

Orange County Public Schools

Apopka Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	23
Budget to Support Goals	25

Apopka Elementary

311 VICK RD, Apopka, FL 32712

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

Demographics

Principal: Patricia Ramsey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

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)	92%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	23
Budget to Support Goals	25

Apopka Elementary

311 VICK RD, Apopka, FL 32712

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

Yes

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

92%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

79%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2018-19
B

2017-18
B

2016-17
B

2015-16
C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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
Pinder, Latricia	Principal	School Leader
Montgomery, James	Assistant Principal	
Cedano, Sujeidy	Guidance Counselor	
Washington , Monica	Instructional Coach	Math/Science Coach
Aho, Pamela	Instructional Media	Accelerated Reader implementation for the school
Elmore, Adasha	Instructional Coach	MTSS coach
Franklin, Chaquisha	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach for ELA instruction
Gary, Constance	Instructional Coach	CCT ESOL Compliance

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	0	113	146	143	132	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	16	13	10	15	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	6	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	10	6	14	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	31	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	4	2	14	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times		0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

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	17	11	16	15	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	4	9	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	5	2	3	8	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	17	11	16	15	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	4	9	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	5	2	3	8	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	59%	57%	57%	54%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	58%	58%	60%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	53%	46%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	63%	63%	67%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	61%	62%	73%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	67%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	56%	53%	48%	50%	51%

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	0 (0)	113 (0)	146 (0)	143 (0)	132 (0)	148 (0)	682 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	16 (17)	13 (11)	10 (16)	15 (15)	13 (9)	8 (17)	75 (85)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	5 (1)	4 (1)	6 (0)	8 (4)	6 (7)	29 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (8)	10 (4)	6 (9)	14 (2)	8 (12)	18 (8)	61 (43)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	31 (33)	31 (36)	42 (27)	104 (96)

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	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	63%	2%	64%	1%
	2018	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	39	37	43	42	31	33				
ELL	48	55	48	58	62	57	44				
BLK	60	60	42	55	68	46	61				
HSP	52	53	51	63	58	42	52				
MUL	64			64							
WHT	67	68		80	71		71				
FRL	52	58	53	56	60	46	54				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	22	17	38	26	15	10				
ELL	39	57	59	59	43	29	22				
ASN	70			90							
BLK	57	54	47	61	52	36	55				
HSP	53	59	52	63	50	30	50				
MUL	58			83							
WHT	68	62		76	54		88				
FRL	52	55	49	62	50	35	50				
2017 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	17	19	25	28	38	33					
ELL	21	42	37	59	67	65	17				
BLK	52	60	50	55	76	65	35				
HSP	45	60	47	69	71	69	40				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	69	53	30	75	75		69				
FRL	46	56	46	61	71	66	39				

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	58
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	54
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	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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.

The lowest data component of Florida Standards Assessment for the 2018-2019 school year was the lowest 25% of students making math learning gains. The amount of lowest 25% of students who were able to achieve math learning gains was 46%. The data component was an increase of 12 percentage points from the 2017-2018 school year which 34% of the lowest 25% of students made math learning gains. When compared to the 2016-2017 school year, 67% of students of the lowest 25% of students achieved math learning gains. An apparent trend of this data component is the inability to sustain a minimum of 50% of the lowest 25% of students for achieving math learning gains. The factors that contributed to this data component showing the lowest performance include limited targeted intervention support for students. Currently, students receive core instruction of the math standards and reteaching of the daily targets of lessons within small group instruction. However, students are limited in receiving intervention support that focus on remedial instruction of math concepts and performing math operations. A greater emphasis is needed to provide opportunities for students to receive intervention instruction that focus on students' academic deficits.

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 school year was science proficiency. The data component of students achieving science proficiency decreased by 3% from the 2017-2018 school year. In addition, students achieving math

proficiency decreased by 2%. The factors that contributed to this decline were limited intervention support for targeted group of students who were not performing at mastery level on PMA (progress monitoring assessments). The amount of 4 students not achieving proficiency level on FSA science assessments contributed to a decline of 3% of the amount of students not achieving proficiency level on FSA science assessment. A focus of implementing reteach lessons within small groups of targeted students will assist with minimizing decline on the proficiency level of FSA science assessments.

