

Orange County Public Schools

Millennia 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	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Millennia Elementary

5301 CYPRESS CREEK DR, Orlando, FL 32811

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

Demographics

Principal: D?Janira Pena

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2019

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)	80%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students 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: B 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: B
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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
Pena, Dyanira	Principal	The principal's role is to provide strategic direction in the school system to ensure the mission and vision of OCPS are enacted daily. The principal serves as the instructional leader and is the primary source of Professional Development. The principal also monitors distribution of leadership roles and addresses the needs of the students, parents, and local stakeholders.
Solano, Lena	Instructional Coach	The role of the coach is to build teacher capacity and their understanding of instructional practices. The instructional coach facilitates PLC meetings and assists teachers with planning and pacing of lessons, the development of differentiated lessons, and the selection of best practices to meet the needs of their students. They also Informally observe (non-evaluative) lessons and provide feedback for a teacher's professional growth and students' success, in addition to modeling lessons.
Otero, Catalina	Instructional Coach	The role of the coach is to build teacher capacity and their understanding of instructional practices. The instructional coach facilitates PLC meetings and assists teachers with planning and pacing of lessons, the development of differentiated lessons, and the selection of best practices to meet the needs of their students. They also Informally observe (non-evaluative) lessons and provide feedback for a teacher's professional growth and students' success, in addition to modeling lessons.
Weiss, Kristi	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader, oversees facility management, and maintains behavioral expectations.
Ullrich, Monica	Other	The Curriculum Compliance Teacher facilitates and monitors services for ELLs and organizes the Multicultural Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings. The CCT also assists teachers in implementing instructional strategies and monitors the effectiveness of those strategies.
Wax, Dana	Other	The Behavior Specialist determines functional behavior capabilities of students in the classroom and home to design behavioral interventions. The Behavior Specialist coordinates between teachers, parents and students to develop behavior interventions and resolve issues. The Behavior Specialist also assists students to determine inappropriate behavior and develop appropriate actions for good interpersonal skills, in addition to overseeing the PBS system.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lyon, Christine	Instructional Coach	The role of the coach is to build teacher capacity and their understanding of instructional practices. The instructional coach facilitates PLC meetings and assists teachers with planning and pacing of lessons, the development of differentiated lessons, and the selection of best practices to meet the needs of their students. They also Informally observe (non-evaluative) lessons and provide feedback for a teacher’s professional growth and students’ success, in addition to modeling lessons. The instructional coach also serves as the assessment coordinator.

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	156	152	161	168	193	186	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1016
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	7	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	81	65	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

74

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

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	22	25	16	27	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	4	6	4	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	54	51	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	7	42	31	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	22	25	16	27	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	4	6	4	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	54	51	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	7	42	31	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	45%	57%	57%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	58%	58%	61%	55%	55%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	53%	64%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	52%	63%	63%	59%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	62%	55%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	51%	44%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	46%	56%	53%	52%	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	156 (0)	152 (0)	161 (0)	168 (0)	193 (0)	186 (0)	1016 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (22)	5 (25)	5 (16)	7 (27)	6 (19)	4 (21)	32 (130)
One or more suspensions	1 (4)	0 (6)	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (3)	1 (24)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (54)	0 (51)	0 (43)	0 (148)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	81 (23)	65 (20)	80 (17)	226 (60)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	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	32%	55%	-23%	58%	-26%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	62%	-19%	62%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	63%	-19%	64%	-20%
	2018	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	40%	57%	-17%	60%	-20%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	53%	-19%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	54	60	19	44	54	13				
ELL	41	60	65	53	58	56	49				
ASN	78	75		78	67						
BLK	45	55	75	47	52	31	39				
HSP	39	56	65	49	56	60	51				
WHT	56	55		69	55						
FRL	44	52	61	49	53	51	42				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	35		29	29						
ELL	52	63	70	59	56	44	50				
ASN	91			100							
BLK	45	49	44	48	45	38	47				
HSP	57	69	73	62	61	47	55				
WHT	61	67		64	48		58				
FRL	52	59	60	58	54	37	51				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	60
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	52
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

In the 18-19 school year, Millennia Elementary showed the lowest performance in our ELA Achievement. Millennia regressed overall for proficiency and learning gains. Third grade students demonstrated the highest deficiencies in reading with a thirteen percent decrease. Also, five of the six subgroups regressed in the ELA Achievement. Millennia’s demographics have shifted significantly in the last school year. Sixty-two of our population is ESOL. The increase in our ELL population and ineffective implementation of ESOL strategies attributed to our decrease in proficiency and increase in gaps.

