Sun Blaze Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sun Blaze Elementary

9101 RANDAL PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://sunblazees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Glenna Wyatt

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (71%)
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

Sun Blaze Elementary

9101 RANDAL PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://sunblazees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	24%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission:
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.

Vision:
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
Szymanski, Christine	Principal	Instructional observations Teacher and classified staff evaluations Personnel hiring and ER issues Progress monitoring and data analysis Monitors and evaluate Deliberate Practice Plans Manages school budget and internal accounts SAC and PTA liaison Oversees professional development for leadership team Public Relations leader Monitors staff and student attendance Shares district initiatives Monitors instruction
Rutledge, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Instructional observations Teacher and classified staff evaluations Personnel hiring and ER issues Progress monitoring and data analysis Monitors and evaluates Deliberate Practice Plans Student discipline/bullying Creates master schedule Monitors FTE/Certify Creates and communicates School Improvement Plan Data collection and analysis Facilities manager Monitors instruction Manages student scheduling
Cadogan, Tomicka	Instructional Coach	Conducts coaching observations Provides teacher and staff development Progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations Coordinates grade-level ELA collaborative planning Monitors ELA instruction Contact for 3rd grade portfolios iReady facilitator Lead mentor supervisor Coordinates reading deficiency and retention letters.
Boston, Jacqueline	Instructional Media	Provides professional development on guided readings Manages media center (library books and digital resources) Canvas representative for the school Facilitates digital professional development Laptop and iPad manager (loss and damages)

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Kristin	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Conducts coaching observations Provides teacher and staff professional development Progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations Testing coordinator Educator Access + grading system contact Organizing and managing school field trips Facilitates school Spelling Bee Organizes and manages all instructional materials
Villalobos, Martiza	ELL Compliance Specialist	Conducts coaching observations Provides teacher and staff professional development Progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations MPLC facilitator Monitors ELL certify Organizes ELL para schedules Manages ELL plans and accommodations Facilitates ELL testing Imagine Learning Contact Organizes and facilitates parent conferences for ELL students
Hoffman, Peggy lee	Staffing Specialist	FSAA Coordinator ESE staffing Monitors ESE Certify errors Conducts ESE annual reviews Manages behavior plans Assists with ESE accommodations Organizes ESE para schedules Manages health care plans ESE transportation contact 504 plan facilitator
Dobson, Valerie	School Counselor	Provides guidance lessons K-5 Provides Child Safety Matters lessons K-5 Conducts SEDNET referrals Facilitates DCF calls and visits Coordinator for the Threat Assessment Meetings McKinney Vento contact Title IX coordinator Social worker liaison Conducts gifted screening Organizes parent conferences
alvarez, travis	Dean	Implements behavior intervention plans Student discipline Facilitates fire, active assailant, and severe weather

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		drills Organizes morning duty schedules Partners in Education liaison Manages bullying investigations Conducts threat assessments
Worrell, Brittany	Math Coach	Conducts coaching observations Provides teacher and staff professional development Involved in progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations Coordinates grade-level math collaborative planning Monitors math and science instruction Contact for STEAM clubs Organizes school-wide STEM challenges Monitors science PMAs Oration Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/13/2018, Glenna Wyatt

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.*
4

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
56

Total number of students enrolled at the school
867

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
12

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	138	134	146	163	136	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	22	21	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	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 6/28/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	122	131	136	156	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	790
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	14	10	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	83	122	131	136	156	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	790
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	14	10	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				71%	57%	57%	68%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	58%	58%	62%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	52%	53%	53%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				76%	63%	63%	73%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	61%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	48%	51%	36%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	56%	53%	68%	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	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math progress monitoring data was collected from the iReady beginning, mid, and end of year diagnostic assessment. Fifth grade Science data was collected through district wide Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs).

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/27%	59/50%	79/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/27%	13/39%	15/44%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	2/33%	3/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	4/19%	6/27%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/21%	50/42%	74/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/16%	8/24%	15/44%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	3/50%	3/50%
	English Language Learners	2/11%	2/10%	5/23%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/31%	58/40%	81/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/24%	16/31%	23/45%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/11%	2/22%
	English Language Learners	5/13%	8/19%	17/38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/12%	39/27%	65/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/4%	8/20%	16/33%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/3%	9/21%	14/33%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43/36%	63/51%	75/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/19%	15/35%	15/34%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/6%	3/19%
	English Language Learners	4/11%	10/27%	12/32%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/10%	36/29%	67/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2%	3/7%	11/26%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/6%
	English Language Learners	1/3%	6/16%	13/35%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51/36%	57/39%	66/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/31%	20/33%	21/36%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	1/8%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	8/16%	5/10%	11/22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/9%	41/28%	72/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/7%	14/23%	21/36%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/8%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/2%	7/17%	14/28%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/21%	43/28%	63/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/17%	8/12%	17/26%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	13/33%	7/18%	13/33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20/14%	39/26%	76/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/5%	11/17%	25/39%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/9%	2/18%
	English Language Learners	4/11%	4/10%	14/37%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102/70%	103/73%	112/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38/64%	35/60%	38/62%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	4/36%	4/31%
	English Language Learners	19/49%	19/54%	23/59%