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 exhibiting the greatest gap in comparison to the state average was the lowest 25th percentile for math achieving learning gains. 46% of from students the lowest 25% achieved math learning gains. In comparison, the state average for students achieving math learning gains was 51%. This indicates a gap of 5%. The contributing factors that contributed to this gap is the lack of instruction being differentiated to address the academic needs of the students. Professional Developments were not provided to teachers that focused on differentiating math instruction for the lowest 25% of students. A greater emphasis is need to provide training (s) to teachers that focus on grouping students for math interventions and developing lessons that focus on targeted deficits of each individualized student.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the amount of students achieving learning gains on FSA math assessment. The amount of students who achieved learning gains for FSA math assessment was 64%. In comparison to the 2017-2018 school year, 52% of students achieved learning gains for FSA math assessment. This is an improvement of 12% in comparison to the prior school year. In addition, the amount of students from the lowest 25th percentile achieving math learning gains was 46%. This is in improvement of 12% from the 2017-2018 school year. The new actions the school took to assist with these improvements include common planning, vertical planning across grade levels, development of common assessments aligned with standards based instruction, and the increasing the level of student engagement through the use of manipulatives and accountable talk.

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

The Early Warning Systems data indicates that the amount of students receiving two or more indicators has increased to 51 students. This is a 11 point increase from prior school year Early Warning Systems data of 41 students receiving two or more indicators. In addition, the amount of students achieving at a level 1 on statewide assessments increased to 104 students in comparison of 96 students from prior school year. These two potential areas of concern will be a focus of improvement for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

1. lowest 25% of students achieving learning gains for FSA math assessment
2. FSA ELA proficiency
3. lowest 25% of students achieving learning gains for FSA ELA assessment

4. FSA Science proficiency
5. FSA Math proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase ELA Proficiency
Rationale	The rationale for this area of focus is to increase the amount of students achieving ELA proficiency. The data component that exhibited the greatest achievement gap in comparison to the state average was the amount of 5th grade students achieving proficiency status. 48% of students from the 5th grade performed at proficient level on ELA FSA assessment. The state average for students from the 5th grade achieving ELA proficiency was 56%. This indicates an achievement gap of 8%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome of the school plan is to increase the amount of students performing at the proficient level on ELA FSA assessment from 59% to 65%. This will indicate a 6% increase from the 2018-2019 ELA FSA Assessment. In addition, the amount of 5th grade students will perform at the proficient level on ELA FSA assessment will increase 48% to 60%. This will indicate a 12% increase from the 2018-2019 school year and lower the achievement gap in comparison to the state average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Latricia Pinder (latricia.pinder@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Evidence-based strategy to assist with increasing ELA proficiency will be Helping Students Elaborate on New Content. Students will generate inferences and elaborate to provide evidence that demonstrates understanding of learned content. Students will use academic notebooks to assist with organizing their thoughts and make connections of the information they are reading. The Evidence-based strategy will be monitored from classroom walk through (s), classroom observations, and teacher evaluations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students must be skilled at general valid conclusions based on content in order to support future analytical thinking and enhance comprehension, High-Yield Instructional Strategies
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development aligned with District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) that assists with implementing high yield instructional strategies focusing on close reading. 2. Targeted Feedback provided to teachers from school administration and academic coaches aligned with monitoring and implementation of literacy strategies 3. Curriculum resources that include Language Arts of Florida Standards (LAF's), student academic notebooks, and increase the use of Accelerated Reader from the school's media center.
Person Responsible	Chaquisha Franklin (chaquisha.franklin@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Narrow the achievement gap of students with disabilities by increasing the amount of students achieving ELA learning gains
Rationale	The rationale for the area of focus is to narrow the achievement gap of students with disabilities in comparison of other student sub-group populations. Students with Disabilities performed below the 41% Federal Index Threshold with a level of 36%. This indicates a 5% difference in achievement gap. The amount of students with disabilities who achieved ELA learning was 39%. This is a 17% increase from the 2017-2018 school year which 22% of students with disabilities who achieved ELA learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plan intends to achieve is to increase the students with disabilities sub-group population above the 41% Federal Index threshold by 10% on the Every Student Succeeds Act. This will indicate a Federal Index threshold of 46% for the 2019-2020 school year of students with disabilities. In order to support the measurable outcome, a focus will be to increase the amount of students with disabilities achieving ELA learning gains to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Montgomery (james.montgomery@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	During the 2019-2020 school year, teachers will make content, skills and concepts explicit by showing and telling students what to do or think while solving problems, enacting strategies, completing tasks and classifying concepts. Teachers will use explicit instruction when students are learning new material and complex concepts and skills. They will strategically choose examples and non-examples and language to facilitate student understanding, anticipate common misconceptions, highlight essential content, and remove distracting information. They will model and scaffold steps or processes needed to understand content and concepts, apply skills and complete tasks successfully and independently. The literacy strategies will be monitored when school leadership team conducts classroom walk-through (s) and classroom observations. In addition, lesson plans will be reviewed on a weekly basis by academic coaches and school administration to ensure the literacy strategies are documented within teacher lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content., High Yield strategies for ESE students.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop professional development that will focus on implementing accommodations that address the academic and social needs of students with disabilities. 2. Core Instruction will be differentiated to support the academic levels of students with disabilities through small group instruction. 3. Progress monitoring tools will be administered during intervention blocks through the use of Phonics for Reading Curriculum. 4. Academic notebooks will be implemented to focus on the use of thinking
--------------------	--

