

Orange County Public Schools

# Three Points Elementary



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>16</b> |

# Three Points Elementary

4001 S GOLDENROD RD, Orlando, FL 32822

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Tiffany Stokes**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/8/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br><b>Students With Disabilities</b><br>White Students |
| <b>School Grade</b>  | 2018-19: C   |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2017-18: C<br>2016-17: C<br>2015-16: D<br>2014-15: D<br>2013-14: C   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   |  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | NOT IN DA  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement**

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  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Stokes, Tiffany   | Principal           | <p>The main role of the school-based leadership team is to support the vision of the school and to build teacher capacity in order to support student achievement. Administration monitors effective implementation of standards-based instruction, provides feedback and engages all stakeholders in the data analysis process to inform decisions. The leadership team meets on a regular basis to set and measure clear goals, manage curriculum, and allocate resources for instruction. Specific roles are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tiffany Stokes, Principal - Provides vision and school-wide goals, monitors instruction and implementation of standards-based instruction</li> <li>• Joann Dorries- Assistant Principal - Support monitoring of instructional delivery and implementation of action steps. Monitors discipline process and appropriate use of facilities.</li> <li>• Geydis Guadalupe, Curriculum Resource Teacher- expert contributor for curriculum standards, data analysis and professional development trainer</li> <li>Kay Smith, Staffing Specialist - expert contributor and schedule Educational Planning Team meetings as needed</li> <li>• Traci McCants, Math Coach - expert contributor, facilitates grade level common planning, serves as math curriculum lead</li> <li>• Joyce Otero, English Language Arts Coach - expert contributor, facilitates grade level common planning, serves as ELA curriculum lead</li> <li>• Tracy Veras, ESE teacher/MTSS - expert contributor, Tier 3 academic and behavior interventionist for MTSS, meeting organizer, note taker, data analyst and professional development trainer, MTSS designee</li> </ul> |
| Otero, Joyce      | Instructional Coach |  |
| Smith, Kay        | Other               |  |
| Guadalupe, Geydis | Instructional Coach |  |
| McCants, Traci    | Instructional Coach |  |
| Veras, Tracy      | Teacher, ESE        |  |
| Dorries, Joann    | Assistant Principal |  |

**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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 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 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**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     |

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

31

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/1/2019

**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     | 18          | 16 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 2  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 2           | 3  | 0  | 4  | 5  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 26 | 46 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 108   |

**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 | 7 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |

**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     | 18          | 16 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 82  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 2  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 2           | 3  | 0  | 4  | 5  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 28  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 26 | 46 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 108 |

**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 | 7 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 40 |

**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             | 44%    | 57%      | 57%   | 40%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 52%    | 58%      | 58%   | 42%    | 55%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 41%    | 52%      | 53%   | 42%    | 48%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            | 51%    | 63%      | 63%   | 53%    | 63%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 64%    | 61%      | 62%   | 46%    | 57%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    | 48%      | 51%   | 45%    | 46%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 37%    | 56%      | 53%   | 38%    | 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     | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 (18)                            | 0 (16) | 0 (12) | 0 (10) | 0 (15) | 0 (11) | 0 (82)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (2)  | 0 (1)  | 0 (2)  | 0 (3)  | 0 (8)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (2)                             | 0 (3)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (4)  | 0 (5)  | 0 (14) | 0 (28)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (26) | 0 (46) | 0 (36) | 0 (108) |



**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.

| <b>ELA</b>            |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 03                    | 2019        | 37%           | 55%             | -18%                              | 58%          | -21%                           |
|                       | 2018        | 46%           | 55%             | -9%                               | 57%          | -11%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -9%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2019        | 49%           | 57%             | -8%                               | 58%          | -9%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 29%           | 54%             | -25%                              | 56%          | -27%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 20%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 3%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2019        | 36%           | 54%             | -18%                              | 56%          | -20%                           |
|                       | 2018        | 40%           | 55%             | -15%                              | 55%          | -15%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -4%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 7%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 03                    | 2019        | 47%           | 62%             | -15%                              | 62%          | -15%                           |
|                       | 2018        | 60%           | 61%             | -1%                               | 62%          | -2%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -13%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2019        | 61%           | 63%             | -2%                               | 64%          | -3%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 45%           | 62%             | -17%                              | 62%          | -17%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 16%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 1%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2019        | 39%           | 57%             | -18%                              | 60%          | -21%                           |
|                       | 2018        | 41%           | 59%             | -18%                              | 61%          | -20%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -2%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -6%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>        |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                    | 2019        | 34%           | 54%             | -20%                              | 53%          | -19%                           |
|                       | 2018        | 37%           | 53%             | -16%                              | 55%          | -18%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -3%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 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  | 12       | 31     | 25          | 14        | 62      | 67           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL  | 38       | 51     | 35          | 43        | 68      | 67           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP  | 42       | 51     | 42          | 49        | 65      | 60           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT  | 48       | 55     |             | 59        | 57      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL  | 38       | 45     | 36          | 47        | 65      | 61           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |

| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 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  | 9        | 26     | 33          | 21        | 32      | 39           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL  | 24       | 40     | 47          | 37        | 33      | 43           | 5        |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK  | 40       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP  | 36       | 39     | 38          | 49        | 44      | 46           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT  | 52       | 44     |             | 68        | 44      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL  | 38       | 39     | 39          | 54        | 45      | 41           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students  | 51   |
| 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 | 58   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 406  |
| 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 | 48 |
|---|----|

| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
|--|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>White Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 55  |
| 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                                | 47 |
| 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 was science at 37%. This data declining has become a trend in the last 3 years, having dropped in points year over year since 2015-2016. Our low historical ELA proficiency is the leading contributing factor. Additional contributing factors are the lack of differentiation within science to attend to the reading needs of the students as well as low monitoring of student knowledge of the standards.