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	20	42		22	33		23				
ELL	52	70	67	61	73	80	43				
ASN	81			89			80				
BLK	78			78							
HSP	61	62	73	67	70	79	59				
MUL	83			92							
WHT	79	68		89	64		81				
FRL	55	46	61	64	63	63	45				
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	25	38	39	33	41	35	9				
ELL	58	63	58	66	67	59	51				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	97	83		97	96						
BLK	68	79		79	79		71				
HSP	65	64	59	71	67	56	58				
MUL	75			75							
WHT	80	72		85	74		82				
FRL	63	65	58	69	66	57	60				
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	28	38	31	30	16	6	21				
ELL	41	61	60	58	47	40	24				
ASN	93	71		96	71						
BLK	64	71		68	61	30	56				
HSP	62	57	53	66	48	37	64				
WHT	78	68		86	66		81				
FRL	62	60	55	66	49	35	63				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	530
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	62

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
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	78
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	66
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	88
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Sun Blaze scored above the district levels for ELA, Math and Science based upon 2019 state data. Students with disabilities (SWD) was the subgroup for 2019 that had the lowest percentages in each data component as well as a 34% for the ESSA Federal Index. Trends of low scores for students with disabilities continued in 2020-2021 according to i-Ready data.

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

Overall 2019 data components show that Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the lowest percent of proficiency at 57% but still Sun Blaze out performed the 2018 school year in this component by 21 percentage points.

Students with disabilities (SWD) was the subgroup with the highest need for 2019 due to scoring the lowest percentages in each data component as well as receiving a 34% for the ESSA Federal Index.

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

With the additional time in the master schedule to support math, small group differentiated instruction will occur to support student learning and increase proficiency and learning gains.

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

All school-wide data components for 2019 with the exception of Science showed an improvement when compared to the previous year. Science remained the same at 68%. Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most growth when compared to 2018 scores even though Math Lowest 25th Percentile was at 57% in 2019 which was the lowest scoring component.

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

The MTSS process along with tutoring and push-in support aided the growth in math learning gains.

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

Acceleration strategies will be reviewed in the PLC process so that teachers do not over perseverate in scaffolding and move forward at a steady pace. Small group instruction along with possible frontloading of material can assist in the accelerating learning as well.

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.

Small group instruction procedures along with the supporting learning materials will be a focus of professional development.

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

MTSS will continue along with the addition of an interventionist to support the learning process in the classroom.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ESE students showed a decreased on their ELA achievement from 28% to 25% on the FSA. The learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA also dropped from 39% to 31% for our ESE students. The Science FCAT had the largest decrease for our ESE students, going from a 21% achievement rate in 2018 to a 9% in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	With the implementation of more support facilitation for ESE, our students with disabilities will show an increase in their overall ELA performance, ELA lowest 25% learning gains, and Science achievement. Overall ELA proficiency will increase by three percentage points from 71% to 74% and math proficiency will increase from 76% to 78%.
Monitoring:	Weekly grade level professional learning community meetings will address the needs and progress of the ESE subgroup. ESE instructional logs will be kept and reviewed regularly to ensure students' IEPs are being followed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Szymanski (christine.szymanski@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students with disabilities will receive their services through a combination of the support facilitation model and direct specialized instruction model. The ESE teachers will provide the students their services while in the general education classroom and/or ESE classroom. The ESE teachers will collaborate with the general education teachers to incorporate close reading strategies and chunking using Science-based informational and literary-based text when providing teacher-led, differentiated small group instruction. The ESE teachers will use explicit instruction when showing students how to use these strategies. They will model and scaffold the processes needed to comprehend the grade-level text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students with disabilities previously received the majority of their services through a pull-out model in which the ESE teacher provided services in a resource classroom. This resulted in a loss of instructional time due to transitions and instruction was provided in a more restrictive environment. With the decrease in both ELA and Science achievement on the FSA, our ESE students would benefit from a combination of support facilitation and direction instruction model. In addition, the ESE teacher provided students with social studies reading materials rather than science-based texts resulting in the decrease in science scores for the students with disabilities. ESE students will be exposed to a balance of social studies and science based texts.

Action Steps to Implement

A second support facilitation ESE teacher will be hired.