maps to assist students with disabilities to process the content of instruction and organize thoughts to generate authentic writing.

**Person
Responsible**

Adasha Elmore (adasha.elmore@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Increase the amount of students within the lowest 25th percentile to achieve math learning gains
Rationale	The rationale for this area of focus is 46% of students from the lowest 25th percentile for math achieved learning gains on 2018-2019 FSA assessments. 34% of students from the lowest 25th percentile for math achieved learning gains on the 2017-2018 FSA assessments. This a 12% increase from the prior school year. The lowest 25th percentile for math achieving learning gains is the lowest school grade data component on the 2018-2019 FSA assessment.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plan intends to achieve is 60% of students from the lowest 25th percentile for math achieve learning gains on 2019-2020 FSA assessment. This will indicate an increase of 14% of students from the 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monica Washington (monica.washington@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Evidence-based strategy to assist with increasing the amount of students from the lowest 25th percentile for achieving learning gains is Helping Students Examine their Reasoning. Students will produce and defend claims through the analysis of reasoning and logic of information. demonstrating new insights gained through the process. Mathematically proficient students look closely to discern a pattern or structure. Young students, for example, might notice that three and seven more is the same amount as seven and three more, or they may sort a collection of shapes according to how many sides the shapes have. Later, students will see 7×8 equals the well remembered $7 \times 5 + 7 \times 3$, in preparation for learning about the distributive property. The use of collaborating with one another and using academic vocabulary will assist students with making claims through analysis of reasoning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is a trend of students identified in the lowest 25% of math reflect an achievement gap for achieving learning gains. Students within the lowest 25% may exhibit difficulty computing math operations that consist of solving multi-step word problems, Math practices from Florida Math Standards

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Developments will be conducted that focus on high yield instructional strategies for math that include teaching students how to examine their reasoning. 2. Math intervention groups will be aligned to the academic deficits of the lowest 30% of students. 3. Teachers will receive targeted feedback from school administration and academic coaches from observations conducted during classroom walk through (s). 4. Teachers will implement unit quizzes to check students' understanding of daily targets from math units and standard (s). 5. Students will participate in daily practice of solving words problems with the use of CUBES strategy.
--------------------	---

Person Responsible Monica Washington (monica.washington@ocps.net)

