

Orange County Public Schools

Meadow Woods Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Meadow Woods Elementary

500 RHODE ISLAND WOODS CIR, Orlando, FL 32824

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

Demographics

Principal: Aleli Santiago V

Start Date for this Principal: 1/24/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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.

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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vazquez Santiago, Aleli	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.
Bransford, Judy	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.
Rivera, Johnny	Guidance 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.
Freiberger, Randolyn Brooke	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach will maintain a knowledge of curriculum and instruction to develop staff and build capacity. They will manage, monitor and ensure fidelity of the MTSS system throughout the school. The Instructional Coach will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful in all academic areas. The Instructional Coach will be a resource for all teachers on a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of all student learners.
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.
VidalLlado, Michelle	Other	The Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) will provide materials and knowledge of content to assure equity among all students

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

and classrooms. They will support the instructional coach in monitoring the teacher and student use of curriculum and access to culturally responsive texts.

Newkirk, ReGina	Instructional Coach	The Math and Science Coach will assist in data collection used for MTSS student eligibility. They will monitor implementation of mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) and coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts in mathematics. They will provide instructional guidance during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to ensure planning is rigorous and targeted to each tier of students.
-----------------	---------------------	---

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/24/2017, Aleli Santiago V

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.*

1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/15/2020

Prior Year - 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	125	127	114	137	113	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	23	21	18	20	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	1	4	1	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	3	15	2	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
-------------------------------	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	61	38	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

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	2	8	1	15	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Prior Year - 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	125	127	114	137	113	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	23	21	18	20	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	15	2	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	61	38	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	2	8	1	15	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	7
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	57%	-9%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	63%	-7%	64%	-8%
	2018	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	53
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Math lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest at 45% followed by ELA Achievement and Science Achievement both of which were 47%. Even though the school showed growth from 28% in 2018 to 45% in 2019, academic vocabulary for mathematics will be a focus area in the 2019-2020 school year. ELA Achievement was the component in which a decline occurred from the previous year. Third Grade English Language Arts (ELA) scored the lowest for the 2018-2019 school year with 40% of students proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). The leadership team analyzed assessments administered by primary grade levels, as well as the scoring calibration. Through this analysis, the team found that assessments administered were not consistently aligned to the depth of knowledge and rigor required by the standard. Additionally, teachers were not consistently scoring the assessments with the same scale as others. This Tier 1 discrepancy in the primary grades contributed to a Tier II and Tier III overage in the intermediate grades, especially third. Additional evidence to support this can be found in the substantial increase in the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the 3rd Grade FSA Reading, while all other performance levels remained the same.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

ELA Achievement was the only component which showed a decline of two percentage points from the previous year. The ELA Achievement in 2018 was 49% whereas in 2019 the percent was 47. For subgroups, fifth grade Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 9% decrease. After analyzing the different domains tested on the FSA, the leadership team found that areas requiring academic vocabulary in Math showed significant decline in when compared to other testing grades. An intense focus on geometric and measurement vocabulary was the identified deficit in 5th grade performance on the Math FSA.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Both ELA Achievement and Math Achievement were 10 percentage points below that of the state. Third grade reading proficiency has the largest gap when compared to the state, at 18 points below state proficiency average. Our analysis determined that this gap was caused by a historical lack of alignment to the standards in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade, as well as a lack of foundational literacy skill mastery. Our Tier I

Orange - 1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary - 2019-20 SIP

Last Modified: 7/7/2020 <https://www.floridacims.org> Page 15 of 21

instructional accountability focus, as well as our intervention monitoring, have been revised in order to address and remediate this gap.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was Learning Gains in Math for our Lowest 25% of students. This year we supported students with more small group instruction to help close achievement gaps. Small group instruction started off below the level of the required for standard mastery due to the need for remediation of foundational skills. Eventually we ended with each standard at the required level for mastery. Small group instruction was provided in the classroom daily with utilization of math centers and also through pull out twice weekly of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance improved from 2018 to 2019 school year but is still an area for growth. As part of our Title I Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) position, the PEL will meet with each parent who demonstrates low attendance in the first quarter to intervene and provide support early in the school year. The PEL will provide updates to the leadership team and MTSS coordinator to review student data and monitor improvements in this early warning indicator.

Will update once EWS data is provided from Accountability

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. We must continue to improve Tier I instruction in order to continue to close the Tier II or III gap.
2. We will monitor instruction and task alignment to ensure equity for all students.
3. We will provide differentiated professional development to teachers in foundational literacy skills for all content, writing, math and intervention systems.
4. We will closely monitor our lowest 25% to continue to increase learning gains in Math and ELA.
5. Teachers will implement UDL strategies with fidelity to ensure ESE students have access to all content.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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.

Measurable Outcome: The achievement gap between all subgroups will remain closed and the exceptional students education students will achieve the same proficiency as their other subgroup peers. Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 52% and math proficiency will increase from 53% to 58%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: General education teachers will collaborate with Tier III teachers, 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 leadership team will maintain an intense focus on Tier I instruction and the tiered systems of support provided to all students with a focus on exceptional education students. (August 10, 2020, weekly - Vazquez)

Person Responsible Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)

2. Administration will structure Professional Developments (PDs) to provide teachers with education on differentiation effect size and research based tools. (August 10,2020 monthly - Vazquez)

Person Responsible Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)

3. All students will use culturally relevant content to increase student proficiency in all subject areas. (August 10, 2020, weekly - Bransford)

Person Responsible Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)

4. Teachers will provide targeted instruction for intervention and enrichment. (August 10, 2020 , weekly - Freiburger)

Person Responsible Randolyn Brooke Freiberger (randolyn.freiberger@ocps.net)

5. Teachers will analyze summative and formative data in all academic areas to adjust differentiation to student needs. (August 30, 2020, monthly Bransford)

Person Responsible Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@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: reduce number of students suspended from school, increase attendance percentage, increase time engaged with standards based instruction, increase student participation in rigorous academic conversation.

Measureable Outcome:

The number of students with one early warning indicator will be reduced by 20% and the students with two or more early warning indicators will be reduced by 10% 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@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 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. (August 10, 2020, weekly - Vazquez)

Person Responsible

Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning. (August 10, 2020, monthly - Vazquez)

Person Responsible

Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. (August 10, 2020, monthly- Bransford)

Person Responsible

Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The leadership team has added four team members to increase the capacity and ability to support the growing population of students and stakeholders. The team has also created an intense focus on vocabulary and vertical alignment to ensure students access prior knowledge during instruction that allows them to close the gap of in person instruction.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Sustain a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with all stakeholders and students.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$25,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary			\$25,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for teachers to attend additional training</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	General Fund		\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: Registration for teachers to participate in SEL and Trauma Informed conferences. Speaker fees for authors to provide training</i>			
Total:						\$40,000.00