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

In the 18-19 school year, the data component that showed the greatest decline was ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains. Our ELL subgroup also regressed in ELA learning gains and our Lowest 25 percent gains. The increase in our ELL population and ineffective implementation of ESOL strategies attributed to our decrease in proficiency and increase in gaps. Teachers mainly focused on implementing the routine ESOL accommodations which included: providing extra time, having students work with a partner, and using Google Translate. Students need the opportunity to truly demonstrate their knowledge of the concept through modified/simplified assignments and alternative assessments. The CCT observed instruction and modeled lessons for the some of our teachers, but primarily focused on the Sheltered Teachers.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to state average is ELA Achievement. ELA Achievement is one of our weakest areas because many of our students are lacking the foundation skills in the English Language. Our population consists of English Language learners that need to be provided with comprehensible input and targeted instruction to demonstrate mastery. Our data demonstrates that our students are struggling with phonics, vocabulary, Integration of Knowledge & Ideas, and Key Ideas & Details.

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

The data component that demonstrated the most improvement was our Math Lowest 25th percentile. In math, we focused on incorporating close reading strategies, thinking maps, and math centers to make concepts comprehensible and provide targeted instruction. Teachers were also encouraged to utilize manipulatives and emulate the flipped classroom approach to reduce teacher talk and involve students in interactive activities. Students also utilized Reflex math to improve their basic math skills while participating in a friendly competition among their peers.

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

One potential area of concern is the influx of students that scored a Level 1 on the ELA FSA Assessment. This count includes students that count and don't count towards the school grade.

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

1. Building capacity in teachers to make content comprehensible for our ELL students. Enhance Instructional Strategies – teachers will focus on monitoring and accountable talk, minimizing teacher talk (flipped classroom approach), incorporating group projects/activities, scaffolding/chunking information and providing accountability for centers.
2. Ensure that students are being provided with the appropriate interventions and being presented with effective instructional strategies that aid in building foundational skills and vocabulary.
3. Closely monitor student data through quarterly data charts and reviewing teacher data charts.
4. Providing parents with interactive workshops that introduce the standards while

providing resources to support their children at home.

5. Ensuring that teachers are effectively implementing our school initiatives to narrow the gap and increase proficiency. These initiatives include centers that include acceleration/enrichment, trailing/current standards, writing/vocabulary, Thinking Maps across content area, Targeted Interventions, Kagan Strategies, Interactive Academic Vocabulary Walls and the implementation of effective ESOL strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Decrease Achievement Gap in ELA and Math
Rationale	In order to decrease the achievement gaps in ELA, teachers will plan using standards based lessons, utilize equitable classroom practices, differentiated instruction, and consistent student monitoring to adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students. In 2019, 39% of our Hispanic subgroup were on grade level in ELA while 49% of the Hispanic subgroup was on grade level in Math. In comparison to 2018, where 57% was on grade level in ELA and 62% was on grade level in Math.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, our Hispanic subgroup proficiency will increase from 39% to 49% in ELA. In math, our Hispanic subgroup proficiency will increase from 49% to 59%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dyanira Pena (dyanira.pena@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our CCT will effectively lead teachers to collaborate (e.g. sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional plans based on student data. Teachers will discuss best practices, share resources that maximize student learning, and focus on intentionally engaging students in vocabulary experiences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies were selected based on teacher observations, home surveys and student data. We reviewed teacher evaluations and the trends in our weekly trend walks to determine the teachers' needs. Professional Development is being offered based on the deficiencies being observed in the classroom. Parents have also voiced their need for additional support and resources on how to assist their children at home.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During collaborative planning, the coaches will assist with deconstructing the standards, locating resources, aligning activities to the standards and creating assessments. 2. Teachers will obtain feedback during Trend Walks and observations. 3. Teacher will monitor and track standard mastery with the use of student data chart. 4. The leadership team will meet quarterly with teachers to analyze individual student data and discuss success and deficiencies for our Hispanic population. 5. Students will be provided with common assessments, mini assessments, and diagnostics to demonstrate mastery of the various standards/skills. 6. The CCT will provide teachers with examples of simplified assignments, modified assignments and alternative assessments. 7. Teachers will be advised to strategically incorporate Acceleration strategies, thinking maps, and academic vocabulary in their lesson plans. 8. Parents will be involved in their child's learning by participating in Literacy Night. During Literacy Night, students will be provided with resources to support their children at home. Non-English speaking parents will receive resources in their native language.

