

Orange County Public Schools

Cheney Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Cheney Elementary

2000 N FORSYTH RD, Orlando, FL 32807

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

Demographics

Principal: Robin Broner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2018

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	
* 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
Broner, Robin	Principal	Principal, Robin Broner: The principal leads the school and ensures all faculty and staff are working towards the school's mission and vision. She conducts all formal observations to make sure all instructional employees are implementing the Marzano Instructional Framework. She utilizes data-based decision-making to ensure the students are provided a meaningful education. The principal is responsible for ensuring students are provided standards-based and differentiated instruction, as well as intervention services. She facilitates data meetings and school leadership team meetings to discuss student academic progress. The principal regularly communicates with stakeholders regarding the school and students' academic progress.
Martinez, Margie	Other	ESOL Compliance Specialist, Margie Martinez: As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Martinez coordinates assessments for English Language Learners, oversees placements and supports in the general education classroom. She is responsible for monitoring and tracking ELL student performance in order to identify trends in instruction. She provides professional development trainings in accountable areas.
Munoz, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Heidi Munoz: The instructional coach ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. She facilitates weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coach assists with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at risk." In addition, she assists in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. She routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. The instructional coach models lessons and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction. The coach is also an integral part of developing common assessments.
Malanga, Connie	Other	Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Connie Malanga: The resource teacher is responsible for timely inventory and delivery of instructional resources to teachers. The CRT schedules, organizes, and maintains the testing calendar to ensure assessments are completed. She is the designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state assessments. She is responsible for collecting and analyzing data as well as generating data reports bimonthly to identify trends in instruction. The CRT schedules all professional development

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>trainings, supports classroom instruction, and conducts peer feedback.</p>
<p>Quinones, Tania</p>	<p>Teacher, ESE</p>	<p>Staffing Specialist, Tania Quinones: Mrs. Quinones serves as the school liaison for ESE. She identifies specific students for ESE testing. She determines students that may need a behavior/ discipline plan, identifies student for 504 plans, identifies students for re-evaluation. She facilitates IEP team meetings with parents and teachers. In addition, she facilitates child study team meetings. Mrs. Quinones also monitors and disaggregates ESE students reading/math data and maintains data and works closely with the school psychologist and school social worker.</p>
<p>Marquez, Oriana</p>	<p>Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>School Counselor- Ms. Marquez serves as the schools mental health liaison. She provides social/emotional support to students. She facilitates social skills groups and individual counseling to students. Mrs. Marquez also facilitates character education lessons. She works closely with community resources and the CHILL counselor.</p>
<p>Silpe, Shane</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Shane Silpe - (Assistant Principal) has a variety of roles. The Assistant Principal provides teachers with observations and feedback to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. He is in charge of discipline, facilities and emergency drills at our school and helps create a safe environment for all students. The AP provides support to students, staff, and parents. This role is monitored through discussions during the leadership team meetings and sharing at PLC meetings.</p>
<p>Wallace, Audrey</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Math/Science Coach- Audrey Wallace: Mrs. Wallace oversees the math and curriculum implementation. She attends math and science common planning meetings and completes the coaching cycle. She analyzes data and provides support for students during their math intervention time. Additionally, she leads staff development that pertains to the pedagogy of teachers for math and science content.</p>
<p>McCarthy, Lisa</p>	<p>Instructional Media</p>	<p>Media Specialist- Lisa McCarthy: Mrs. McCarthy creates a school-wide love for reading by developing and administering an integrated school library media program. She instruct students and staff in effective use of the media center, information and technology literacy skills, and use of equipment. She teaches literacy skills that are aligned with the standards. She provides leadership and guidance to teachers and students for effective reading strategies Develop knowledge of curriculum in all subject</p>

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

areas. Instruct teachers, administrators, and other staff in the use of new information technologies. Recommend and procure resources for staff for use in meeting their instructional objectives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/20/2018, Robin Broner

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Elementary School PK-5</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p>2018-19 Title I School</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)</p>	<p>Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: B (59%)</p>

	2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	
* 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	30	69	87	82	92	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	14	8	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

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	94	74	78	94	83	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	521
Attendance below 90 percent	23	6	4	5	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	5	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	12	9	9	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	2	9	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	6	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	94	74	78	94	83	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	521
Attendance below 90 percent	23	6	4	5	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	5	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	12	9	9	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 2 9 6 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 32

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 6 8 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 24

