Columbia Elementary

leadership
students
school improvement
mission Florida analysis college and career ambitious
family and community involvement
striving achievement relationships
teaching areas of focus
success instruction
needs assessment strategic planning collaboration vision learning supportive environment resources growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Columbia Elementary

18501 CYPRESS LAKE GLEN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32820

https://columbiaes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Katie Brinkman   Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
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: A (69%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (64%)
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

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

Columbia Elementary

18501 CYPRESS LAKE GLEN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32820

https://columbiaes.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	No	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

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
Pritts, Matthew	Principal	Matthew Pritts, Principal: Responsible for teacher observations K-5 along with resource staff. Observations will be used to monitor classroom instruction, scope and sequence of standards, close reading strategies, and standards based tasks. Iobservation tool will be used to monitor frequency with informal, coaching, and formal observations being completed. He will also schedule and conduct monthly data meetings with 2nd-5th grade and quarterly with K-1st grade. Data chats will be based on iReady, common assessments, and other resources. Schedule will be used to establish dates for the meetings, type of data, and grade level targets. SELL team lead will be another area of responsibility with instructional practices. Establish DPLC members and develop a schedule to meet to implement the SELL information to school teams. Agendas and notes will be used to monitor the monthly meetings along with grade level evidence of SELL implementation. Matthew Pritts will also be responsible for overseeing all school functions.
Barbour, Debra	Staffing Specialist	Debra Barbour, Staffing/CCT: She is responsible for all IEP and CCT documentation. She will conduct meetings based on IEP dates and ELL guidelines. She will share meeting and updates weekly at leadership meeting. District compliance personnel will assist with monitoring staffing and CCT paperwork compliance monthly by sharing results of audit. She will meet weekly with MTSS coordinator to cross reference students needing support.
Sealey, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Melissa Sealey, CRT: Responsible for MTSS, iReady progress monitoring, FSA assessments, curriculum materials, coaching, and DPLC. She will design a monthly schedule for individual teachers to meet for MTSS to discuss student progress. The schedule will be for 9 months that will include key team members. Schedule and MTSS notes will be used to monitor frequency and completion of task. IReady will be weekly with usage and progress monitoring tools. IReady reports will be pulled weekly, monthly, and beginning/mid/end of year to monitor iReady implementation. Curriculum will be shared with teachers and/or ordered to assist with instruction. Invoices and team planning will be evidence of tasks to assist with curriculum (Ex. New Science Curriculum). She will provide coaching observation connected with MTSS/FBS instruction to assist with monitoring lowest 25% ELA instruction. She will also be part of our school based DPLC team and assist teams by modeling lessons, assisting with resources, and/or planning. She will attend DPLC monthly meetings to assist with implementation and share ideas. Agenda and notes will be used to monitor.
Rosa, Arlene	Instructional Coach	Arlene Rosa, Instructional Coach: Responsible for coaching teachers, SELL team member, team planning, and intervention assistance. She will be working with k-5 during common planning times with reading instruction weekly. She will develop a schedule with teams to join weekly that will include common assessments, resources, plans to model lessons, and/or observe lessons for feedback. Focus will be ELA. Schedules and notes will be used to monitor planning and coaching cycles. She will continue as SELL lead for school team to assist with collaboration of our teams and monitor

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		implementation. She will develop notes of our bimonthly meetings, collect grade level evidence, and provide reminders and assistance to our grade level SELL leaders to monitor implementation of our school plan. She will also provide intervention assistance with one grade level with reading comprehension. She will track student data for lowest 25% ELA in 5th grade to monitor student performance on grade level and intervention progress.
Pressy, Robyn	Instructional Media	Robyn Pressy, Media Specialist. She will be responsible for text book inventory, media circulation and updating, Accelerated Reader Program, and intervention support. She will maintain inventory through electronic tracking of materials to teachers and students. Reports will be pulled mid-year and weekly during the month of May to assist with inventory. Circulation will be monitored by pulling check out rates each quin along with invoices on new purchases for books and media resources. Accelerated Reader program will be school wide and tracked by class. Bimonthly reports will be sent out to all staff to track progress. Recognition events throughout the year will be held for class participation and student progress. Intervention group will be tracked using data sheet for her 5 students. Part of the data will be shared monthly with leadership team to monitor progress and group performance.
Henry, Sharon	School Counselor	Sharon Henry, Guidance Counselor: She is responsible for all 504 renewals and documentation. She will support teachers and students who may need assistance with behavioral structures, support groups, or other assistance. She will also teach monthly character education lessons and recognize students monthly from each grade level. Character lessons will be scheduled with teams and shared with leadership team for updates. A support log will be used to track students needing small group support with frequency. She will also assist with new health CRM's being implemented district wide. She will be part of the SEL professional development team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/1/2013, Katie Brinkman

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

476

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

0

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

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	5	89	69	92	93	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	14	22	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	8	22	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Tuesday 6/29/2021

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	29	70	80	103	92	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	6	12	14	19	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	

