

Orange County Public Schools

# Castle Creek Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Castle Creek Elementary

1245 N AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Monica Johnson**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/17/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students <b>English Language Learners</b> Hispanic Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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
Johnson, Monica	Principal	Principal, Monica Johnson - Oversees all aspects of the school, oversees all aspects of SIP, conducts daily classroom visits, oversees Tier I core instruction, oversees all Tier II and Tier III intervention and progress monitoring plans for all students, and oversees the monthly book study professional development. The Principal attends PLC meetings weekly for all grade levels. The Principal oversees reading in conjunction with the reading coach and oversees all student celebrations and business partnerships. Dr. Johnson is the Coordinator of the Green School Project and STEM activities. Principal Johnson is a voting member of the School Advisory Committee.
Camacho Moody, Maria	Instructional Coach	Math/Science Coach, Dr. Maria Moody - Conducts daily classroom visits in grades K-5 for teacher feedback and support, works with grades K-5 PLCs and lesson planning meetings to implement effective Tier I core instruction, works with teachers in implementing effective Tier II and Tier III interventions for the lowest 25% of students in Math in grades K-5, coordinates with the testing coordinator to monitor that all state and district assessments are completed on time and that data is disseminated to teachers appropriately, as well as analyzes data to redirect students to appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions as new data is available. The Math/Science Coach provides professional development program. She reports weekly to the Principal on the effectiveness of math interventions. The Math Coach oversees i-Ready math data and Science Progress Monitoring data.
Starling, Erica	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, Erica Starling - Conducts daily classroom visits in grades K-5 for teacher feedback and support, works with grades K-5 PLCs and lesson planning meetings to implement effective Tier I core instruction, works with teachers in implementing effective Tier II and Tier III interventions for the lowest 25% of students in ELA in grades K-5, coordinates with the testing coordinator to monitor that all state and district assessments are completed on time and that data is disseminated to teachers appropriately, as well as analyzes data to redirect students to appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions as new data is available. The Reading Coach provides professional development training in strategies for all teachers, including the Castle Creek Ph.D. monthly professional development program and DPLC initiatives. She reports weekly to the Principal on the effectiveness of ELA interventions. The Reading Coach is also the coordinator of ELA tutoring, as well as oversees i-Ready ELA data.
Northway, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Curriculum Resource Teacher, Sarah Northway - Conducts daily classroom visits in all grades for teacher feedback and support, works with the K-5 PLCs to implement effective Tier I core

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>instruction, works with teachers to implement appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions and progress monitoring with in grades K-5 based on student data. Ms. Northway is also the testing coordinator. She monitors that all state and district assessments are completed on time and data is disseminated to teachers appropriately and analyzes data to direct students toward appropriate interventions for improvement. She works with the Reading Coach and Math Coach to provide professional development to teachers in ELA and Math strategies.</p>
<p>Craig, Laura</p>	<p>Teacher, ESE</p>	<p>Exceptional Education Staffing Specialist, Laura Craig - Works with all teachers, the ESOL Compliance Coordinator, and the CRT to help determine appropriate placement for students. She works with the district School Psychologist to coordinate testing for ESE placement, creates learning plans through IEP's and 504 plans to meet specific student needs based on student testing, conducts parent meetings to ensure compliance with all laws governing ESE and 504 students, and provides support for teachers to ensure that students are given the appropriate accommodations to help student achievement. She is the reading support teacher and visits classrooms weekly to give teacher feedback on effective strategies. Also has daily scheduled classroom visits to help students learn strategies to help them master standards.</p>
<p>Phelps, Christy</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Assistant Principal, Christy Phelps - Conducts daily classroom visits for teacher feedback, works with the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Math Coach and Reading Coach on curriculum and best practices for grades K-1 and best practices for grades K-5. She is also responsible for working with Special Area teachers, ESE and ESOL students, works with the K, 1, and 4 PLCs to implement effective Tier I core instruction, works with the MTSS Coach to implement Tier II and Tier III interventions and progress monitoring of student data, creates all academic schedules for students with the registrar, is the leader of the Behavioral Leadership Team and attends all SAC meetings as a non-voting member.</p>
<p>Rosado, Alicia</p>	<p>Teacher, K-12</p>	<p>CCT Resource teacher for ELL students/Intervention Leader, Alicia Rosado- Works with the Reading Coach, Curriculum Specialist and ESE Compliance leaders to determine appropriate placement for LEP students, coordinates testing and creates LEP plans to meet the needs of second language students, provides teacher support to ensure that students are given the necessary learning tools to support student achievement, and analyzes testing data to determine appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions. She oversees the school-wide iStation Reading program. She is an instructional coach and visits classrooms weekly to give teacher feedback on effective strategies.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Manzano, Karen	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Mental Health Contact, Title IX Contact, Karen Manzano- Oversees the positive behavioral plan, works with teachers and the Behavioral Leadership Team to create behavior plans for students with discipline issues, aids families in need of food and school supplies, works with students who need guidance with grades, assists students who feel that they are being bullied, or who are potentially bullying others and oversees character education for all students. She serves as a member of the BLT, Student Attendance Team and Child Study Team.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Sunday 1/17/2016, Monica Johnson

