

Orange County Public Schools

Meadow Woods Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Meadow Woods Elementary

500 RHODE ISLAND WOODS CIR, Orlando, FL 32824

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

Demographics

Principal: Edmi Figueroa Solis

Start Date for this Principal: 2/10/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Meadow Woods Elementary

500 RHODE ISLAND WOODS CIR, Orlando, FL 32824

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways 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
Figueroa Solis, Edmi	Principal	The Principal will be responsible for cultivating, shaping and ensuring rigorous academic goals for all staff and students. The Principal will problem solve, coach and build capacity in staff to create a positive and effective school culture. The Principal will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support in order to assure the school's mission and vision are achieved.
Glenn, Laquel	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will support the principal in assuring the mission and vision are achieved. The Assistant Principal will monitor data to provide needed adjustments to close the achievement gap, assure building safety, coach and support all staff, and maintain and deepen current educational best practices to support the positive and effective school culture.
Lebron, James	Dean	The dean will provide social emotional learning to high needs students to ensure they can reach proficiency and oversee the behavior management systems within the school.
Solano, Lena	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach will model, build capacity and assist primary teachers with foundational skills. They will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful in all academic areas. They will build capacity in core subject areas and assist in vertically aligning primary instruction to intermediate instruction.
Roman, Faye	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) will provide materials and knowledge of content to assure equity among all students and classrooms. They will support the instructional coach in monitoring the teacher and student use of curriculum and access to culturally responsive texts.
Steelman, Jessica	Math Coach	The Math Coach will model, build capacity and assist K-5 teachers with Math skills and standards-based instruction. She will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful with Math standards. She builds capacity within Math Interventionists to maximize student support in Math and assist in vertically aligning primary instruction to intermediate instruction.
Castanera, Rosita	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will maintain an understanding of all communication skills, decision making, relationship skills, conflict resolution and goal setting to ensure students receive support and to reduce all barriers to their academic success. The Guidance Counselor will confer with teachers to provide interventions, preventions and behavior modifications that will allow all students to achieve success and participate in rigorous instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/10/2021, Edmi Figueroa Solis

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.*

2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

18

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

16

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	38	84	114	143	98	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	617
Attendance below 90 percent	18	41	37	41	17	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	8	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	2	0	9	4	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	65	126	128	130	142	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708
Attendance below 90 percent	28	33	33	24	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	46	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	24	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	15	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	65	126	128	130	142	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708
Attendance below 90 percent	28	33	33	24	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	46	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	24	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	15	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	57%	57%	49%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	58%	58%	51%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	53%	44%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	63%	63%	53%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	61%	62%	43%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	48%	51%	28%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	56%	53%	43%	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	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	63%	-7%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
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 progress monitoring tools which Orange County Public Schools use are diagnostic assessments given through the i-Ready platform for both reading and math. Diagnostic data are collected at the beginning of the year (BOY), middle of the year (MOY) and end of year (EOY) for both reading and math. Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs) are used in science three times a year to check on how the students are developing in the understanding of the science standards.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/17	22/20	38/35
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/21	18/24	26/36
	Students With Disabilities	3/21	3/21	2/15
	English Language Learners	4/11	2/5	9/23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19/18	20/18	35/32
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/17	13/18	20/28
	Students With Disabilities	3/21	3/21	4/31
	English Language Learners	5/13	6/15	11/29
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/12	19/17	41/35
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/14	17/23	28/36
	Students With Disabilities	1/8	1/8	2/17
	English Language Learners	4/9	5/11	12/26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/4	7/6	30/26
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/5	5/7	22/29
	Students With Disabilities	1/8	0/0	1/8
	English Language Learners	1/2	2/4	11/23

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/18	25/23	44/41
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/17	13/18	25/35
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	3/21
	English Language Learners	4/10	6/15	16/40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/2	8/7	33/31
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/1	6/8	18/25
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/14
	English Language Learners	1/3	4/10	14/35
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/11	21/16	26/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/11	12/13	17/19
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/3	3/10
	English Language Learners	7/10	8/12	15/23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/8	18/13	35/27
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/8	9/10	20/22
	Students With Disabilities	2/6	1/3	2/7
	English Language Learners	5/7	9/13	17/26

