

Orange County Public Schools

Three Points 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	19

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

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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	
* 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
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"> • Tiffany Stokes, Principal - Provides vision and school-wide goals, monitors instruction and implementation of standards-based instruction • Joann Dorries- Assistant Principal - Support monitoring of instructional delivery and implementation of action steps. Monitors discipline process and appropriate use of facilities. • Geydis Guadalupe, Curriculum Resource Teacher- expert contributor for curriculum standards, data analysis and professional development trainer Kay Smith, Staffing Specialist - expert contributor and schedule Educational Planning Team meetings as needed • Traci McCants, Math Coach - expert contributor, facilitates grade level common planning, serves as math curriculum lead • Joyce Otero, English Language Arts Coach - expert contributor, facilitates grade level common planning, serves as ELA curriculum lead • 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
Otero, Joyce	Instructional Coach	
Smith, Kay	Other	
Guadalupe, Geydis	Instructional Coach	
McCants, Traci	Instructional Coach	
Veras, Tracy	Teacher, ESE	
Dorries, Joann	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
 Wednesday 8/8/2018, Tiffany Stokes

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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	
* 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	29	64	80	61	87	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	20	20	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	1	9	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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 7/16/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(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	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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	53%	-19%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	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				

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	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.

ESSA Federal Index	
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
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	
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
Hispanic Students	
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
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

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	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

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 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. Additionally, science is not prioritized until 5th grade and students may not have had sufficient exposure to all of the standards. 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 proficiency component for ELA had the lowest performance (43%). Some contributing factors to this performance include a lack of MTSS supports for the majority of students and a lack of systematic instruction focused on the students' areas of need.

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.

Based on 2018-2019 data, the component that showed the greatest decline was 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 and did not receive sufficient differentiated supports.

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, low monitoring of student knowledge of the standards, and lack of science focus in grades K-4.

Considering the 2018-2019 FSA data, the proficiency 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 a lack of MTSS supports for the majority of students and a lack of systematic instruction focused on the students' areas of need. 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 43% and math is 36%. Specifically MOY data for the fourth graders which will be the 2020-2021 fifth graders showed a (MOY) proficiency for ELA as 33% and math as 38%.

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 math learning gains. Contributing factors to the improvement included the implementation of a math intervention block where students were grouped according to areas of need and were either retaught previous standards or skills from previous years. 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 included instructional matching of materials to student needs and decreasing class sizes for higher needs students.

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

The largest areas of concern from the 2018-2019 school year are the number of students with levels 1s and the number of students with attendance below 90%.

Based upon the most recent EWS data, an area of improvement is students with level 1 on the state assessment and will be addressed by increased focus on MTSS, small group instruction, and alignment of curriculum to standards.

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

1. Increase Lowest 25% Learning Gains in ELA
2. Increase Science Proficiency
3. School Culture and Climate
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA Lowest 25% learning gains is the second lowest performing area and has declined the past two years and will continue to be the learning focus for this year. In order for students to become highly effective in all areas, they must be proficient in reading.

Measureable Outcome: Three Points plans to achieve 55% ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%, which is a 14% increase. Strategies put in place will also increase ELA proficiency from 44% to 47%.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will effectively implement MTSS structures 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 standards-based lessons and strategies. This will be monitored by ELA Coach Otero weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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 professional development, and supporting teachers in their implementation, we will see an increase in the achievement of these students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize a consistent framework for intervention, including appropriately aligned resources. (Starting 8/31/20; daily)
2. Provide additional small group instruction to support students falling into the lowest 25% focusing on their areas of deficiency. (Starting 10/5/20; weekly)
3. Increased emphasis on independent reading through the implementation Book Taco. (Starting 8/10/20; daily)
4. Provide after school tutoring for students falling into the lowest 25% for ELA. (Starting 9/14/20; weekly)
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 8/31/20; weekly)
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 8/17/20; weekly)

Person Responsible Joyce Otero (joyce.otero@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science proficiency is the only school grade component that sits below 41% at Three Points and has continuously declined since 2016. Science proficiency is directly connected to students' critical thinking skills supports 21st century skills as well as college and career readiness.

Measureable Outcome: 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 collaboratively plan for and 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 Steps to Implement

1. 5th grade science teachers and the math/science coach will revise the science instructional block to include missed standards from 4th grade, weekly hands-on experiences, and targeted vocabulary activities. (7/13/20-7/16/20)
2. Use district-provided common assessments to collect data and drive data-based decision making. (Starting 8/24/20; per unit)
3. Administration and Math/Science coach will monitor the implementation of science instruction and provide specific feedback and coaching support to teachers. (Starting 8/17/20; Weekly)
4. Utilize the Minority Achievement Office's Acceleration Tutoring program for Science, targeting students who sit below proficiency. (Starting 9/21/20; Bi-monthly)

Person Responsible Traci McCants (traci.mccants@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. 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 will address the following school needs:
 -Reduce the number of suspensions based on threats
 -Reduce the number of threats to others and threats to self

Measureable Outcome: Three Points will reduce the number of suspensions based on threats to others and reduce the overall number of threats made by students by 10%. Additionally we will monitor our Cognia survey data for a decrease of 10% in the number of comments mentioning bullying.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joann Dorries (joann.dorries@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. 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. 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. School Social Emotional Leadership & Learning (SELL) team will use distributive leadership with social and emotional learning strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise. (Starting August 27th, monthly)
2. The school-based SELL team will use cycles of professional learning, establish a plan for continuous school improvement that integrates academics and social and emotional learning. (Starting August 27th, monthly)
3. Grade level teachers will implement wellness check-ins with students as a part of ongoing social and emotional learning support. (starting August 10th, weekly)

Person Responsible Shannon Folsom (shannon.folsom@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All areas of focus were addressed through the action steps.

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.

Three Points will participate in the Social Emotional Leadership and Learning (SELL) district-wide professional development this year. Through this distributive leadership model, the SELL team will support teachers and staff in understanding the connection between academic success and social emotional learning (SEL). Additionally the team will provide strategies and techniques that teachers can implement in class to support their students' social and emotional needs. This process will be discussed in School Advisory Council meetings and those stakeholders will be invited to make suggestions or additions to the process. Finally, the school psychologist will begin providing SEL training for adults, to ensure that the teachers and staff have strategies to care for their own social emotional health.

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: ELA				\$656,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0215 - Three Points Elementary	General Fund		\$576,000.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom teachers in grades 4-5 will provide multi-tied supports to students in the lowest quartile.</i>			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0215 - Three Points Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$80,000.00

						<i>Notes: Certified Reading Specialist will provide support to classroom teachers in reading instruction and provide intensive Tier 3 supports to students in the lowest quartile.</i>
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$80,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0215 - Three Points Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$80,000.00
						<i>Notes: The math/science coach will provide resources and support to teachers and students in science.</i>
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
						Total: \$736,000.00