Students retained two or more times 0 1 2 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5

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	53%	57%	57%	63%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	59%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	69%	63%	63%	72%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	77%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	48%	51%	64%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	55%	56%	53%	67%	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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	53%	-4%
	2018	61%	53%	8%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	26	32	33	48	55	42	13				
ELL	43	51	58	64	61	44	45				
BLK	60	80		83	79						
HSP	50	57	66	65	59	48	51				
WHT	47	47		71	58						
FRL	52	60	63	64	57	51	56				

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	30	37	36	22	37	30					
ELL	46	54	57	62	72	68	27				
BLK	81	60		75	71						
HSP	57	54	59	72	79	66	66				
WHT	70	64		65	68		65				
FRL	64	57	61	72	80	71	69				

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	61
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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 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	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	58
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	56
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	59
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 data trends from 2019-20, fourth grade only increased 8 percentage points in ELA based on the i-Ready assessment from the beginning of the year to the middle of the year. Also, fifth grade only increased by 9 percentage points in math based on the i-Ready assessment from the beginning of the year to the middle of the year. Additionally, the lowest 25% in Math performed at 62% for the 2018-19 school year compared to 77% for the 2017-18 school year (17 percentage points).

There was a lack of implementation and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement mathematical practices to include standards-based instruction, real-world applications, fluency and abstract thinking tasks with fidelity.

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

According to the 2019-20 progress monitoring science data we decreased by 7 percentage points (57% to 50%). In addition, our data according to the science Our overall math learning gains showed the greatest decline during the 2018-19 school year. We decreased by 17 percentage points (77% to 62%). There was a lack of implementation of best practices for instructional accommodations; to include standards-based instruction, vocabulary, and abstract thinking tasks. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement a plan for remediation or enrichment and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan.

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

According to the 2019-20 mid-year I-ready data, math achievement showed the greatest gap compared to the state average (63% to 47%), a 16 percentage point decrease. here was a lack of implementation of best practices for instructional accommodations; to include standards-based instruction, vocabulary, and abstract thinking tasks. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement a plan for remediation or enrichment and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan.

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

Based on i-Ready 2019-20 data trends, there was an overall increase from 33% to 50% in ELA (17 percentage points) and an increase from 28% to 47% in math (19 percentage points). Additionally during the 2018-19 school year, ELA lowest 25% showed the most improvement. We increased by 8 percentage points (59% to 67%) with our lowest quartile of students in reading.

A strategic action plan was implemented to increase student achievement in English Language Arts. The action plan encompassed standards-aligned tasks and assessments, and coaching support. Students in the lowest quartile were targeted for intervention and extra instruction in reading. Student data was monitored bi-monthly to identify trends and progress. Instruction and action steps were adjusted using data gathered from

multiple tools such as iReady reading, Core Phonics, standards-aligned tests, and iObservation. In addition, a re-assessment and re-teach plan was implemented during math instruction.

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

Based on data trends in EWS, our areas of concern is level 1 on the 2019 statewide assessment in ELA and Math for 4th and 5th grade levels.

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

1. ELA overall proficiency
2. Math overall learning gains
3. Math lowest 25% learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019, FSA math data indicated that there were significant declines in learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest quartile. Additionally, based on data trends from 2019-20, fourth grade only increased 8 percentage points in ELA based on the i-Ready assessment from the beginning of the year to the middle of the year. Also, fifth grade only increased by 9 percentage points in math based on the i-Ready assessment from the beginning of the year to the middle of the year.

These results demonstrate an urgent need to adjust instructional practices and to implement structured progress monitoring throughout the school. Teachers will effectively integrate mathematical practices to include standards-based instruction, real-world applications, fluency and abstract thinking tasks.

Measureable Outcome: Students will demonstrate mastery of math standards resulting in an increase of math overall learning gains to 67 percentage points and the lowest 25% learning gains will increase to 65 percentage points on the 2020-21 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Frontload academic vocabulary
2. Utilize Backward Design Model when planning for math instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using the Backward Design Model, teachers will intentionally plan for standards-based instructions. They will also purposefully embed vocabulary throughout instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step 1- Implement math small group interventions that include a strategic remediation and reassessment plan for all targeted math standards.

Person Responsible Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Action Step 2- Facilitate weekly common planning with an intense focus on targeted standards-based instruction through the use of collaborative structures and metacognitive strategies.