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/7	13/12	14/13
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/9	11/15	10/14
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/29
	English Language Learners	2/5	5/11	4/9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/5	13/12	22/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6	11/15	16/23
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/5	5/11	8/17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	34/35	37/35	41/38
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/35	25/36	31/46
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/13	1/7
	English Language Learners	15/36	14/31	18/39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	33	31	13	31	40					
ELL	40	54	44	46	47	69	35				
BLK	26	24		30	19		25				
HSP	46	54	48	44	39	62	40				
WHT	62			62							
FRL	40	46	32	37	40	56	38				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	8	38	45	25	52	44					
ELL	41	66	67	47	55	56	38				
BLK	46	58	58	47	50	46	39				
HSP	46	58	55	52	57	47	49				

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
WHT	64			73							
FRL	43	55	56	49	51	42	46				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	44	43	26	46	38	31				
ELL	41	45	40	50	44	27	33				
BLK	38	39	29	35	37	25	26				
HSP	50	52	49	55	44	31	43				
WHT	71	62		76	46						
FRL	48	48	39	53	43	27	41				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	62
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	41
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?

Based on 2019 raw FSA data, Meadow Woods Elementary performed below the state and the district average in ELA and in Math by 10% across all grade levels. When looking at students, the SWD subgroup was considerably low in ELA and Math across all grade levels. Based on 2019 raw FSA data, Meadow Woods Elementary performed below the state and the district average in ELA and in Math by 10% across all grade levels. The percent of students proficient in ELA was 47% and the District and the State were 57%. For Math, Meadow Woods Elementary scored 53% proficient while the District and the State scored 63%. When looking at students' 2019 FSA results, the SWD subgroup was considerably low in ELA and Math achievement across all grade levels. Based on i-Ready end of year diagnostic data, the total student population increased from the beginning of the year to the end of the year by 22% in reading with 55% of students meeting proficiency and by 31% in math with 53% of students meeting proficiency.

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

The components with the most need for improvement are math and reading achievement and from the subgroups, the SWD. Based on previous trends, students at Meadow Woods Elementary scored 49% in proficiency in reading for 2018 and 47% proficient in 2019. In math, the school has scored 53% proficient in 2018 and 2019. This data shows a decline in ELA achievement and a freeze in Math achievement.

The greatest need for improvement has been targeted to three areas: (1) Common Planning with a clear focus on Tier I instruction and differentiation, (2) Common Summative / Formative Assessments that have FSA response mechanisms, and (3) Coaches and Administration providing comprehensive feedback via classroom walkthroughs.

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 need for improvement in these areas relates to the lack of instruction in math during the pandemic, including the time students were off-campus from March 2020-August 2020. Guided reading and guided math were limited due to social distancing requirements.

Actions taken include, increased support during small group instruction, math intervention time, increased push-in support, and differentiated learning opportunities for students based on data analysis. PLCs will be closely monitored providing support to ensure students received on level standard-based instruction with the goal of accelerating student learning to close the gaps.

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

2019 data shows there was improvement in the lower 25% by 17% from 2018 to 2019 in Math and learning gains increased by 13%.

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

The school implemented a Math Power Hour to give additional time, so students could receive extra Math instruction that targeted the gaps in the specific standards of need. Also, more than 120 students attended ATS Math tutoring 3 days a week. Additionally, the school had two Math interventionists that provided additional services based on data from progress monitoring. These lessons were customized by need and in a small group setting.

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

To accelerate student learning, teachers and staff will be provided with professional development to aid in the implementation of scaffolding, build knowledge and vocabulary, prioritize standards, diagnose essential missed learning, and utilize academic teams.

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.

Professional development in core content will be provided:

Focus Driven PLC's

Marzano Instructional Framework

Differentiated Learning (Station Rotations, Engagement)

High expectations for low expectancy students

Social Emotional Learning

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

Accountability is the additional service that we will provide to ensure that what is implemented is sustained with fidelity.

