

Orange County Public Schools

Keenes Crossing Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Keenes Crossing Elementary

5240 KEENES PHEASANT DR, Windermere, FL 34786

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

Demographics

Principal: Sherry Donaldson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2010

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Donaldson, Sherry	Principal	<p>Sherry Donaldson, Principal, Samuel Davis, Jeffrey Peters, Assistant Principals. The administrators perform classroom walkthroughs during the school year to promote standard-based instruction and alignment to professional development. In order to ensure that the achievement gap is closed administrators will plan with teachers to identify targeted subgroups. Leadership team meetings will be held weekly to review and discuss school data prior to meeting with classroom teachers.</p> <p>Data meetings will be conducted once a month with grade levels to determine instructional needs based on the implementation of tier 1 whole instruction. The data is then broken down to determine tier 2/3 interventions and enrichment. Progress monitoring will be in place to help make academic decisions. Staff development and resources are provided to support classroom teachers.</p> <p>The facilitation of horizontal and vertical subject-based PLCs will be done by the administration. Notes from these meeting will be posted in grade-level google drive for review, next steps, and documentation.</p>
Friedman, Michelle	Other	<p>Responsible for compliance of exceptional education, gifted, 504 and other documentation that complies with state statutes. Meet with parents and other stakeholders to update plans and to monitor the progress of each plan. Inform Teachers and staff of any updates concerning laws or compliance.</p>
Drone, Jennifer	Instructional Media	<p>Responsible for supporting reading activities and incentives for the students. Responsible for targeting resources for supporting teachers and students. Manages textbook inventory.</p>
Davis, Samuel	Assistant Principal	<p>Sherry Donaldson, Principal, Samuel Davis, Jeffrey Peters, Assistant Principals. The administrators perform classroom walkthroughs during the school year to promote standard-based instruction and alignment to professional development. In order to ensure that the achievement gap is closed administrators will plan with teachers to identify targeted subgroups. Leadership team meetings will be held weekly to review and discuss school data prior to meeting with classroom teachers.</p> <p>Data meetings will be conducted once a month with grade levels to determine instructional needs based on the implementation of tier 1 whole instruction. The data is then broken down to determine tier 2/3 interventions and enrichment. Progress monitoring will be in place to help make academic decisions. Staff development and resources are provided to support classroom teachers.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>The facilitation of horizontal and vertical subject-based PLCs will be done by the administration. Notes from these meeting will be posted in grade-level google drive for review, next steps, and documentation.</p>
		<p>Sherry Donaldson, Principal, Samuel Davis, Jeffrey Peters, Assistant Principals. The administrators perform classroom walkthroughs during the school year to promote standard-based instruction and alignment to professional development. In order to ensure that the achievement gap is closed administrators will plan with teachers to identify targeted subgroups. Leadership team meetings will be held weekly to review and discuss school data prior to meeting with classroom teachers.</p>
<p>Peters, Jeffrey</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Data meetings will be conducted once a month with grade levels to determine instructional needs based on the implementation of tier 1 whole instruction. The data is then broken down to determine tier 2/3 interventions and enrichment. Progress monitoring will be in place to help make academic decisions. Staff development and resources are provided to support classroom teachers.</p>
		<p>The facilitation of horizontal and vertical subject-based PLCs will be done by the administration. Notes from these meeting will be posted in grade-level google drive for review, next steps, and documentation.</p>
<p>Perez-Fernandez, Barbara</p>	<p>Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>Responsible for supporting the staff regarding all guidance issues. Support students and teachers to create a safe and supportive learning environment. Responsible for the implementation of small group sessions that work with students who have issues with behavior, social skills, divorce or death. Mental Health Designee.</p>
<p>Jagarnath, Mohamed</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Ensures and manages all testing from the state, district, and school levels. Supports teachers in managing data using a school-wide monitoring system. Supports 3rd-5th grade with science instruction and support. Additionally, responsible for STEM throughout the school by supporting teachers and students during instructional time. Rocio Cstiblanco - Compliance Specialist</p>
		<p>Supports ELL students through class visits and monitoring instructional practices. Maintains updated plans to ensure adequate support in the classroom, including paraprofessional support.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Instructional Coach	Rebecca Young Instructional Coach - Responsible for data monitoring and student/teacher support. Provides instructional coaching through coaching and mentoring following class visits. Additionally, she will provide support for new teachers in all areas of instruction and classroom procedures. She will provide professional development as necessary for the instructional needs as a school. Partners with all stakeholders such as parents, teachers, students, etc. to ensure student success.

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	125	178	177	184	201	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1059
Attendance below 90 percent	34	24	22	20	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	40	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
	0	1	1	7	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	7	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

67

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

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
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	14	16	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	0	0	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	14	16	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	0	0	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	80%	57%	57%	80%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	58%	68%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	53%	47%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	80%	63%	63%	84%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	69%	61%	62%	75%	57%	59%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	51%	67%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	75%	56%	53%	74%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	125 (0)	178 (0)	177 (0)	184 (0)	201 (0)	194 (0)	1059 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	34 (22)	24 (21)	22 (14)	20 (16)	24 (17)	23 (28)	147 (118)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (1)	3 (0)	2 (0)	9 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (11)	3 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	1 (0)	8 (15)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	41 (30)	40 (29)	44 (29)	125 (88)
	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	12 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	55%	24%	58%	21%
	2018	79%	55%	24%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	57%	19%	58%	18%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
	2018	77%	55%	22%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
	2018	84%	61%	23%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	63%	17%	64%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	53%	18%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	45	50	55	48	45	55	43				
ELL	60	70	75	62	67	52	60				
ASN	91	79		93	85		79				
BLK	85	64		90	68		73				
HSP	70	64	57	71	63	49	69				
WHT	83	68	62	81	70	48	76				
FRL	68	56	55	66	62	50	62				

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	42	36	17	48	56	61	23				
ELL	67	75	68	76	76	75					
ASN	87	73		96	77		86				
BLK	79	64		85	82		42				
HSP	74	72	63	78	72	70	70				
WHT	82	67	37	85	75	63	76				
FRL	71	65	54	73	71	67	57				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	76
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	65
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	
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	71
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	63
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

Based on 2019 Math FSA data, Tier I students, including our enrichment and gifted, made adequate growth or excelled. However, the lowest 25% of students dropped by 14% as compared to 2018 Math data indicating a downward trend in this area. The school had a significant increase in second language learners that were here less than three years. A contributing factor may have been a lack of adjusting instruction during grade-level planning and not following the interventions with fidelity as suggested by the CCT.