#4

Title Increase Science Proficiency

Rationale

The rationale for this area of focus is 58% achieved Science proficiency on the 2018-2019 FSA Assessment. In comparison, 61% of students were proficient on the 2017-2018 FSA Science Assessment. This is a 3% decrease from the 2017-2018 FSA Assessment

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

The measurable outcome for the school plan is 65% of students will be proficient on the 2019-2020 FSA Science Assessment. This will indicate an increase of 7% of students from the 2018-2019 FSA Science FSA assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Monica Washington (monica.washington@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Students will interact in small groups and utilize effective conative skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to enhance the use of science labs and science inquiry based learning to build students interest towards learning. Students use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepen knowledge, High Yield Instructional Strategies.

Action Step

Description

1. School Administration and academic coaches will provide targeted feedback to teachers that focus on students deepening their knowledge of content of the science standards within small groups
2. Teachers will provide hands on science labs that include student based reflections of outcomes from the experiments.
3. Teachers will implement reteach and intervention instruction for students who were unable to earn mastery of a science standard with printed exit slips to assist with checking students' understanding of the standard (s).
4. Professional Development will be provided to teachers with the focus on teaching Thinking Maps through the use of student academic notebooks that categorize science concepts, vocabulary, and evidence based learning.
5. Teachers will select students to participate in science squads that provide enrichment and targeted reteaching of standard (s) during before and after school tutoring.

Person Responsible

Monica Washington (monica.washington@ocps.net)

#5	
Title	Lower the amount of students who receive disciplinary referrals
Rationale	The rationale for the area of focus is 75 students had attendance rates below 90%. In addition, 2 students received one or more suspensions from school. However, 49 disciplinary referrals were processed in the 2018-2019 school year. In comparison to 27 disciplinary referrals that were processed in the 2017-2018 school year. This is an increase of 22 disciplinary referrals processed for the 2018-2019 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome of the school plan is to decrease the percentage of students whose attendance rates are below 90% and to decrease the amount of students receiving disciplinary referrals. The amount of students who receive daily attendance rates below 90% will decrease to 50 students. In addition, the amount of students who receive disciplinary referrals will decrease to 30 students. The expectation is staff members at Apopka Elementary will become more culturally responsive to minority subgroup populations of students and adults.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sujeidy Cedano (sujeidy.cedano@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Respect for the learner is a critical component of effective teaching. In addition to pedagogical and subject matter knowledge, competent instructors relate well to their students and possess dispositions such as compassion, fairness, integrity and respect for diversity. Teaching that is respectful and learner focused will naturally involve individual accommodations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to assist with bringing awareness of cultural backgrounds of students and providing equal opportunity for access to educational opportunities.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development will be provided to teachers that focus on Access and Equity among students and adults. 2. Social Skills groups will be provided to students through school counseling. 3. School wide assemblies that focus on cultural awareness and character education through Apopka House program will be conducted to students each semester. 4. SOAR mentoring groups will be formed that focus on individualized academic and social skills support for lowest 30% of identified students in 3rd/4th/5th grade.
Person Responsible	Sujeidy Cedano (sujeidy.cedano@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).

