

Orange County Public Schools

Zellwood Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	18

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

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

Demographics

Principal: Frank Mattucci

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

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)	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 Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: D 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
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
Mattucci, Frank	Principal	Oversees the MTSS process, participates in MTSS meetings, teacher observations (formal and informal) and teacher evaluations.
Hunter, Carissa	Instructional Coach	Coordinates and provides professional development, coordinates curriculum materials and assessments, provides support to teachers in the teacher induction program, coordinates state and district assessments.
Cordero, Evelisse	Guidance Counselor	Oversees the CHAMPS program, coordinates mental health counseling provides counseling to individuals and small groups, participates in Behavior Team meetings and Thread Assessment team meetings, and is the school's homeless liaison.
Jadonath, Harrischandra	Instructional Coach	Provides coaching, modeling, resources, and support to teachers in math and science.
Jacovino, Barbara	Instructional Coach	Oversees and manages media center, provides library resources for students and teachers, provides coaching support for teachers, provides reading resources for interventions and enrichment, provides professional development.
Hildago, Ena	Other	Coordinates Dual Language Program and assessments for ELL students, monitors ELL students and services, participates in MTSS meetings for ELL students.
Turnage, Deborah	Other	Coordinates the ESE eligibility process when a student does not respond to interventions, coordinates and monitors ESE services, coordinates 504 Plan eligibility process and monitors plans.
Ward, Cecelia	Assistant Principal	Oversees the MTSS process, participates in MTSS meetings, teacher observations (formal and informal) and teacher evaluations.

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	92	92	95	105	108	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	20	27	14	23	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	6	7	4	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	2	2	13	10	20	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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

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	16	21	22	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	4	4	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	38	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	3	0	5	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	16	21	22	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	4	4	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	38	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	3	0	5	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	51%	57%	57%	47%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	58%	43%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	53%	42%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	52%	63%	63%	58%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	42%	61%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	20%	48%	51%	39%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	57%	56%	53%	54%	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	92 (0)	92 (0)	95 (0)	105 (0)	108 (0)	94 (0)	586 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 (16)	27 (21)	14 (22)	23 (8)	12 (8)	18 (17)	114 (92)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	1 (1)	1 (0)	0 (2)	0 (1)	1 (1)	3 (6)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (4)	6 (4)	7 (4)	4 (0)	6 (8)	17 (14)	50 (34)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	44 (31)	39 (38)	46 (36)	129 (105)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

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	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	63%	-13%	64%	-14%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	52	52	23	33	17	15				
ELL	40	57	65	46	38	14	48				
BLK	32	47	50	32	40	17	38				
HSP	47	60	67	51	40	17	51				
WHT	67	57	60	65	45		78				
FRL	41	55	65	45	40	19	51				

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	13	40	40	36	50	64					
ELL	38	37	35	51	46	37	36				
BLK	28	47		51	50	40	47				
HSP	43	33	26	55	46	34	48				
WHT	63	60		66	60		67				
FRL	42	38	41	55	51	39	46				

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	52
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	47
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	37
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	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
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	48
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 25th percentile in Math performed the lowest at 20%, which is a three year trend.

Math proficiency levels decreased by six percentage points. Some contributing factors may have been a lack of teacher training and familiarity with the math small group structure. Also, there was a lack of content knowledge related to the standards.

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

The largest decline was present in the math lowest 25th percentile, from 39% to 20%, a 19 percent decline. Contributing factors may have been a lack of correlating data from i-Ready to the standardized data results. Confusion about instructional grouping may have also been a factor.

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

Mathematics proficiency was eleven percentage points below the state average. This data reflects a decline that is not associated with a downward trend for the area.

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

The ELA Lowest 25% percentile group grew by 21 percent from 42% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. This growth can be attributed to school-wide focus on writing and explicit writing instruction and support for the lowest 25 percentile group. Resource teacher provided intensive ELA small-group instruction for lowest 25 percentile students.

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

A potential area of concern is the course failures in mathematics by our lowest 25% as well as the number of level 1 statewide assessment performance results.

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

1. Lowest 25% in Mathematics
2. Learning Gains in Mathematics
3. Increase the Proficiency Levels in Mathematics
4. Maintain the Growth in ELA
5. Maintain the Growth in Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Mathematics Proficiency
Rationale	The 2018-2019 FSA data proficiency performance in Mathematics showed a decline from the previous year, as well as decline in the achievement of lowest 25% for mathematics. This is a critical area for students and needs to be improved for the mathematical competence of our students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By increasing the rigor of standards-based instruction, proficiency in Mathematics will increase from 52% to 55%. Our lowest 25% will increase from 20% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Harrischandra Jadonath (harrischandra.jadonath@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The leadership team will monitor the implementation of the lessons in the classroom by using a common walk-through tool. The leadership team will calibrate scoring to ensure consistent high-expectations. This calibration will take place in leadership meetings (quarterly). Teachers will be provided with actionable feedback from the classroom walk-throughs that focus on the implementation of standards-based instruction, student engagement, use of manipulatives and small group interventions for mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy was selected to provide measurable feedback based on a common tool to teachers in order to improve the mathematics instruction presented to students. This will provide a means for coaching teachers and assuring best practice instruction that will increase math fluency, critical thinking skills and close reading of content-based problems.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training will be provided to the teachers on best practices for instruction and collaborative planning. 2. The administration and instructional coaches will conduct calibrated walk-throughs to determine trends and create a method to best address areas of concern. 3. Feedback will be provided to teachers on mathematics instruction either written, face to face, or digitally by administration and instructional coaches. 4. Direct coaching and support for teachers will be provided by administration and instructional coaches. 5. The administration and instructional coaches will monitor/reflect with teachers.
Person Responsible	Cecelia Ward (cecelia.ward@ocps.net)