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

Based on the data from 2017-2018, overall we saw the greatest decline in the math gains for the 2018-2019 school year. A contributing factor may have been a lack of adjusting instruction during grade level planning and not following the interventions with fidelity as suggested by the CCT.

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

Keene's Crossing Elementary outperformed the state average in all areas. However, there was only a 5% difference between Keene's Crossing Elementary scores and the state scores in the area of learning gains for the lowest 25% in math.

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

Our ELA Lowest 25% increased by 15 points. Grade level teams used various resources to help intervene in key areas of reading with the lowest 25%. Students in this category were given additional opportunities in instruction such as tutoring, chess club, and STEM camp. The administration conducted data meetings to monitor student progress.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Looking at EWS the biggest concern as a school is to monitor the attendance of our primary students. The Registrar, Attendance Clerk, and Admin will work with the assigned social worker to monitor absenteeism and provide intervention when appropriate.

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

1. SWD
2. DPLC writing in response to complex text
3. Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%
4. FRL
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Writing
Rationale	Increasing writing proficiency for every student is important to the overall growth in not only FSA writes but overall growth.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of implementing writing goals across all grade levels, Kennes's Crossing should see a 10% increase in writing score component.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Explicitly teach students strategies for planning, writing, editing, and revising. In addition, teachers will also Explicitly teach students procedures for summarizing what they read. Developmentally appropriate expectations and examples for how students chunk and/or annotate text are displayed in the physical or dig (e.g. anchor charts, posters, student work samples), and/or students have individual copies to reference in their notebooks or devices. All students have access to complex text, physical or digital, at or above grade level.</p> <p>The implementation of the strategies listed above will help students generate and organize ideas. This will decrease the overuse of text and proper technique of revising.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Conduct Bi-Weekly data meetings with teachers 2 - Observation of instruction (Tier 1, 2, 3) 3 - Review lesson plans 4 - Walk-throughs to ensure that teachers are differentiating their instruction to meet the needs of students. 5 - Analyze student progress monitoring data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide an overview of common planning process 2. Professional development to new teachers (overview of year one) 3. Professional development to returning teachers (review year one) 4. Teachers will choose culturally diverse texts and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards-aligned lessons and units
Person Responsible	Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@ocps.net)

#2

Title Narrow the achievement Gap (SWD)
 Based on 2019 FSA data, only 49% of our students with disabilities (SWD) scored on grade level in ELA and only 47% scored on grade level in math. While this met the ESSA requirement for the state focus on this subgroup will help increase proficiency and learning gains. By monitoring SWD using progress monitoring and data meetings.

Rationale

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

As a result of using evidence-based strategies for SWDs proficiency and learning gains should increase by 5% in this subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Samuel Davis (samuel.davis2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

ESE resource teachers will instruct in small, interactive groups and tailor the instruction to meet individual needs while using on-going assessments to help guide instruction. To activate prior knowledge teachers will provide opportunities for students to preview the lesson to help identify basic relationships between prior and upcoming content. Teachers (ESE & Gen Ed) will use visuals such as anchor charts that let students know where they are going in a unit or lesson and orient them to the tasks ahead. Presentation of content will occur in multiple ways. Once instruction and other supports are designed and implemented, special education teachers have the skills to manage and engage in ongoing data collection using curriculum-based measures, informal classroom assessments, observations of student academic performance and behavior, self-assessment of classroom instruction. The implementation of the strategies listed above will help students understand the benefits of background knowledge and encourage the process of tracking their own learning and progress to increase retention of the curriculum.

The implementation of the strategies listed above will help students understand the benefits of background knowledge and encourage the process of tracking their own learning and progress to increase retention of the curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

- 1 - Conduct Bi-Weekly data meetings with teachers
- 2 - Observation of small group instruction
- 3 - Review Individual Education Plans (IEP)
- 4 - Walk-throughs to ensure that teachers are differentiating their instruction to meet the needs of students.
- 5 - Analyze student progress monitoring data.
6. Developmentally appropriate expectations and examples for how students chunk and/or annotate text are displayed in the physical or dig (e.g. anchor charts, posters, student work samples), and all students have access to complex text, physical or digital at or above grade level.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Identify target skill/concepts2. Teach in multiple ways3. Provide feedback to students based on evaluations and assessments4. The use of relevant professional development for both ESE and Gen Ed teachers5. Address best practices for inclusive education by analyzing data to identify barriers that will close the achievement gap6. Specials Education teachers develop instructional goals and make adjustments to student's instructional programs.
Person Responsible	Samuel Davis (samuel.davis2@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

The school leadership team will continue to monitor students on Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL) by ensuring equal access to all events and programs offered at the school. FRL students will be provided with resources as needed. The School Emergency Response Team (SERT) will conduct monthly active assailant drill and debrief with the school resource officer (SRO) to make improvements and adjustments as needed. Math and Science will continue to be a focus for the school. Instructional Leadership will continue to monitor student progress and provide teachers with resources and professional development based on data.