#### **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 is math proficiency, dropping 2% from 53% to 51%. The factor that most greatly contributed to this was an increased focus on providing tier 2 and 3 supports for math. While the majority of the students remained proficient, overall the proficient students were not as tightly monitored as students receiving tier 2 and 3 supports in math.

#### **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**

Science proficiency has the greatest gap compared to the state average. The state sits at 53% while Three Points is 16% below, at 37%. Our low historical ELA proficiency is the leading contributing factor. Additional contributing factors are the lack of differentiation within science to attend to the reading needs of the students as well as low monitoring of student knowledge of the standards.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement with an 18% increase (46% to 64%). This past year we implemented a math intervention block where students were grouped according to areas of need and were either retaught previous standards or skills from previous years.

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

My largest area of concern is the number of level 1 students on the Florida Standards Assessment.

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

1. Increase Science proficiency to 55%
2. Increase ELA Lowest 25% learning gains to 65%

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>     | Science Proficiency   |
| <b>Rationale</b> | Science proficiency is the only school grade component that sits below 41% at Three Points and has continuously declined since 2016. (Division Priority - Accelerate Student Achievement) |

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve**  
 Three Points plans to achieve science proficiency of 55% on the Statewide Science Assessment, which is a 18% increase.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**  
 Tiffany Stokes (tiffany.stokes@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy**  
 Teachers will effectively implement standards-based science instruction, incorporating hands-on experiences and rigorous common assessments , in order to increase student achievement. This will be monitored by Math/ Science Coach McCants and will occur weekly.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**  
 Science instruction continues to decline at Three Points due to lack of attention to standards and hands-on experiences to enhance student learning. This strategy will ensure that teachers and students are provided the appropriate resources, experiences, and support necessary to ensure student success.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Promote hands-on science activities which support and deepen learning of standards. (Starting 9/3/19; Weekly)
2. Use district-provided common assessments to collect data and drive data-based decision making. (Starting 9/3/19; Weekly)
3. Provide Saturday school enrichment for science. (Starting 9/27/19; Bi-monthly)
4. Administration and Math/Science coach will monitor the implementation of science instruction and provide specific feedback and coaching support to teachers. (Starting 8/19/19; Weekly)
5. Utilize the Minority Achievement Office's Acceleration Tutoring program for Science, targeting students who sit below proficiency. (Starting 9/27/19; Bi-monthly)

**Person Responsible**  
 Tiffany Stokes (tiffany.stokes@ocps.net)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>#2</b>  |   |
| <b>Title</b>   | ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains   |
| <b>Rationale</b>   | ELA Lowest 25% learning gains is the second lowest performing area and has declined the past two years. (Division Priority - Narrow Achievement Gaps)   |
| <b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Three Points plans to achieve 55% ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%, which is a 14% increase. Strategies put in place will also positively impact ELA and math proficiency levels. ELA proficiency will increase from 44% to 47% and math proficiency will increase from 51% to 54%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                 | Tiffany Stokes (tiffany.stokes@ocps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                   | Teachers will effectively implement interventions and small group instruction aligned to the areas of deficiency for students in the lowest 25% for ELA, incorporating text-based evidence writing and other District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) strategies. This will be monitored by ELA Coach Otero weekly.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                     | The lowest 25% for ELA has declined due to a lack of resources appropriately aligned to student needs. By providing appropriate resources, strategies learned through DPLC, and supporting teachers in their implementation, we will see an increase in the achievement of these students.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>   |   |
| <b>Description</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Utilize a consistent framework for intervention, including appropriately aligned resources. (Starting 9/13/19; daily)</li> <li>2. Provide additional small group instruction to support students falling into the lowest 25% focusing on their areas of deficiency. (Starting 10/7/19; weekly)</li> <li>3. Increased emphasis on independent reading through the implementation Book Taco. (Starting 8/13/19; daily)</li> <li>4. Provide after school tutoring for students falling into the lowest 25% for ELA. (Starting 9/19/19; weekly)</li> <li>5. Administration and ELA coach will provide resources, monitoring and support for teachers implementing interventions and small groups for students in the lowest 25% for ELA. (Starting 9/19/19; weekly)</li> <li>6. In response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities will provide targeted lessons aligned to the specific areas of deficit for their students on a weekly basis. (Starting 9/9/19; weekly)</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Tiffany Stokes (tiffany.stokes@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**

Parental Involvement plan was submitted to the district .