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	29	70	80	103	92	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	6	12	14	19	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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				72%	57%	57%	69%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	58%	58%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	53%	59%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				79%	63%	63%	78%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	61%	62%	73%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	48%	51%	59%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	56%	53%	80%	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	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	71%	63%	8%	64%	7%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-79%					
05	2021						
	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-71%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021						
	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison							

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

In grades 1st - 5th teachers use iReady and common assessments to progress monitor students. In 5th grade science teachers also use PMAs to monitor student progress. All grade levels use common assessment tools to cross reference student data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	41	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	21	34
	Students With Disabilities	17	33	33
	English Language Learners	33	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	31	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	21	29
	Students With Disabilities	17	33	33
	English Language Learners	33	67	33

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	34	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	23	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	20	0	20
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3	16	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	12	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	20	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	38	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	26	34
	Students With Disabilities	0	16	11
	English Language Learners	8	15	29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	19	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	12	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	11
	English Language Learners	0	15	29

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	28	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	22	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1	12	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	9	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	11

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	32	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	13	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	13
	English Language Learners	20	17	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	41	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	23	42
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	13
	English Language Learners	20	17	25
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	67	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	46	53
	Students With Disabilities	19	31	21
	English Language Learners	11	56	14

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	18	29	33	22	23	10	15				
ELL	43	50		41	30						
ASN	87			87							
BLK	83			61							
HSP	59	75		51	38		65				
WHT	69	76		71	59		83				
FRL	55	72	58	49	42	9	63				
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	16	40	43	35	38	40					
ELL	45	63	64	69	89	83	55				
ASN	92			92							
BLK	88	85		82	77						
HSP	63	60	54	74	74	63	69				
MUL	70			80							
WHT	74	67	56	80	72	59	78				
FRL	62	61	49	72	69	63	70				
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	17	58	58	34	56	53					
ELL	47	60		47	40						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	60	43		70	64						
HSP	75	66	60	79	78	60	74				
MUL	75			92							
WHT	64	64	63	75	69	54	83				
FRL	60	64	61	71	68	57	73				

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	56
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	40

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	41
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	87
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	72
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	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
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?

We have noticed that our ESE and ELL subgroups struggle in both math and ELA in grades 1-5. ESE students dropped from 33% in ELA and math. Our ELL students remained at 33% in ELA in grades 1-5 and dropped from 33% to 25% in math. In science our 5th grade demonstrated a similar pattern with ESE at 21% and ELL at 14%.

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

In grades 2-5, the greatest need for improvement in ELA is comprehension and vocabulary. In grades 3-5, two areas of improvement in math are number and operations and algebra and algebraic thinking.

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 contributing factor we need to improve in is targeting ESE, ELL and tier 3 students during their ELA intervention in grades 2-5. The action steps that need to be taken will be to redesign intervention using research based materials, PDs to our teachers with resources they can use, and provide strategies they can implement during small group instruction. Teachers will be given opportunities to team plan and create lessons for intervention and core instruction.

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

The most improvement came from our math learning gains with our ELL, Black, White, FRL, and Hispanic students who were higher in proficiency and learning gains.

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

In grades 4th and 5th our teachers use spiral review, exit tickets and provide feedback. During PLCs teachers work collaboratively to deconstruct math standards and plan lessons that meet the depth of the standard.

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

The strategies needed to accelerate learning will be to analyze data in order to plan intervention lessons and determine which curriculum will meet the student academic needs.

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.

This school year our focus will be to increase student achievement through professional developments. Our professional developments will be on-going throughout the year and will focus on the following:
-SEL
-B.E.S.T standards and new curriculum
-Analyzing subgroup data
-SIPPS
-ELL and ESE instructional strategies

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

This year we are implementing the SIPPS program in grades K-2 to improve reading fluency and comprehension. In grades 3-5, teachers will use reading passages to target student needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Columbia Elementary will integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: -- Academic discourse and SEL competencies: focus on goal settings through AR and feedback on common assessments to assist with self-management. --Through family engagement nights we will provide ESE and ELL families with strategies they can implement at home as well as relationship skills built through school connections.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of establishing a culture for social and emotional learning, we anticipate an increase in our culture and climate continuum data of 5% and an increase of 3% in our Panorama survey data within the following indicators: School Climate, Sense of Belonging, and Professional Learning about SEL.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will monitor the measurable outcomes throughout the year by having grade level teams complete the culture & climate continuum and analyzing the data. We will also collect qualitative data from students, staff, and families in the areas of school climate, sense of belonging, and professional learning about SEL. We use the data to monitor student needs, staff needs, and family needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Henry (sharon.henry@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Columbia Elementary will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families. 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 the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family 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, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. 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

The SELL team will work with teachers to identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction. Together they will determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standards. Also, interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Arlene Rosa (arlene.rosa@ocps.net)

The SELL team will monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning and leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture.

Person Responsible Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@ocps.net)

Through newsletters parents will attain information regarding instructional strategies and social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible Sharon Henry (sharon.henry@ocps.net)

The SELL team will work with teachers to create resources based on parent and student needs. We will plan parent engagement opportunities where our SELL team and teachers share social and emotional strategies and resources with parents. By working with students and parents we are building a school culture that incorporates all stakeholders to ensure our students are receiving social and emotional that pertain to them.