School wide initiatives of creating safe working environment for students, faculty, and community members will be enforced throughout the school. Safety drills will be implemented on a monthly basis to assist with following emergency preparedness guidelines. Threat assessment team meetings will be conducted on a monthly basis to monitor disciplinary records and provide support for students making threats to self and/or others. The threat assessment team meetings will consist of school guidance counselor, school resource officer, and school administration staff. Student support services will be offered through Sed-Net community based and school based counseling services. Social worker referrals will be offered to support students with their social and academic needs. The remaining school wide improvement priorities will provide the students of Apopka Elementary a safe learning environment.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Apopka Elementary ensures that a Parental Engagement Liaison will be a point of contact and reference for our families. The Parental Engagement Liaison promotes character education with our students and families through home visits, student recognition incentives, before school clubs, school wide events, and parental workshops. Extended Media night hours will be an opportunity for families to bring their children to check out books and families to attend parental workshops. Our Parental Engagement Liaison will present quarterly modules to the faculty of Apopka Elementary to keep them informed of the services that are being offered to the students and families of our school. Based on the review of the needs assessment of our school, our school's Parental Engagement Liaison will be an integral team member to assist in lowering the amount of students who receive less than 90% of attendance rate to school. A Parental Engagement resource room will be made available to support our families with available resources within the community to assist with providing house & living support, educational support, and referral for counseling support. The partnership with the resources that are being provided with our school's Parental Engagement Liaison and the collaboration with resources within the community will assist in building capacity between the faculty of Apopka Elementary and its families.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Apopka Elementary School seeks the input from all area preschool programs. It is our hope that through open lines of communication we can receive academic/behavioral student information from the programs, while keeping our families abreast of our summer kindergarten orientation. Individual tours are also given to interested families throughout the year to assist in the transition to kindergarten.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Principal/Assistant Principal: provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that MTSS, PLC, and data is at the core of the grade level, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, 504s, IEPs, and Marzano's instructional practices.

MTSS Coach: coordinates the MTSS process with all team members, is the liaison between the school and the parents, coordinates the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III implementation, and assists the teacher in successful intervention implementation.

General Education Teachers: provide information about core instruction and students' unique deficiencies, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, integrates Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities, and provides ongoing documentation of all MTSS, Marzano, IEPs, and 504 implementation and the subsequent results.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Resource Teachers: participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier III instruction, provides strategies to/for the general education teachers, and collaborates with general education teachers to assist them in meeting the individual needs of the students.

Instructional Coaches: coordinates grade level assessments, breaks down data and assists teachers with understanding the data, assists teachers in understanding/implementing effective data-based decisions, and provides insight to the MTSS administration team regarding individual students/classes data.

ESOL Compliance Teacher: provides guidance on ELL, ESOL, and SIOP; facilitates, supports data collection, planning, analyzes data for our ELL students.

Guidance Counselor: monitors and analyzes discipline/behavior data, monitors attendance data, and plans accordingly, provides support to teachers with classroom management and social/emotional skills, provides character education and coordinates incentive programs.

Instructional "Math/Science" Coach: provides guidance on district/school Math/Science plans, facilitates and supports data collection activities, assists in data analysis, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based and standards-based instructional planning.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Apopka Elementary seeks to promote college and career readiness with our scholars. It is the expectation that faculty members of Apopka Elementary develop a common language with students as referring them as, "Scholars". It is the expectation that the scholars of Apopka Elementary will be exposed to the resources that are available to them when seeking to fulfill their education requirements. These resources will consist of field trips to area Orange County Tech school centers, State Colleges, and Local Universities. These opportunities will assist our scholars in making college and career goals.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Apopka Elementary seeks to promote college and career readiness with our scholars. It is the expectation that faculty members of Apopka Elementary develop a common language with students as referring them as, "Scholars". It is the expectation that the scholars of Apopka Elementary will be exposed to the resources that are available to them when seeking to fulfill their education requirements. These resources will consist of school presentations that allow members from the community to share their college and career experiences with our students. These opportunities will assist our scholars in making college and career goals.

Part V: Budget

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Proficiency				\$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	100-Salaries	1282 - Apopka Elementary	Other		\$7,500.00
			<i>Notes: Teacher planning development</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Narrow the achievement gap of students with disabilities by increasing the amount of students achieving ELA learning gains				\$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	1282 - Apopka Elementary	Other		\$7,500.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the amount of students within the lowest 25th percentile to achieve math learning gains				\$7,368.96

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1282 - Apopka Elementary	Other	3.0	\$7,368.96
<i>Notes: Teacher planning</i>						
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Science Proficiency				\$7,368.96
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1282 - Apopka Elementary	Other	3.0	\$7,368.96
<i>Notes: Teacher planning</i>						
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lower the amount of students who receive disciplinary referrals				\$3,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7800	360-Rentals	1282 - Apopka Elementary	Other		\$3,400.00
<i>Notes: Field Trips to promote cultural awareness</i>						
					Total:	\$38,137.92