#### **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**

Students who are identified as needing more individualized support receive small group and individualized services from the guidance counselor. If the need for individualized counseling is long-term, a SEDNET referral is initiated. The school also works closely with our Social Worker to assist families in crisis or help transition to secure services that might be available to them. This year, we have designated a Mentor Coordinator. Students in need will be paired up with mentors that will meet with them once per week to give them academic and social supports.

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

Three Points offers a full day VPK program with a certified teacher and paraprofessional serving 20 students. The program is 1/2 day VPK and 1/2 day funded through Title I funds. Incoming Kindergarten students are provided with an orientation to ease the transition to school. Families are provided with ongoing information to support their child(ren) throughout the school years.

Students follow the VPK prescribed curriculum of DLM Early Childhood Express so that upon exiting the program they know their letters, sounds and numbers. Many are already reading upon leaving the program. Attending the VPK program prepares children for the kindergarten classroom as well as the school environment.

Students who didn't attend VPK here or at another site are supported through the MTSS process if it is determined, via data, that they are struggling academically or socially.

Outgoing cohorts of 5th grade students meet with the guidance counselor of the area feeder schools. They are invited to select courses for electives of their interest. At the same time, students are provided with an orientation to middle school so they know the expectations and changes to anticipate.

**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**

Our MTSS system provides students with differentiated instruction by their classroom teacher and/or instructional coaches with the use of materials aligned to student needs. At the beginning of the year, the MTSS designee provides teachers with graphed progress monitoring data for prior year students.

Teachers are responsible for continuing the Tier 2 process. Once the students complete beginning of the year diagnostic assessments in reading and math, teachers create instructional groupings for their tiered interventions. Students in any of the OCPS defined at-risk categories will become part of the MTSS immediately and the teacher must begin implementing and monitoring Tier 2 interventions and referring for additional support through Tier 3 interventions as appropriate. The teacher determines the problem, the appropriate research-based intervention, and the expected rate of progress.

If a student is making appropriate progress at an acceptable rate, interventions continue. If the student is not making appropriate progress at an acceptable rate for at least three weeks, the teacher meets with their grade level PLC to review data for new and specific interventions. The team will use the OCPS MTSS District Graphing Template. If the student is making appropriate progress rate based on progress monitoring data that is graphed and is not more than 3 months below grade level, the classroom teacher continues providing the intervention and progress monitor the data. If the student is still not making the rate of progress and is a year or more below grade level after progress monitoring, the teacher submits the data collection form to the MTSS designee to schedule an MTSS meeting to see if ESE services are needed.

**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 prepare for college and career awareness we offer a variety of different extra-curricular clubs including: Science Club, Math Club, Chess Club, Safety Patrols, Drama Club and Student Council. With participation in any of these clubs, the students are able to see what they might like to do later in life as well as to prepare them for their future endeavors. It is through these clubs that students can become aware of the different opportunities that are out there for them and are able to help make decisions about their future.

To prepare our students for 21st century careers with technology and industry, Three Points has increased access to digital curriculum and access through the use of i-Ready Reading, i-Ready Math, Accelerated Reader, and HMH Think Central for interactive lessons and digital experiments to provide real world experiences. Additional technology integration in the classroom, via doc cams, projectors and teacher iPads, assists with preparing 21st century learners for careers involving computers. Three Points is also becoming a digital school for the 19-20 school year which will increase student opportunity to interact with digital curriculum and resources.

## Part V: Budget



| <b>1</b>  | <b>III.A</b>                                | <b>Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency</b>           |                 |     |                       | <b>\$740,861.00</b> |
|---|---|--|-----------------|-----|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Function  | Object                                      | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE | 2019-20               |                     |
| 5100  | 120-Classroom Teachers                      | 0215 - Three Points Elementary                       | General Fund    |     | \$688,000.00          |                     |
| <i>Notes: K-5 classroom teachers will provide science instruction and support.</i>                          |   |  |                 |     |                       |                     |
| 5100  | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0215 - Three Points Elementary                       | Title, I Part A |     | \$52,861.00           |                     |
| <i>Notes: The math/science coach will provide resources and support to teacher and students in science.</i> |   |  |                 |     |                       |                     |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>III.A</b>                                | <b>Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains</b> |                 |     |                       | <b>\$693,604.00</b> |
| Function  | Object                                      | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE | 2019-20               |                     |
| 5100  | 120-Classroom Teachers                      | 0215 - Three Points Elementary                       | General Fund    |     | \$688,604.00          |                     |
| <i>Notes: Classroom teachers will provide tier 1, 2, and 3 support to students in the lowest 25%.</i>       |   |  |                 |     |                       |                     |
| 3374  | 120-Classroom Teachers                      | 0215 - Three Points Elementary                       | Title, I Part A |     | \$5,000.00            |                     |
| <i>Notes: Before school tutoring will be provided to 4th and 5th grade students in the area of ELA.</i>     |   |  |                 |     |                       |                     |
| <b>Total:</b>   |   |  |                 |     | <b>\$1,434,465.00</b> |                     |