Person Responsible Sharon Henry (sharon.henry@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA subgroup is an area of focus since the data shows this subgroup is growing in proficiency at a much slower rate than all other areas of our school. In 2018-2019, we did not meet the federal guidelines of 41% proficiency and in 2020-2021, the EOY iReady results show that only 12% of our 3-5 grade students were at proficiency. Typically, these students are in Tier 3 of the MTSS process and receive intervention with strategic and consistent measures as well ass timely feedback which is critical to the success of the ESSA subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of implementing targeted instruction and intervention, our ESSA subgroup will increase in proficiency in iReady. On the EOY iReady for 2021-2022, this group will show a proficiency rate of at least 41%.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will monitor the measurable outcomes throughout the year by analyzing student iReady results, common assessments, SIPPS, DRA, and meeting with teachers to discuss students progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to effectively move out proficiency levels in the ESSA subgroup, we must strengthen our MTSS system that includes intervention with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As the majority of our ESSA students are in either Tier 2 or 3 of the MTSS process, our MTSS procedures play a vital role in their success rates. It is important for all members to regularly collaborate and work as a team to ensure the most optimal learning environment for success. The system must also include a more conscientious approach to data collection and analysis with a proactive strategy rather than a reactive strategy. This would lead itself to the MTSS problem solving framework. This would include the use of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning. Early intervention is key for success of our ESSA subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase effectiveness of the MTSS program, including FBS, progress monitoring, and data analysis. The MTSS team will collaborate with teachers and ESE team to create an environment of proactive verses relative support using the decision making process. Grade K-1 will complete a DRA 2x per year and SIPPS (for selective students who are one to two levels behind grade level) to use as an additional data point for their students. Grades K-2 will complete fact fluency checks weekly to add additional data points.

Person Responsible	Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

Increase the use of close reading strategies and small group instruction. The leadership team will continue to lead PLCs to discuss close reading strategies for ESSA students to help them gain a greater level of understanding of the concept being taught. Teams will continue to collaborate on effective strategies for close reading and small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

The leadership team will monitor iReady to ensure students are meeting typical growth expectations and working towards the stretch growth goal.

Person Responsible   Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

To ensure our ESE students and parent needs are being addressed, the leadership team with work collaboratively with classroom and ESE teachers to create meaningful activities and resources for parent engagement night.

Person Responsible   Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@ocps.net)

Reading and Math tutoring will be provided for grades 3-5 and will target the lowest 25% and ESE students. Teachers will implement the acceleration model for reading and math.

Person Responsible   Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@ocps.net)

In grades K-2 teachers will implement the new McGraw-Hill curriculum and B.E.S.T standards. In grades 1-5 teachers will implement the Cambridge Global Perspectives program. By focusing on the new curriculum, B.E.S.T standards, and the Cambridge program our ESE and lowest 25% students will have the opportunity to engage in new meaningful lessons that are aligned to the standards that promote academic discourse as well as builds collaboration in the classroom.

Person Responsible   Arlene Rosa (arlene.rosa@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.

When comparing our discipline data to the data across the state we found Columbia scored at a moderate level and was ranked #712 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. There were 0.5 incidents (weapons possession & threat or intimidation) and 0.0 suspensions documented compared to the state data which was 1.0 incidents and 3.9 suspensions. Overall, Columbia's data shows we have very low incidents and zero suspensions compared to elementary schools statewide. We will maintain how we establish our current culture and climate and reevaluate if needed. Our guidance counselor will continue to work with students one-one-one and in small groups.

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.

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.

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

It truly does take a village to reach all children. Communication is paramount when enlisting and increasing parent and community involvement. Each school year, a Stellar Customer Service (SCS) Plan is developed and/or reviewed with a focus on the registration process. The SCS plan incorporates steps to clarify and correct communication as well as streamlines the steps in the registration process by providing computer access to potential parents.

The PTA and SAC are another strong avenue that build the relationships and offer a bridge of communication to the community. Other ways Columbia ES connects with the parents and community include: Parent/Student Handbook, Skyward, Progress Reports, Report Cards, Conference Night, Announcements on the Marquee, School Messenger phone calls, Extended Day, Open House, Quarterly Newsletter, Facebook, Twitter, and Parent-Teacher Conferences.

We also have a number of Partners in Ed that are involved in the school. Some of the needs they address are providing supplies to the students and staff, volunteering in areas of need, providing incentives for students, and providing a support system by mentoring at risk students.

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				$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1000	140-Substitute Teachers	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		$2,000.00
		Notes: Substitutes for Planning PD and SELL team development				
	1000	500-Materials and Supplies	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		$500.00
		Notes: Material for PD and Staff Development				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$71,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	0000	100-Salaries	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		$67,000.00
		Notes: ESE Teacher Salary				
	0000	520-Textbooks	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		$2,000.00
		Notes: Supplemental Material for ESE and Lowest 25% (subgroups)				
	0000	140-Substitute Teachers	1451 - Columbia Elementary	General Fund		$2,500.00
		Notes: Substitutes for PD and MTSS meetings.				
					Total:	**$74,000.00**