

Orange County Public Schools

Catalina Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Catalina Elementary

2448 29TH ST, Orlando, FL 32805

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

Demographics

Principal: Seth Daub

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: D 2015-16: D 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Daub, Seth	Principal	
Austin, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Dolan, Meagan	Instructional Coach	
Ingram, William	Dean	
Walter-Noe, Mary	Guidance Counselor	
Martinez, Mayra	Instructional Coach	

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	83	122	121	159	110	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	32	33	30	28	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	1	4	11	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	24	3	4	11	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	50	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181

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	8	4	5	24	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	1	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	4	6	0	7	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	2	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	72	43	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	6	3	0	20	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	4	6	0	7	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	2	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	72	43	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	6	3	0	20	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	33%	57%	57%	33%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	58%	58%	44%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	53%	58%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	49%	63%	63%	43%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	62%	52%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	67%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	23%	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	83 (0)	122 (0)	121 (0)	159 (0)	110 (0)	107 (0)	702 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	32 (3)	33 (1)	30 (1)	28 (0)	26 (2)	16 (0)	165 (7)
One or more suspensions	1 (4)	4 (6)	11 (0)	6 (7)	5 (7)	7 (12)	34 (36)
Course failure in ELA or Math	24 (7)	3 (2)	4 (6)	11 (4)	1 (1)	3 (0)	46 (20)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	71 (72)	50 (43)	60 (40)	181 (155)

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	23%	55%	-32%	58%	-35%
	2018	36%	55%	-19%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	57%	-14%	58%	-15%
	2018	26%	54%	-28%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	23%	54%	-31%	56%	-33%
	2018	24%	55%	-31%	55%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
	2018	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	63%	-19%	64%	-20%
	2018	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
	2018	27%	59%	-32%	61%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	18%	54%	-36%	53%	-35%
	2018	29%	53%	-24%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	25	30	28	30	41	28	11				
ELL	27	46	53	46	59	71	13				
BLK	30	44	41	49	48	35	23				
HSP	35	54	62	49	54	77	19				
FRL	30	45	46	47	48	43	18				

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	45	53	23	58	75					
ELL	32	52	63	45	60	77					
BLK	31	41	59	41	52	68	36				
HSP	38	49		45	54		42				
FRL	32	46	57	42	52	64	37				

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	45
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43

Black/African American Students	
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	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
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

Based on the grade level data provided in the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the data component that performed the lowest was in the area of fifth grade Science. In the 2017-2018 school year, fifth grade students scored 29% in Science achievement. In the 2018-2019 school year, fifth grade students scored 18% in Science achievement, an 11% decrease. The data shows a decreasing trend among the fifth grade Science achievement for two consecutive years. In 2018-2019, fifth ELA was the lowest performing category. The contributing factors for low performing students is attendance, lack of support at home and mobility.

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

Based on the grade level data provided in FCIM, the data component that showed the greatest decline was in the area of third grade ELA achievement. In the 2017-2018 school year, third grade students scored 36% in ELA achievement. In the 2018-2019 school year, third grade students scored 23% in ELA achievement, a 17% decline from the previous year. The contributing factors for low performing students is attendance, lack of support at home and mobility.

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

Based on the grade level data provided in FCIM, the data component with the greatest gap for the 2017-2018 school year in comparison to the state average, was in the area of fifth grade ELA achievement. Fifth grade students at Catalina scored 27% in ELA achievement compared to the State average at 61% in ELA achievement, a gap of 34%. In the 2018-2019 school year, fifth grade students at Catalina scored 18% in Science achievement compared to the State average at 53% in Science achievement, a gap of 35%. There was an additional component with an equal achievement gap, third grade ELA. Third grade students at Catalina scored 23% in ELA achievement compared to the state average at 58%, a gap of 35%. The contributing factors for low performing students is attendance, lack of support at home and mobility.

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

Based on the grade level data provided in FCIM, the data component that showed the most improvement was in the area of fourth grade ELA achievement. In the 2017-2018 school year, fourth grade students scored 26% in ELA achievement. In the 2018-2019 school year, fourth grade students scored 43% in ELA achievement, a 17% increase from the previous year. The actions that supported the area of improvement is a collaborative school effort; collaborative planning sessions take place weekly with school-based coaches, administration conducted data meetings bi-weekly or monthly to discuss class and grade level data, iObservation feedback is provided by administration and school-based coaches, teachers are tiered based on the level of support needed and the Coaching Cycle is implemented, a Mentoring Program is implemented to support beginning teachers and new teachers to OCPS, iReady data is analyzed to make strategic educational decisions and create interventions groups for Tier II and Tier III support, After-School tutoring and Saturday school is offered to student in 3-5 grade students performing in the lowest quartile, and push-in or pull-out support is provided by the leadership team during extra hour instruction.

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

Reflecting on the Early Warning Signs data, the main area of concern is attendance. There is a high percentage of students that arrive tardy to school or are frequently absent. We have implemented students incentives as well as parent incentives for students arriving on time to school.