#2

Title Increase Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25 Percentile
Rationale The 2019-2020 school year will be the first where all students have a digital device. The integration of digital learning will be critical for student success in all content areas and tier-levels.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve We will see a proficiency increase in mathematics from 52% to 55% and increase learning gains for the lowest 25 percentile by a minimum of three percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Barbara Jacovino (barbara.jacovino@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Differentiated instruction through the use of the digital tools will lead to more effective small groups and individualized learning. The individualized learning will directly impact the student-specific needs and increase student engagement. This strategy will be monitored by using the various reporting functions of the digital learning programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Use of the digital tools for learning will link the 21st century skills with the district initiatives for learning. This strategy will increase student engagement and connection with the content as well as more readily accessible data reporting and direct feedback on performance tasks and activities.

Action Step

- 1. Train teachers and students on the best practice use of the digital tools for learning
- 2. Monitor the student engagement with the content and provide meaningful feedback
- 3. Conduct student conferences to set goals for digital learning outcomes
- 4. Provide parent training and support for the monitoring of their student's digital learning
- 5. Evaluate the effectiveness of student learning through academic notebooks and other monitoring tools

Person Responsible Frank Mattucci (franklin.mattucci@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)

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

The FLDOE will upload PIP.

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

The School Counselor meets with individual or small groups of students to teach social skills and provide counseling. Zellwood Elementary also has access to mental health counseling through providers which have been approved through OCPS. The referral process starts when a teacher or parent contacts the School Counselor.

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

The Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) program at Zellwood helps children develop a love of learning. A strong emphasis is placed on teaching pre-reading, pre-writing, pre-math, and social skills. Children develop oral language skills which will help them experience more success throughout life. This structured learning helps foster abilities which help students be successful as they transition into kindergarten. In the spring, Zellwood ES provides an opportunity for preschool students from other schools to visit the school and spend time in a Kindergarten classroom. This helps VPK students feel more comfortable with the transition to Kindergarten.

Every spring the guidance department from Wolf Lake Middle School comes to Zellwood to present information to the 5th grade students, conduct a screening, and allow students to select electives. The students are given an opportunity to tour the middle school and see what a morning is like at the school.

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

Teams meet once a week for common planning. Instructional Coaches facilitate meetings to ensure lessons are rigorous and aligned with the standards.

The MTSS/Rtl team includes: Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher,

Staffing Specialist, Compliance Teacher, Coaches, School Psychologist, and Speech and Language Pathologist.

- MTSS/RtI team will meet with teaches at the beginning of the year to discuss grade level data for the incoming students.
- MTSS/RtI team will meet monthly to discuss Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students
- MTSS/RtI team will review existing action plans and update them as needed.
- MTSS/RtI team will review and update the “menu of available intervention options” which follows an if-then problem/solution model.

Federal funds:

Title I: Covers the salaries of 2 teachers, and a Parent Education Liaison.

Title III: Covers the salary of one bilingual paraprofessional.

21st Century Community Learning Center Academy Grant: Enrichment program and math tutoring for students in 2nd -5th grades.

State funds:

ATS Funds: Extended learning for 3rd-5th grade enrichment and tutoring in reading.

FTE, Full Time Equivalent: Per student expenditures for supplies, utilities, teacher salaries, etc., ESE teachers.

FEFP:

Class size amendment - cover the salaries of some teachers

Local Services:

Counseling: Mental Health Counseling

Partners In Education: Community partnerships. Ex: First United Methodist Church, Victory Church, Willow Street Neighborhood Center, Signal Lights, Red Caps, and Advent Health all who commit to volunteering for school wide activities and functions.

Local Programs:

KZ Active: After school program to develop physical and social skills.

JB Mobile Fitness: After school program to develop physical skills.

Agriculture Literacy Day: Apopka Middle and High School FFA - Spring 2019.

Zellwood ES Garden: Community/school involvement

Zellwood History Project: Community/school involvement to develop student awareness of local history.

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

In order to advance college and career awareness, students at Zellwood Elementary will be learning about their teacher’s college experience. Teachers will prepare a presentation to talk about the importance of school and how they became teachers.

The School Counselor will teach about careers every week and students will be able to write about what they would like to be in the future.

Teach In will give our students another opportunity to learn about different careers through volunteers that will visit our school.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase Mathematics Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25 Percentile	\$0.00
Total:			\$1,500.00