As we look at our students in terms of proficiency, we can see a decline. Accelerated learning will be implemented in all classrooms through the Math Power Hour. All students will receive an additional hour every other Wednesday. Students will be grouped by standard deficiencies in every grade level and teachers will target that specific standard.

Math Interventionists will look at data at the end of every intervention cycle to make instructional decisions that match students' learning gaps.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Description/Rationale: On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that (50% or more) of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA) in at least one of the tested grade levels. The following percentages for ELA achievement are: Third Grade-47%, Fourth Grade-35%, Fifth Grade-41%. (FSA Report: Schools with/without 50 Percent or More of any Grade Level Scoring Below Level 3)

Measurable Outcome: The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase for the following grade levels:
 Third Grade - three percentage points from 47% to 50%
 Fourth Grade - fifteen percentage points from 35% to 50%
 Fifth Grade - nine percentage points from 41% to 50%

Monitoring: To monitor growth towards the goal, i-Ready diagnostic data, Progress Monitoring Activities (PMAs) and Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) will be monitored fall, winter and spring as well at the end of units of instruction. Adjustments to instruction will be made in response to data and Instructional Groups for students will be created in I-Ready for grades three through five. Comparisons and adjustments to small groups will occur when additional data points are collected . Classroom Walkthroughs will happen on a continual basis as well to address instructional delivery, student engagement and the planning process through PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edmi Figueroa Solis (edmi.figueroasolis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Each student will read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. For students of greater need, small group instruction will occur to better scaffold student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The selected instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding.

Quasi-experiments have a moderate level of evidence due to that they lack the key feature of randomly selected groups. Here students are assigned to intervention groups by using a non-random process based upon data.

Action Steps to Implement

The ELA Coach will plan with teachers weekly using instructional focus calendars, CRM's, as well as other ELA resources provided by OCPS and bought by the school to ensure lessons are aligned to the state standards for ELA while ensuring the incorporation of culturally responsiveness.

Person Responsible Lena Solano (lena.solano@ocps.net)

School administrators, MTSS Coach, and coaches will determine the baseline curriculum for all tiers. Team will then meet with teachers and interventionists bi-weekly, to analyze MTSS data and adjust groups as needed.

Person Responsible Laquel Glenn (laquel.glenn@ocps.net)

School administrators, coaches and instructional support team will conduct classroom walk-throughs, provide teachers with actionable feedback, and ensure the implementation of standards-based instructional practices. Our main focus will be on our Tier I curriculum and differentiation among all grade levels.

Person Responsible Edmi Figueroa Solis (edmi.figueroasolis@ocps.net)

Administration will structure Professional Developments (PDs) to provide teachers with education on differentiation effect size, research based tools, student engagement, and co-teaching strategies.

Person Responsible Faye Roman (faye.roman@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Sustain a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school sustains our culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: increase the number of restorative practices and staff trained. Keeping students on campus expanding time engaged with standards-based instruction, positive attendance percentages and raising student participation in rigorous academic conversations.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students with one early warning indicator will be reduced by 5% and the students with two or more early warning indicators will be reduced by 3% as a result of a continued intense focus on social emotional learning. Student proficiency in grades 3, 4 and 5 will increase by 5% in all subject areas.

Monitoring: Beyond the annually given Panorama Survey, students and staff will be appraised using a school created google form during the first, second and third nine week period to determine whether connections to culture and environment are perceived more or less positive. Gather provided teacher input based on the focused areas of provided support and if the student is using the skills and strategies that have been taught

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edmi Figueroa Solis (edmi.figueroasolis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning a month to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational

Action Steps to Implement

Reinforce the existing common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning with stakeholders and students.

Person Responsible Rosita Castanera (rosita.castaneragarcia@ocps.net)

Having Professional developments on SEL practices and CASEL Framework

Person Responsible Rosita Castanera (rosita.castaneragarcia@ocps.net)

Creating opportunities for celebrating success both academically and behaviorally.

Person Responsible James Lebron (james.lebron@ocps.net)

Weekly focus on Covey's 7 Habits of Happy Kids

Person Responsible Lena Solano (lena.solano@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible Faye Roman (faye.roman@ocps.net)

Reinforce the existing common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning with stakeholders and students.

