

Orange County Public Schools

Dommerich Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	14

Dommerich Elementary

601 N THISTLE LN, Maitland, FL 32751

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

Demographics

Principal: Karen Verano

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	20%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	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.

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
Verano, Karen	Principal	
Permenter, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Nimnicht, Lorie	Teacher, ESE	
Aydt, Marcy	Instructional Media	
Braxton, Eva	Instructional Coach	
Cardenas, Carolina	Other	
Engler, Nicole	Other	
Davis, Emily	Other	
McCann, Jane	Other	

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	81	110	110	125	108	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	645
Attendance below 90 percent	9	4	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/21/2019

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	9	8	5	6	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	5	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	9	8	5	6	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	5	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	82%	57%	57%	81%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	58%	58%	62%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	53%	43%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	82%	63%	63%	87%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	62%	65%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	51%	51%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	75%	56%	53%	78%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	81 (0)	110 (0)	110 (0)	125 (0)	108 (0)	111 (0)	645 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (9)	4 (8)	4 (5)	4 (6)	2 (7)	1 (1)	24 (36)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (5)	0 (1)	5 (0)	1 (5)	8 (12)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (7)	10 (10)	10 (12)	34 (29)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	55%	24%	58%	21%
	2018	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	57%	26%	58%	25%
	2018	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
	2018	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	63%	26%	64%	25%
	2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
	2018	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
	2018	78%	53%	25%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	32	24	20	52	48	25	42				
ELL	57			79							
BLK	41	33		38	33	14					
HSP	70	53		78	59		57				
MUL	91			82							
WHT	88	64	65	88	72	53	79				
FRL	54	43	41	56	46	30	42				

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	50	47	43	77	65	70					
BLK	54	47	45	50	53	43					
HSP	58	37		77	53						
WHT	86	66	40	91	66	56	84				
FRL	53	41	36	65	56	42	31				

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	67
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	68
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	32

Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
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	87
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	73
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

Two subgroups (black and ESE) are below 41%. Contributing factors may include lower socio-economic barriers such as limited support outside of the school day. Students may have a lack of understanding in the value of their academics. Students may not always feel engaged by the teacher. Some students need additional academic support while others need additional social emotional support. To address these areas, we have worked to include subgroup students in enrichment opportunities, math acceleration program, and mentor program for relationship building and motivation.

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

Math learning gains for lowest quartile students were 44% this year, dropping from 51% last year. Contributing factors include amount of intervention, lack of small group instruction in math, and lower scores in 5th grade.

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

Math learning gains for lowest quartile students scored 44%, which was lower than the state average of 50%. Contributing factors include amount of intervention and small group instruction time spent on ELA in comparison to math and student language skill set when participating in academic discourse.

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

ELA lowest quartile students improved from 43% to 57%. Action taken included a more focused approach to intervention time and using ability grouping to meet individual student needs, as well as monitoring intervention data to adjust groupings as needed.

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

Level 1's on FSA and Attendance below 90% are areas of concern.

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

1. Math Learning Gains 25%
2. ELA Learning Gains 25%
3. Subgroups - Black/African American students and Exceptional Student Education students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%
Rationale	Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% is our area of greatest need as it dropped seven points from last year and is below the state average. District Division Priority: Narrow Achievement Gap
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% from 44% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karen Verano (karen.verano@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-teach/Acceleration Model 2. Provide support for students social emotional learning (SEL) through Responsive Classroom, mentoring, and guidance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The pre-teach/acceleration model has proven its effectiveness in pre-teaching math skills, concepts, and vocabulary to increase student learning gains and proficiency on FSA math. This will support our ESSA subgroups (black and ESE). 2. Providing SEL support for students will help them establish and maintain positive relationships, set and achieve goals, show empathy for others, and make responsible choices. This will also support our ESSA subgroups (black and ESE).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Send teachers to Responsive Classroom professional development to help build relationships and establish a positive class culture and community. 2. Build a culturally responsive plan which will include the pre-teach/acceleration model for targeted students in math. 3. Provide professional development to teach accelerated model for small group instruction. 4. Grow our mentoring program to better support student's social emotional needs. 5. Provide transportation for after school activities. 6. Monitor using data from walkthroughs, observations, and district common assessments scanned through Performance Matters to support teachers through the coaching cycle.
Person Responsible	Karen Verano (karen.verano@ocps.net)

#2

Title ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%

Rationale ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% is an area that we want to continue to improve. District Division Priority: Narrow Achievement Gap

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve Increase ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% from 57% to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Karen Verano (karen.verano@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy OCPS District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) initiative will focus on writing, academic conversations, standard based instruction with targeted questions, and strategies for monitoring. Through this district provided professional development, our school DPLC team will use a distributive leadership model to share literacy strategies with teachers so they are able to help their students write with evidence in response to complex texts, across all content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy All students need to be fully engaged in the standards based instruction. The teachers need to learn strategies to support engagement. The DPLC model will support our ESSA subgroups (black and ESE).

Action Step

Description

1. Hire interventionist to support lowest quartile students. Interventionist will pull small groups and monitor student progress.
2. DPLC school team will provide professional development of literacy strategies.
3. Communicate expectation of teacher led small group instruction to support students in ELA.
4. Incorporate new research based curriculum into ESE instruction.
5. Monitor using data from walkthroughs, observations, and district common assessments scanned through Performance Matters to support teachers through the coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Karen Verano (karen.verano@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)

Based on AdvancED data, stakeholders wish to learn more about some of our programs and support systems in place for students. We will partner with our School Advisory Council to build a parent academy with information sessions, including topics such as Gifted, MTSS, and Social Emotional.

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 Pilot SIP 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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%				\$4,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1181 - Dommerich Elementary	General Fund		\$2,100.00

			<i>Notes: Add 5th grade math to Minority Achievement acceleration program</i>			
			1181 - Dommerich Elementary	General Fund		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Resources and materials to provide parent academy information sessions</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%				\$8,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1181 - Dommerich Elementary	General Fund		\$2,100.00
			<i>Notes: Provide ELA tutoring program for targeted students</i>			
			1181 - Dommerich Elementary	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide transportation for ELA tutoring program</i>			
			1181 - Dommerich Elementary	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for Professional Development and PLC work</i>			
					Total:	\$12,200.00