Person Responsible Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Action Step 3- Implement structured data meetings to track and monitor student progress in math. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support.

Person Responsible Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Action Step 4- The Math/Science Coach will support teachers with deconstructing standards, planning standards-aligned questions and tasks, and modeling effective instructional strategies in math.

Person Responsible Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Action Step 5- Students will have opportunities to apply real-world math concepts through rigorous lessons, web simulations, and hands-on math activities. A before and after school math acceleration will be offered.

Curriculum will focus on pre-teaching upcoming math standards, vocabulary, and process skills.

Person Responsible Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on data, achievement levels decreased in reading during the 2018-19 school year. Reading decreased by 10% (63% to 53%). In addition, assessment results show a twelve percent decrease in science compared to the 2017-18 school year. However, according to 2019-20 data, there is a slow steady increase based on i-Ready diagnostic data from the beginning to the middle of the year. Teachers will use standards-based instruction across content areas including the use of complex text and standards-aligned tasks to help students make real-world connections.

Measureable Outcome: Students will demonstrate mastery of ELA standards resulting in an increase of 10% overall proficiency (63%). In addition, ELA overall learning gains will increase by 5 percentage points (64%) and the lowest 25% learning gains will increase by 5 percentage point (72%).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Build background knowledge
2. Frontload academic vocabulary
3. Implement the core skills to utilize academic discourse to answer text-dependent questions: elaborate and clarify, support Ideas with examples, build on and/or challenge a partner’s idea, paraphrase, and synthesize conversation points.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students’ analysis of reasoning deepens their understanding of content knowledge and enhances long term retention, decision making, critical thinking and problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step 1- Facilitate ongoing professional development focused on the implementation of effective instructional strategies, standards-based instruction, close reading strategies, and text-dependent questioning.

Person Responsible Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 2- Vocabulary strategies to support all students will be intentionally planned for during common planning. Strategies will include the use of visual representation, oral language, and scaffolds.

Person Responsible Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 3- Implement structured bi-weekly data meetings to track and monitor student progress. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standards and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support subgroups and our ESSA priority.

Person Responsible Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Action Step 4- Maintain and monitor the effectiveness of a structured process to be used for interventions, which includes a tracking system to collect consistent data to meet the identified needs of students, aligned to our subgroups and our ESSA priority (students with disabilities).

Person Responsible Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. The academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. In addition, the adults will be able to make connections and build their confidence as it relates to social and emotional learning and awareness.

Measureable Outcome: There will be a 10% increase in parents, students, and teachers completing the Cognia survey data. Also anticipated impact of a culture and climate will increase overall student achievement by 5% in all content areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will plan and implement ongoing professional development to improve practices that support social and emotional learning. We will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action based on data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to build and create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students school-wide, it is critical to foster the development of the competencies that relate to the CASEL approach. Through a distributive leadership model, we will enhance opportunities to strengthen team dynamics and improve student success.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will implement the Sanford Harmony curriculum school-wide.

Person Responsible Oriana Marquez (oriana.marquez@ocps.net)

Facilitate ongoing professional development focused on the implementation of effective SEL strategies.

Person Responsible Oriana Marquez (oriana.marquez@ocps.net)

Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students.

Person Responsible Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

A team comprised of the principal, instructional coaches, the ESE teacher, select classroom teachers, and the guidance counselor convened to complete the Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) Assessment to evaluate our current practices. The school leadership team will create and implement a professional development plan that will focus on best instructional strategies, data analysis, common planning and the backward design model. With application and practice of these strategies, we will be able to identify strengths and weaknesses that are relevant to increasing student achievement in all content areas.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Cheney Elementary will 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, we will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through professional develop, we will utilize a common language that encompasses the CASEL Core Competencies to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect interpersonal and intrapersonal skills to support student success. Our core team will work with the school site team to implement professional learning for school stakeholders.

In addition, our school will implement the Sanford Harmony curriculum for K-5 grade levels. This curriculum will focus on social and emotional learning and provide lessons on diversity and inclusion, empathy and critical thinking, communication, problem solving, and peer relationships.

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: Math	\$10,000.00
----------	---------------	---	--------------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	500-Materials and Supplies	0711 - Cheney Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Acaletics Instructional Materials</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$26,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	160-Other Support Personnel	0711 - Cheney Elementary	General Fund		\$26,000.00
			<i>Notes: Exceptional Education Paraprofessional</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$36,000.00