

Orange County Public Schools

Mollie Ray Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mollie Ray Elementary

2000 BEECHER ST, Orlando, FL 32808

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

Demographics

Principal: Nathaniel Stephens

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI

* 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mollie Ray Elementary

2000 BEECHER ST, Orlando, FL 32808

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">98%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stephens, Nate	Principal	<p>Dr. Stephens provides the vision for the school to ensure high academic achievement is attained for all students. He implements and evaluates programs within the school to ensure that the achievement gap is closing among subgroups. As an administrator, he performs classroom observations to manage and support alignment for student learning. Additionally, actionable feedback is provided to the teachers for improvement of instruction. He holds weekly Professional Learning Community meetings at each grade levels with the instructional team members and the support coaches to discuss standards-based instruction, Tier I and Tier II interventions along with enrichment lessons for students who are working above grade level. All discussions are focused toward increasing student achievement through fostering a growth mindset. Dr. Stephens coordinates the operation and management of all school functions, community relations, and school budget in compliance with district policies. He also participates in the School Advisory Council (SAC).</p>
	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal (AP) is responsible for assisting the principal with carrying out the school's vision and mission. Her role as an instructional leader includes the collection and analysis of data and supervisory support of all grade levels with an intense focus on the primary levels grades K-2. She facilitates common planning and data meetings and provides instructional resources for teachers K-2. She conducts classroom observations and provides feedback and support to teachers on instructional practices and classroom interventions.</p>
Fedrick, Laquanda	Instructional Coach	<p>Ms. Fedrick supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the B.E.S.T Standards. She supports school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as the ELA instructional coach, and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. Ms.Fedrick conducts curriculum materials inventory, assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices, and monitors the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. She oversees and monitors the reading assessments and student data. She supports and monitors Professional Learning Communities for ELA and coordinates the reading diagnostic assessment schedules. She also provides guidance for curriculum and instruction in other content areas such as science and math.</p>
Cooper, Shalanda	Dean	<p>Ms. Cooper supports student supervision and school-wide discipline. She maintains appropriate records related to discipline referrals and supports the implementation of CHAMPS, which is the school-wide behavior initiative. Ms. Cooper assists the general education teachers in developing positive behavior plans by implementing strategies that conform to CHAMPS expectations.</p>
Murray, Regina	Math Coach	<p>Ms. Murray supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the B.E.S.T. Standards. She facilitates school curriculum planning and implementation of</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Constant, Deborah	Behavior Specialist	<p>curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as an instructional coach, conducts curriculum materials inventory, and coordinates mathematics programs and initiatives. Ms. Murray assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices and the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. Additionally, Ms. Murray infuses strategies for curriculum and instruction in other content areas such as ELA and science.</p> <p>Ms. Constant is responsible for establishing, coordinating, and monitoring functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans for Exceptional Student Education students. Ms. Constant is responsible for coaching and directing teachers in best learning practices and supporting school progress monitoring programs.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/1/2021, Nathaniel Stephens

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

445

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	18	75	73	90	66	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384
Attendance below 90 percent	6	41	73	44	21	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	10	32	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

Monday 6/27/2022

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	62	54	62	48	76	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	362
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	0	16	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	17	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	2	0	0	17	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	62	54	62	48	76	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	362
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	0	16	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	17	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	2	0	0	17	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	26%	56%	56%				28%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						48%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						48%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	46%	50%				58%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						56%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	23%	61%	59%				41%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	20%	55%	-35%	58%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	63%	6%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD		24	27	22	64						
ELL	29	37		58	84		31				
BLK	24	47	38	48	70	62	22				
HSP	38	39		68	89		31				
FRL	27	44	36	50	73	64	22				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	6	11		15	22	30	23				
ELL	22	45		48	55		40				
BLK	15	31	46	30	28	37	29				
HSP	29			55							
FRL	18	31	40	35	29	32	35				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	7	46	48	30	43	36	7				
ELL	22	56	62	67	67	80	35				
BLK	25	43	42	55	54	35	43				
HSP	39	70		70	65		33				
FRL	30	49	44	58	53	36	40				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

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

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
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	44
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
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The first trend that emerges across grade levels is a slight increase in ELA performance in our intermediate grade levels as evidenced on i-Ready end-of-year assessments (EOY). Our 2021-2022 EOY results revealed 30% proficiency in ELA, whereas our 2020-2021 results revealed 21% proficiency. Conversely, our primary grades decreased their ELA achievement levels from 49% to 45% on the EOY assessments.