Person Responsible Edmi Figueroa Solis (edmi.figueroasolis@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After reviewing data it was identified that one of our biggest gaps, when compared to the district and state, was Math achievement. Providing teachers with professional development in differentiation and tools that assist with differentiation will increase student exposure to rigorous content and ensure equitable learning for all students. Differentiation is a critical need to close the gap between our exceptional education students and their general education peers as well as ensure all students are exposed to rigorous culturally responsive instruction. Having co-teaching during key times with specific grade levels and subjects will assist with the differentiation process.

Measurable Outcome: The 2022 MATH FSA will show an increase for the following grade levels:
 Fourth Grade - four percentage points from 46% to 50%
 Fifth Grade - twenty-four percentage points from 26% to 50%

Monitoring: To monitor growth towards the goal, i-Ready diagnostic data and Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUA) will be monitored fall, winter and spring as well at the end of units of instruction. Adjustments to instruction will be made in response to data and Instructional groups for students with disabilities (SWD) will be created in I-Ready for grades three through five. Comparisons and adjustments to small groups will occur when comparisons are made between the SWD instructional groups and grade level proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: General education teachers will collaborate with Co-teachers along with academic coaches and special education teachers to exchange and share resources that serve students with exceptionalities while maintaining a focus on the measurable outcomes. The collaboration will also include maximizing resources to increase capacity in instructional practices in all classrooms as well as ensure equity in grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our ESSA data gap for our exceptional education students is small but our overall percentage of exceptional education students is large. We also have a large number of students receiving Tier II and Tier III support requiring enrichment, intervention and targeted small groups as essential parts of instruction. Improved collaboration between all stakeholders will lead to continued improvement between achievement in subgroups and overall proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

The math coach will plan with teachers weekly using instructional focus calendars. CRMs as well as other math resources provided by OCPS along with those which are bought by the school will be used to ensure lessons are aligned to the state standards for math.

Person Responsible Jessica Steelman (jessica.steelman@ocps.net)

School administrators, MTSS Coach, and coaches will determine the baseline curriculum for all tiers. Team will then meet with teachers and interventionists bi-weekly, to analyze MTSS data and adjust groups as needed.

Person Responsible Laquel Glenn (laquel.glenn@ocps.net)

Administration will structure Professional Developments (PDs) to provide teachers with education on differentiation effect size, research based tools, student engagement, and co-teaching strategies.

Person Responsible Faye Roman (faye.roman@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Meadow Woods Elementary School is ranked 1,213 out of 1,395 schools statewide and 72 out of 126 schools in Orange County for incidents that occur on campus. There are three categories that may occur at schools which include Violent, Property and Drug/Public Order incidents. For the 2020-2021 school year, Meadow Woods had a total of 30 Violent Incidents which include threat or intimidation (8), harassment (4), physical attack (12, with 4 occurring in ASD self-contained units, and the other 8 involving three KG students) and fighting (8) with an enrollment of 725 that converts to 4.1 percent for the Incident Rate in the 2020-2021 school year. The ranking ranges from Very Low to Very High. Meadow Woods has a ranking of Very High for the incidents that occurred in 2020-2021. The continued implementation of Restorative Practice along with Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies will be used along with support from the guidance counselor to guide students to 5 CASEL competencies: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationships Skills, and Responsible Decision Making.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

In order to maintain a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with

stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. The Parent Engagement Liaisons will continue to bridge the community and school culture.

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

Administration - Edmi Figueroa Solis - Principal; Laquel Glenn- AP
 Guidance Counselor- Rosita Castanera Garcia
 Teachers - Renia Bankhead, Yaritza Enchautegui, Daniel Davis
 PEL - - Mayra DeJesus - creates and manages engaging opportunities for students and families through outreach
 Partners in Education - Ida Santana

SAC & PTO - staff, family, and community members are provided an opportunity to share in the development of engaging opportunities for students and families

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$65,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	General Fund		\$25,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes teachers to attend additional training</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$40,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitutes so teachers may attend training for standards-aligned materials for both reading and math instruction.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitutes so teachers may attend District SELL meetings/training</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
					Total:	\$70,000.00