9. Acceleration will be provided at our Saturday Academy and tutoring sessions.

Person Responsible Monica Ullrich (monica.ullrich@ocps.net)

#2

Title

Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to utilize literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts in all content areas.

Rationale

Research and current school data indicates that as teachers acquire knowledge and understanding of implementing literacy strategies and social and emotional learning strategies, students will benefit by obtaining a deeper understanding of complex texts. Students will be able to respond to complex texts with evidence based writing across all content areas.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

By June 2020, 55% of students at Millennia Elementary will demonstrate proficiency in the area of ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristi Weiss (kristi.weiss@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Cycle of Professional Learning related to academic discourse, connecting literacy strategies to writing, social and emotional learning, and writing with evidence in response to complex texts across all content areas will be implemented throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

In the 18-19 school year, ELA Achievement at Millennia Elementary School declined. Improvement is needed in learning gains and overall student achievement. Classroom Observation data from trend walks indicates that teachers are in need of Professional Development to implement research based literacy strategies in their classrooms.

Action Step

1. Teachers will participate in ROTATE- Reflect Observe Talk Action Teach Evaluate
2. Teachers will meet every quarter for data meetings and monitor/track standard mastery with the use of student data chart.
3. Teachers will implement literacy and social and emotional learning strategies and have students write with evidence in response to complex text across all content areas.
- 4 Teachers will implement strategies to increase academic discourse within the classroom.
5. Teacher will monitor the students' use of literacy strategies to deepen their understanding of content.
5. Teacher will receive Professional Development and coaching through the coaching cycle.

Description

Person Responsible Dyanira Pena (dyanira.pena@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Culturally Responsive Schools
Rationale	The diversity in our school continues to broaden. Enhancing our current practices using cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students will result in making learning more relevant and effective for them. It can also strengthen student connectedness with schools, and enhance learning. Establishing a culturally responsive school will also promote positive interpersonal relationships with parents and stakeholders, in addition to increasing parent engagement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The 2019-2020, Advance Ed Survey Parent school climate score will increase from 4.30 to 4.32, while the student 3-5 school climate score will increase by 3 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristi Weiss (kristi.weiss@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The school will continue to implement and revise the current PBS plan as necessary. Teachers will share instructional strategies for culturally responsive classrooms (e.g. cooperative learning, visual imagery, graphic representations). Teachers will also be provided with Professional Development to guide them on how to utilize these strategies in the classroom. The Parent Liaison will schedule informational sessions for our families and plan nightly events to make them an integral part of the teaching and learning process for student academic success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Focusing on building a culturally responsive school will have two critical attributes. The first attribute is the inclusion of students' languages, cultures, and daily experiences into academic and social context of school; and second, the explicit teaching of the dominant's culture's expectations, so that all children can fully participate (Zeichner, 2003).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School Wide PBS system. 2. Provide teachers with Professional Development on becoming culturally responsive teachers and creating a culturally responsive classroom. 3. Scheduling Parent workshops to educate to involve them in the teaching and learning process. 4. Providing our families with with resources to support their children at home in their native language. 5. Hosting events that embrace the different cultures at our school. 6. Mentoring program for our students needing additional support and guidance
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

N/A

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

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A Areas of Focus: Decrease Achievement Gap in ELA and Math	\$0.00
---	----------------------------------------------------------------	--------

2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to utilize literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts in all content areas.	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Culturally Responsive Schools	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00