectations. The school's leadership team will monitor discipline data throughout the school year to see what areas need to be addressed and what areas are showing improvement.

#### 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.

Eagle Creek Elementary builds a positive school environment by seeking valuable input and establishing strong relationships with school and community stakeholder groups. Eagle Creek works tirelessly to provide positive and culturally responsive experiences for students, staff, and families. Teachers and staff work to bring awareness and honor a variety of cultures each month. The school community is always looking for new and inventive ways to enable students to meet their highest level of potential. Eagle Creek faculty and staff work closely with PTA to provide students with a variety of experiences that enrich their education. Strong school and community partnerships drive school decision making through informed, collaborative initiatives that provide our students with the best educational experience possible.

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

Eagle Creek's school advisory council meets monthly to discuss school improvement efforts centered on the academic and social emotional well-being of our students. The collaboration between school and community has supported students and teachers through providing valuable resources to increase student achievement. Eagle Creeks SAC has shown tremendous support for building teacher capacity through professional development. The school advisory council has helped to fund training in positive school culture initiatives such as the model school conference.

Eagle Creek has a well-established parent teacher association (PTA) that works hard to provide meaningful experiences for the community. The PTA supports all families and students through various community events throughout the year. Some examples of how Eagle Creeks PTA supports a positive school culture through events such as community fundraisers and enrichment opportunities for all students. For the 2021-2022 school year, Eagle Creek's PTA will continue to support teacher development through funding professional development that continues to build cultural awareness as well as teacher development in support of our specialized classrooms.

The school based SELL team works closely with teachers to help support each student's emotional and social well being and culturally responsive instruction through the implementation of evidence based strategies that support all student groups. As a school community, Eagle Creek will continue to support teacher development in this area, and enhance it through job embedded professional learning.

In the 2021-2022, Eagle Creek will reinstate teacher sponsored clubs to help support the diverse needs and interests of all students. School clubs give students a variety of choices that appeal to them. Additionally, school club activities enable students to build positive social relationships with peers.

Eagle Creek also supports the OCPS induction program with our teacher sponsored "CubClub." The "Cub Club" meets monthly with teachers within their first three years in the classroom. The "Cub Club" supports new teachers in learning about various topics such as the instructional framework, MTSS, and the ways of OCPS. The "Cub Club" brings new and veteran teachers together to help increase teacher capacity and build strong relationships among the staff.

### 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                     |  |                |     | \$245,000.00  |
|   | Function | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22       |
|   | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 1921 - Eagle Creek<br>Elementary   | General Fund   |     | \$70,000.00   |
|   |          |  | Notes: Identified teachers will provide tiered intervention support in math and/or ELA.  |                |     | n and/or ELA. |
|   | 2162     | 500-Materials and Supplies                                       | 1921 - Eagle Creek<br>Elementary   | Other          |     | \$20,000.00   |
|   |          |  | Notes: Supplemental support/ intervention materials needed for both math and reading instruction to assist students performing in the lowest 25% to help increase proficiency. |                |     |               |
|   | 2162     | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 1921 - Eagle Creek<br>Elementary   | Other          |     | \$7,500.00    |
|   |          |  | Notes: Tutors will support students before and after school in the area of mathematics.  |                |     |               |
|   | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 1921 - Eagle Creek<br>Elementary   | General Fund   |     | \$140,000.00  |
|   |          |  | Notes: Identified teachers will support MTSS (multi-tiered system of supports) process to close the instructional gaps that exist among the lowest 25% of students.            |                |     |               |
|   | 2162     | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 1921 - Eagle Creek<br>Elementary   | Other          |     | \$7,500.00    |

## Orange - 1921 - Eagle Creek Elementary - 2021-22 SIP

| Notes: Tutors will support students before school to increase reading proficiency among the lowest 25% of students. |              |
|---|--------------|
| Total:  | \$245,000.00 |