Person Responsible	Christine Szymanski (christine.szymanski@ocps.net)

The staffing specialist and the ESE teachers will identify the students who will need direct instruction vs support facilitation. They will then develop a schedule in order to provide the students with their services in the least restrictive environment.

Person Responsible	Peggy lee Hoffman (peggylee.hoffman@ocps.net)

The leadership team will meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review common assessment data and progress monitor the growth of our ESE students.

Person Responsible	Nicole Rutledge (nicole.rutledge@ocps.net)

A reading intervention program will be purchased and implemented to provide tier 2 and 3 interventions as needed.

Person Responsible	Christine Szymanski (christine.szymanski@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Sun Blaze will build and establish a culture for social emotional learning at Sun Blaze with adults and students. Academic learning will be enhanced when students have the opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By encouraging a culture for social emotional learning, we will address the need for updated training in regard to SEL and MTSS by making a connection of how they can work together resulting in a better understanding of individuals.
Measurable Outcome:	Panorama survey data from students will show a 3% increase in the overall average score when compared to the previous year's overall average score.
Monitoring:	Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Szymanski (christine.szymanski@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-Based Strategy: Using distributive leadership and social emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration, we will build academic expertise and self confidence for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale: In order to achieve sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of all members belonging to the school. In order to create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and support of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will work to make positive change by moving the mindset toward using a group mentality to scaffold social and emotional practices. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development training on the CASEL Core Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies as it relates to the district Social Emotional Learning Leadership (SELL) initiative.

Person Responsible	Christine Szymanski (christine.szymanski@ocps.net)

Teachers will implement a new social emotional learning curriculum titled, Caring School Community. Professional development will be provided regarding the new curriculum.

Person Responsible	travis alvarez (travis.alvarez@ocps.net)

Identify SEL needs of students with on-going behaviors through the MTSS process and implement research-based strategies identified through the CASEL Core Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies.

Person Responsible	Peggy lee Hoffman (peggylee.hoffman@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Sun Blaze Elementary School is ranked 1,098 out of 1,395 schools statewide and 53 out of 126 schools in Orange County for incidents that occur on campus. There are three categories for incidents that may occur at schools. These three categories include: Violent Incidents, Property Incidents and Drug/Public Order Incidents. Sun Blaze had a total of 16 Violent Incidents with an enrollment of 1,131 students which converts to 1.41 percent for the Incident Rate in the 2019-2020 school year. The ranking ranges from Very Low to Very High to include five categories: Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very High. Sun Blaze has a ranking of High for the 16 incidents that occurred in 2019-2020. This school year, Sun Blaze will be incorporating a new SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. This research-based program will be used to build school-wide community, develop our students' social skills and Social Emotional Learning (SEL) competencies, and enable a transformative stance on discipline. This proactive approach should help to reduce the number of Violent Incident occurrences on campus. Our dean, Mr. Alvarez, will incorporate a staff/student mentoring program for our high needs/at risk students. Our counselor, Ms. DiPaolo, will provide guidance lessons regarding SEL strategies and work with individual students on various social groups, such as conflict resolution and relationship skills.

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.

Sun Blaze addresses building positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved through various methods. First, Sun Blaze holds monthly School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings which involves community members, parents, teachers, staff and administration. During SAC meetings, members discuss goals and their progress as they relate to the School Improvement Plan. The committee will vote on various budgetary proposals that aim toward meeting the SIP goals. Sun Blaze also participates in the Partners in Education Program. This program links businesses and organizations with schools to share resources, both people and materials. Sun Blaze also utilizes Additions, the Orange County Public Schools volunteer program and has an active and involved Parent-Teacher Association. This organization plans various family events at the school and works closely with administration to support the goals from the School Improvement Plan.

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

Leadership - reviews Panorama data along with input from staff and students to determine what changes may need to occur to promote a positive environment

Guidance Counselor - promotes SEL strategies through guidance lessons and student interactions

Teachers - utilize positive Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) as well as SEL strategies and lessons

Students - participate in SEL guidance lessons and school rewards system

PEL - Parent Engagement Liaison works on outreach to parents through events hosted at the school

PTA/SAC - meet monthly to review data and needs of the school as well as plan for future activities

Partners in Education - support the school's rewards system by offering incentives to the school

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$73,263.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1831 - Sun Blaze Elementary	General Fund		$73,263.00
			Notes: School budget was used to purchase an additional ESE support facilitation teacher			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$77,138.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1831 - Sun Blaze Elementary	General Fund		$77,138.00
			Notes: Guidance counselor will be used to conduct PD for SEL and to assist the staffing specials in documenting MTSS interventions for behavior			
					Total:	$150,401.00