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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



	<b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	31	92	123	101	117	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	24	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	10	1	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	5	3	8	16	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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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 7/8/2020

**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	

Number of students enrolled	121	115	119	131	136	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	18	19	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	1	0	5	6	28	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	52	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

**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	1	10	33	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**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	121	115	119	131	136	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	18	19	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	0	5	6	28	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	52	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136

**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	10	33	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

**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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	55%	57%	57%	57%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	53%	44%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	61%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	51%	61%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	22%	48%	51%	31%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	61%	56%	53%	60%	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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	5	29	30	14	28	21					
ELL	38	39	31	47	39	15	43				
ASN	95	69		100	62						
BLK	52	51	47	54	43	25	56				
HSP	47	48	39	52	50	21	51				
WHT	65	53	23	66	55		74				
FRL	48	45	43	49	46	25	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	3	19	22	19	30	30					
ELL	32	47	41	41	37	32	29				
ASN	92	94		96	94						
BLK	50	39	25	46	47	36	45				
HSP	53	56	54	56	52	33	52				
WHT	58	56	37	67	53	20	71				
FRL	51	50	44	55	52	29	53				

**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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
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	45
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**

Reading is the lowest performance component based on the 2019-2020 i-Ready MOY data. Third grade had 55% of the students show proficiency on the BOY diagnostic which increased to 66% on the MOY. Fourth grade had 33% of the students show proficiency on the BOY which increased to 48% on the MOY. Fifth grade had 25% of the students show proficiency on the BOY which increased to 39% on the MOY. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were not reteaching standards the students were struggling with and spending too much time with whole group reading instruction instead of small groups.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Reading. In 2018-2019 the school wide proficiency was 36% at the BOY iReady diagnostic assessment and 55% at the MOY diagnostic assessment, with a 19% growth rating. In 2019-2020 the school wide proficiency was 34% at the BOY and 51% at the MOY diagnostic assessment, with a 12% growth rating. The factors that contributed to this decline were due to the teachers not having ample time to reteach and reassess the skills presented.

#### **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**

The data component with the greatest gap in comparison to the state average is our SWD in ELA. With a 50% gap on the 2018 FSA ELA, 5% of Castle Creek's SWD students reached proficiency in ELA. Our other students were 55% proficient in ELA. The contributing factors were having only one ESE resource teacher to serve all grades, poor student motivation due to lack of personal rapport with teachers and students not having mastery of the five basic reading competencies.

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

Math is the data component that showed the most improvement based on the 2019-2020 i-Ready MOY data. Third grade had 15% of the students show proficiency on the BOY diagnostic which increased to 48% on the MOY. Fourth grade had 32% of the students show proficiency on the BOY which increased to 58% on the MOY. Fifth grade

had 32% of the students show proficiency on the BOY which increased to 49% on the MOY. The new actions our school took in this area were having teachers attend the county Impact math training that focused on implementing the small group rotational model. The teacher leaders would then return to campus and train the other teachers on their team.

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

The potential area of concern from the EWS data in Part 1 (D) would be the attendance below 90%. There were 115 students with attendance below 90% school wide.

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

1. Overall Proficiency for Students with Disabilities (ESSA)
2. Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains
3. Proficiency for ELL in ELA (ESSA)
4. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
5. Social Emotional Learning and Leadership

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Description: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.

Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will see an increase in student attendance and a decrease in student discipline referrals.

**Measureable Outcome:**

Our current Early Warning Systems indicator data for attendance below 90% is as follows: 7 students for kindergarten, 27 for first grade, 24 for second grade, 19 for third grade, 19 for fourth grade, and 19 for fifth grade. This is a total of 115 students. Our intended outcome is to decrease the attendance below 90% to less than 10 students on each grade level.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@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.

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Rationale for Strategy Selection: 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 improvement and change.

Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Introduction to the online SEL Canvas Course
2. SEL School Team assembled for first meeting in September
3. SEL Team members to present information to team during small group professional development sessions
4. Staff will understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies throughout ongoing professional development sessions

**Person Responsible** Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Description: Increase ELA Learning Gains in K-5  
 Rationale: Castle Creek has increased learning gains in all grade levels based on the 2019-2020 iReady scores. iReady ELA diagnostics demonstrate an increase in proficiency from 34% to 51% school wide. Castle Creek will continue to focus on ELA to continue closing achievement gaps and increase learning gains.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our current ELA learning gains based on the 2019-2020 iReady between BOY and MOY are: 37% for kindergarten, 17% for first grade, 15% for second grade, 11% for third grade, 15% for fourth grade, and 14% for fifth grade. Our intended outcome is to increase the ELA learning gains to 70% on each grade level.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** All students will be grouped using the BOY iReady diagnostic results. Teachers will meet with small groups daily during their reading block to focus on differentiated instruction. Teachers will meet weekly during PLC meetings to discuss the data (formative assessments, common assessment, iReady) on the students from that week. Teachers will then plan to reteach the skills not mastered from that common assessment and reassess the standard.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will have multiple exposures to the standards before being assessed. If the standard is not mastered, they will have additional small group or individual time with the grade level tutor, leadership team member assigned to the grade level, extra small group with the teacher, and/or invited to after-school tutoring for skills or Saturday School two times per month to front load the next standard for skill and vocabulary practice.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Virtual and in person PLC data meetings for individual students
2. Leadership team assigned to specific grade levels to support small groups
3. Monitor students weekly using iReady data from assigned path lessons
4. Teacher will continually regroup students based on data and reteach skills not passed
5. Teacher will address the essential standards weekly through small group instruction
6. Leadership team will visit both virtual and face to face rooms to observe and provide feedback and support

**Person Responsible** Christy Phelps (christy.phelps@ocps.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Description: Increase Math Learning Gains in K - 5  Rationale: Castle Creek has increased learning gains in all grade levels based on the 2019-2020 iReady. iReady Math diagnostics demonstrate an increase in proficiency from 24% to 48% school wide. Castle Creek will continue to focus on Math to continue closing achievement gaps and increase learning gains.
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	Our current Math learning gains on iReady between BOY and MOY are: 26% for kindergarten, 26% for first grade, 17% for second grade, 33% for third grade, 26% for fourth grade, and 17% for fifth grade. Our intended outcome is to increase the ELA learning gains to 70% on each grade level.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Monica Johnson (monica.johnson@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	All students will be grouped using the 2019-2020 BOY iReady diagnostic results. Teachers will meet with small groups daily during their reading block to focus on differentiated instruction. Teachers will meet weekly during PLC meetings to discuss the data (formative assessments, common assessment, iReady) on the students from that week. Teachers will then plan to reteach the skills not mastered from that common assessment and reassess the standard.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students will have multiple exposures to the standards before being assessed. If the standard is not mastered they will have additional small group or individual time with the grade level tutor, leadership team member assigned to the grade level, extra small group with the teacher, and/or invited to after-school tutoring for skills or Saturday School two times per month to front load the next standard for skill and vocabulary practice.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Virtual and in person PLC data meetings for individual students.
2. Leadership team assigned to specific grade levels to support small groups.
3. Monitor students weekly using iReady data from assigned path lessons
4. Teacher will continually regroup students based on data and reteach skills not passed
5. Teacher will address the essential standards weekly through small group instruction
6. Leadership team will visit both virtual and face to face rooms to observe and provide feedback and support

**Person Responsible** Maria Camacho Moody (maria.camachomoody@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**In order to improve attendance rates, Castle Creek's leadership team will cultivate a school wide culture of attendance through the existing house system. The team will stress the importance of going to class daily, engaging staff members in consistently sending positive messages that attendance matters, and by implementing positive points on Class Dojo in houses for attendance.**

## 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, 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. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons 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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>	<b>\$5,000.00</b>
----------	---------------	---	-------------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	500-Materials and Supplies	1612 - Castle Creek Elementary	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Materials and Supplies for SEL</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$9,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	1612 - Castle Creek Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$9,000.00
			<i>Notes: Staff services for Saturday School and Tutoring for ELA (Virtually and/or in person)</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$9,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	1612 - Castle Creek Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$9,000.00
			<i>Notes: Salaries for Saturday School and Tutoring for Math (virtually and/or in person)</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$23,000.00</b>