

Orange County Public Schools

Michael McCoy Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Michael McCoy Elementary

5225 S SEMORAN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32822

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

Demographics

Principal: Christina Howell

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2018

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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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
Howell, Christina	Principal	<p>The Principal will provide the vision and direction for the school through shared leadership, discussions, and collaboration with our Professional Learning Communities. The Principal will communicate the school wide expectations for instruction in core subjects and support implementation of effective instructional strategies by observing, providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers, ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels, ensuring the use of common language for implementing the effective leadership habits, and communicating with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.</p>
Unger, Eric	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to provide the vision and direction for the school through shared leadership, discussions, and collaboration with our Professional Learning Communities. The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to communicate the school wide expectations for instruction in core subjects and support implementation of effective instructional strategies by observing, providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers, ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels, ensuring the use of common language for implementing the effective leadership habits, and communicating with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.</p>
McCready, Chasity	Instructional Coach	<p>The Instructional Coach/Reading Coach will provide guidance of effective instructional strategies through professional developments (Close Reading, etc.), observing instructional delivery, providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers. She will facilitate data collection, and assist with data analysis for Tier I, II, and III. She will assist in ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels and communicate with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans. She will work directly with the lowest 25% students in intermediate grades during interventions.</p>
Mihelich, Tracy	Other	<p>Instructional Support will provide guidance of effective instructional strategies through professional developments, observing instructional delivery, providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers. She will facilitate data collection, and assist with data analysis for Tier I, II, and III. She will work directly with the struggling students in intermediate grades during interventions.</p>
Hernandez, Brenda	Guidance Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor will provide support to students and staff concerning mental health issues. She will monitor the early warning signs of all students and assist with monthly meetings to discuss students at risk. She will communicate with parents</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		of students on the EWS list to increase student attendance and encourage positive behaviors.
Betancourt Diaz, Janet	Other	The CCT/ESE Support will provide guidance of effective ELL instructional strategies through professional developments, observing instructional delivery, providing actionable feedback, monitor compliance, and coaching to teachers. She will monitor the implementation of the MAO Culturally Responsive Plan. She will facilitate ELL data collection, and assist with data analysis for ELL students. She will work directly with our ELL/ESE students.
Tirado, Sirenaika	Other	The Staffing Specialist will provide guidance of effective ESE instructional strategies through professional developments, observing instructional delivery, providing actionable feedback, monitoring/implementation of the BPIE and coaching to teachers. She will assist in ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels and communicate with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans. She will facilitate data collection, and assist with data analysis for Tier I, II, III. She will work directly with our ESE students.
Lattin, Callie	Other	Math Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/12/2018, Christina Howell

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
-----------------------------------	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	27	72	77	103	114	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	7	20	11	22	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	34	62	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	27	60	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	26	62	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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

Thursday 5/28/2020

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	79	96	99	101	88	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	18	18	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	24	2	32	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	42	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	10	1	31	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	79	96	99	101	88	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	18	18	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	24	2	32	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	42	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	10	1	31	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	57%	57%	42%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	58%	58%	54%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	66%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	55%	63%	63%	50%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	62%	52%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	30%	56%	53%	46%	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	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
	2018	39%	55%	-16%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	57%	-14%	58%	-15%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	28%	54%	-26%	56%	-28%
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%
	2018	39%	62%	-23%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	39%	57%	-18%	60%	-21%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	54%	-25%	53%	-24%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	19	50	50	23	50	62	17				
ELL	32	47	44	47	67	68	24				
BLK	57	73		57	67						
HSP	39	47	43	53	65	67	29				
WHT	46			62							
FRL	41	49	44	53	65	67	32				

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	12	50	50	27	48	64					
ELL	33	53	62	45	57	67	31				
BLK	50	57		67	57						
HSP	41	54	63	50	52	55	48				
WHT	38	45		38	45						
FRL	40	52	62	47	51	54	45				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	64
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	52
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	
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	54
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	53
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

Due to no testing data for the 2019-2020 school year, 2018-2019 FSA data is still being considered for the 2020-2021 School Improvement Plan. The ELA component had the lowest performance for the 2018-2019 school year. Since the 2018-2019 third grade data will be used in calculating the 2020-2021 school grade, a closer look at that grade level is warranted. For third grade, the Key Ideas and Details component for ELA had the lowest performance. Some contributing factors to this performance include the loss of the extra hour and changes to the 3rd grade team (5 out of 6 teachers were new to the grade level and/or a first year teacher).

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

Due to no statewide testing occurring for the 2019-2020 school year, there were no declines in any components.

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

Considering the 2018-2019 FSA data, the Key Ideas and Details component for ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average for the 2018-2019 school year. Factors that contributed to gap included the loss of the extra hour and changes to the 3rd grade team (5 out of 6 teachers were new to the grade level and/or a first year teacher). For the 2019-2020 school year, I-Ready data has been used to monitor student growth and the middle of the year (MOY) proficiency for ELA is 35% (Grades 3-5 is 29%) and math is 30% (Grades 3-5 is 31%). Specifically, MOY data for the fourth graders which

will be the 2020-2021 fifth graders showed a (MOY) proficiency for ELA as 25% and math as 37%.