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

1. Student Achievement with a focus on learning gains with the lowest 25% performing students
2. Increase in reading and math proficiency
3. Increase in parent involvement
4. Building teacher capacity
5. Retention of teachers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Performing
Rationale	Based on the grade level data provided in the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the data component that performed the lowest was in the area of fifth grade Science. In the 2017-2018 school year, fifth grade students scored 29% in Science achievement. In the 2018-2019 school year, fifth grade students scored 18% in Science achievement, an 11% decrease. The data shows a decreasing trend among the fifth grade Science achievement for two consecutive years.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Catalina ES plans to increase 25% in Science achievement, from 23% to 35% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Seth Daub (seth.daub@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Helping Students Process New Content Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborative planning sessions with school-based coaches 2. Data meetings biweekly 3. Tiered teacher support 4. Coaching Cycle 5. Strategic plan for the lowest 25% performing students
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2

Title Greatest Decline

Rationale Based on the grade level data provided in FCIM, the data component that showed the greatest decline was in the area of third grade ELA achievement. In the 2017-2018 school year, third grade students scored 36% in ELA achievement. In the 2018-2019 school year, third grade students scored 23% in ELA achievement, a 17% decline from the previous year.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve Catalina ES plans to increase 25% in ELA in achievement, from 33% to 41% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Seth Daub (seth.daub@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Helping Students Revise Knowledge
Students make additions and deletions to revise previous knowledge and thinking processes in order to deepen understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Students' revision of knowledge enhances the development of declarative knowledge, allowing students to add to and sharpen their knowledge base.

Action Step

Description

1. Collaborative planning sessions with school-based coaches
2. Data meetings biweekly
3. Tiered teacher support
4. Coaching Cycle
5. Strategic plan for the lowest 25% performing students

Person Responsible Seth Daub (seth.daub@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)

The actions that supported the area of improvement is a collaborative school effort; collaborative planning sessions take place weekly with school-based coaches, administration conducted data meetings bi-weekly or monthly to discuss class and grade level data, iObservation feedback is provided by administration and school-based coaches, teachers are tiered based on the level of support needed and the Coaching Cycle is implemented, a Mentoring Program is implemented to support beginning teachers and new teachers to OCPS, iReady data is analyzed to make strategic educational decisions and create interventions groups for Tier II and Tier III support, After-School tutoring and

Saturday school is offered to student in 3-5 grade students performing in the lowest quartile, and push-in or pull-out support is provided by the leadership team during extra hour instruction.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

The school has a Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) will be coordinating all community-school events. The role of the PEL is to establish and improve effective communication between home and school, improve community outreach, and coordinate training opportunities for parents and families of students in grades Pre-K through 12 that will impact student academic performance. The PEL will conduct home visits, deliver parent workshops, gather and present detailed data pertaining to parent engagement activities, participate in parent/school leadership councils, establish communication with all parents, and create engagement opportunities for all parents. The PEL maintains regular contact with each business to invite them to School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA) meetings and monthly events. The businesses receive updates on student achievement.

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

In addition to our Guidance Counselor and Children and Family Place, our school supports students' social and/or emotional needs by providing a variety of programs such as Big Brother, Big Sister program, City Year mentoring, Safe Ambassadors Club, Child Safety Matters (Bullying and Abuse Prevention), and our PEL (Parent Engagement Liaison), which supports parent engagement. We also have The Love Pantry and The Colt Closet to support those in need.

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

Catalina's PEL will provide program information to preschools located in our attendance zone. In addition to providing flyers about primary literacy and parent nights, surrounding daycare providers are provided with kindergarten registration packets and invitations to "Kindergarten Round-up" for students entering school in 2019-2020.

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

Title I, Part A - The school team will collaborate to meet the needs of the whole child with regards to academic remediation, counseling, and psychological needs. Implementation school-wide of CHAMPS, a positive behavior support system. The After-School Tutoring (ATS) program for students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile is also funded.

Title I, Part C - Migrant - N/A

Title I, Part D - A partnership with the middle school in our feeder pattern continues to support fifth grade transitions.

Title III - Funding will allow us to provide teachers with specific strategies and resources for ELLs. Also providing funding for Saturday tutoring and bus transportation.

Title IX, Homeless - Basic hygiene supplies and clothing for students identified as homeless is provided. School supplies are collected and distributed to all students and food is provided as needed through the "Love Pantry."

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - SAI funds will be used to provide after-school tutoring for students performing in the lowest quartile. The ATS Program will start at 3:30 p.m. and end at 6:00 p.m.

Nutrition Programs - breakfast and lunch programs are provided to all students daily. The After-School Supper Program provides dinner for our after-school program.

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

Catalina promotes academic and career planning through district and school initiatives throughout the year. "Teach-In" brings in guests of various careers to speak with the students. Speakers focus on the necessary skills needed to be successful in a college or career environment. Field trips are aligned with core curriculum and college and career opportunities. The faculty, staff and students participate in "College Day" each week by wearing the t-shirt or jersey of their favorite college or university every Wednesday.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Lowest Performing	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Greatest Decline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00