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

For the 2018-2019 school year, the data component which showed the most improvement was Language and Editing. Contributing factors to the improvement included a shift in planning to increase application and practice within differentiated centers and writing component of the literacy block, as well as, teacher directed error analysis. These actions were continued for the 2019-2020 school year. I-Ready diagnostic data was reviewed for the 2019-2020 school year and based upon the outcomes, select action steps will be kept for the 2020-2021 school year. These action steps include teacher directed error analysis and targeted planning focusing on utilization of writing within the literacy block.

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

Based upon the most recent EWS data, an area in need of improvement is attendance and will be addressed by continued communication with parents stressing the importance of attendance.

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

The top three priorities include:

- 1) ELA and Math Proficiency
- 2) ELA and Math Learning Gains for 5th grade
- 3) Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The state of Florida has created standards for each grade level as a guide to master. This year begins the transition from Florida Standards to B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers will need to become familiar with these new standards and begin implementation using best practices for instruction.

Measureable Outcome: 1) Twenty percent or 96 out of 479 students had attendance below 90 percent for the 2019-2020 school year. The child study team will work on a reduction from 20% to 15% in the total percent of students with attendance below 90 percent.
 2) Overall FSA ELA proficiency will increase 2% to 44% and learning gains will increase 2% to 51%.
 Overall FSA Math proficiency will increase 2% to 57% and 5th grade FCAT Science proficiency will increase 10% to 40%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christina Howell (christina.howell@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: By building common knowledge, the teachers will have a pedagogical toolbox of best practices helping them understand how the framework impacts standards-based instruction with the support of administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Rigorous standards need to be identified and effectively implemented in order to increase students' performance levels. Providing targeted professional development will assist teachers in improving their instructional delivery to enable them to target specific needs including ELL and ESE students.

Action Steps to Implement

The Leadership Team and the School-Based Coaches will provide professional development on the implementation of standards-based instruction to ensure instruction follows the Marzano framework with fidelity. Professional development will focus on the implementation of the new B.E.S.T. State Standards, effective differentiated culturally responsive instruction across content areas, Webb's Depth of Knowledge, continue Florida State Standards, the use of technology in the classroom (iReady), student engagement, and Marzano instructional strategies for effective rigorous standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible Christina Howell (christina.howell@ocps.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Leadership Team will offer feedback on teaching strategies to improve best practices within academic instruction. Coach teachers individually, based on needs through the coaching cycle and student achievement would yield positive academic gains.

Measurable Outcome: Overall FSA ELA proficiency will increase 2% to 44% and learning gains will increase 2% to 51%.
Overall FSA Math proficiency will increase 2% to 57% and 5th grade FCAT Science proficiency will increase 10% to 40%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eric Unger (eric.unger@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Leadership Team will coach teachers individually or through grade level PLCs, based on needs through the coaching cycle. After observation, actionable feedback will be provided by the Leadership Team to the teacher(s).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative reflections will drive actionable feedback to help teachers continually implement strategies gained from ongoing professional developments.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Conduct classroom walk throughs, observations using the iObservation tool, monitor evidence of students mastery of standards, and quality of classroom instruction.
- 2) Collaboration with PLCs, data meetings and classroom observations.

Person Responsible Eric Unger (eric.unger@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of Focus: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Rationale: Initial research indicates the increased social-emotional challenges our students are facing due to the Covid-19 pandemic and social unrest during the spring/summer of 2020. During times of crisis, children need extra emotional support. By supporting student social-emotional health, 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 can then address the following school needs:
 1) ELA and Math Proficiency
 2) ELA and Math Learning Gains for 5th grade
 3) Science Proficiency

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to achieve positive measurable outcomes in the following areas:
 1) Twenty percent or 96 out of 479 students had attendance below 90 percent for the 2019-2020 school year. The child study team will work on a reduction from 20% to 15% in the total percent of students with attendance below 90 percent.
 2) Overall FSA ELA proficiency will increase 2% to 44% and learning gains will increase 2% to 51%.
 Overall FSA Math proficiency will increase 2% to 57% and 5th grade FCAT Science proficiency will increase 10% to 40%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brenda Hernandez (21079@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.
 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: 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) Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies
- 2) Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students
- 3) Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture
- 4) Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school
- 5) Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture
- 6) Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning
- 7) Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Christina Howell (christina.howell@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Based upon the most recent EWS data, an area in need of improvement is attendance and will be addressed by continued communication with parents stressing the importance of attendance.

The Leadership Team realizes the health and safety of our students is top priority and will encourage ill students to stay home and recover. The Leadership Team will monitor levels of student's daily attendance and emphasize its importance. They will work with parents to provide support as needed.

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.

The mission of McCoy Elementary School is to lead our students to success with the support and engagement of families and the community. In an effort to uphold the goals of Orange County Public Schools, McCoy ES will build capacity for parental involvement and sustained community engagement. It is our belief that a strong home school relationship will have a

positive impact on student achievement. We will host multiple curriculum events aligned to grade level standards to model instructional strategies for home and school.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$74,882.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	100-Salaries	0891 - Mccoy Elementary	General Fund		\$74,882.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach - support teacher trainings, small group instruction, FBS</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback				\$110,415.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	110-Administrators	0891 - Mccoy Elementary	General Fund		\$110,415.00
			<i>Notes: The Assistant Principal provides actionable feedback to instructional staff.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$74,892.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	100-Salaries	0891 - Mccoy Elementary	General Fund		\$74,892.00
			<i>Notes: Our Guidance Counselor will provide social and emotional support to students and staff.</i>			
					Total:	\$260,189.00