The second trend that emerges across grade levels is a slight increase in math performance in our intermediate grade levels as evidenced on i-Ready end-of-year assessments (EOY). Our 2021-2022 EOY results revealed 43% proficiency in math, whereas our 2019-2020 results revealed 37% proficiency. Conversely, our primary grades decreased their math achievement levels from 47% to 40% on the EOY assessments.

When comparing i-Ready assessment scores to the 2022 FSA outcomes, our ELA scores showed slight underperformance. Our overall ELA FSA score was 26%. When disaggregated by grade level the results revealed 31%, 29%, and 22% in grades 3-5 respectively.

When comparing i-Ready assessment scores to the 2022 FSA outcomes, our math scores increased significantly over both i-Ready EOY and 2021 FSA scores. Our overall math FSA score was 52%. When disaggregated by grade level the results revealed 53%, 52%, and 42% in grades 3-5 respectively.

Our ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWDs), indicates a significant lag when compared to their peers. In ELA, the EOY diagnostic indicated 0% proficiency. In Math, the EOY diagnostic indicated 0% proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Using 2022 FSA data as a barometer, ELA, science, and the students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup represent the areas of greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

In ELA, science, and the students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup, there was a significant loss of learning that needed to be overcome. One of the primary contributing factors to the underperformance was the extended time required for students and teachers to assimilate back into the school building after working in virtual and hybrid environments. We were also staffed with teachers with limited capacity and efficacy.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders includes professional development focused on the high-quality instructional materials that will be available to students. In addition, professional development will focus on supporting teachers as they prepare their lessons so they will have a deep understanding of the content and are able to effectively deliver it to

students. Through common planning, coaches will model lessons, discuss engagement strategies, and clarify misconceptions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area that showed the most improvement as evidenced on the 2022 FSA was math.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement include, but is not limited to, strategic student groupings and utilization of additional instructional resource personnel with strong math content knowledge.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning in the upcoming school year, an intense focus will be placed on ensuring the learning acceleration model is implemented during the extended hour of the school day. Students will have access to high-quality instructional materials that are aligned to the standards. Teachers will integrate lessons using priority standards to provide an appropriate balance of fluency, conceptual understanding, and hands-on practice. Additionally, Tier 1 interventionists will push in to classrooms providing additional support in ELA and Math. The framework for this support consists of the lead teacher providing grade level instruction to half of the class, while the Tier 1 teacher provides the trailing standard to the second half of the class. At prescribed intervals, the groups will rotate. Diagnostic and common assessment data will be used to determine acceleration groupings and resources. Instructional resources that will be utilized include but are not limited to i-Ready scaffolded lessons. For these strategies to work effectively, all teachers will require professional development focused on acceleration practices.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided to teachers, over the course of the school year, will be based on standards-aligned instruction and Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports Framework. While these overarching topics are broad, the following are some of the titles of the professional development opportunities:

- Implementing and Deconstructing K-5 ELA and Math B.E.S.T Standards
- Behind the Science of Science
- Taking a Deeper Dive Into the MTSS Process
- Whole Group and Small Group Framework (all content areas)
- Providing Targeted Support for ESE Population
- Overview of the Instructional Framework (Leading Standards-based Instruction)

Increasing student achievement within subgroups and data analysis will also be embedded into the professional learning repertoire.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Supplemental academic services will be provided before and after school through the acceleration model where students will have pre-exposure to core grade level standards. Structures have been established for acceleration to occur in every content area including the extended learning opportunity through the additional hour for reading. Scholars will receive core instruction on current standards from the teacher of record and also receive instruction on new standards with an interventionist.

Based on data, tutors will be providing strategic small group instruction to students in need of Tier II or Tier III support outside of the core instruction. Mollie Ray Elementary School will participate in the Caring School Community program. Caring School Community is a comprehensive, research-based social and emotional learning (SEL) program that builds school-wide community, develops students' social skills and SEL competencies, and enables a transformative stance on discipline. Additionally, differentiated and tiered coaching support will be provided to teachers based on classroom data and observational trends. Instructional trend feedback from administration will be given to teachers in need of Tier II or Tier III support on a bi-weekly basis.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teachers have limited knowledge and experience with applying research-based instructional strategies using the Florida B.E.S.T Standards. We will use research-based instructional strategies, and the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards to collaboratively plan, deliver, and monitor lessons for all tiers of instruction to increase student proficiency on state assessments. Teacher collaboration and modeling, with support from a school-based and/or district coaches, will strengthen teachers' understanding and instructional delivery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June 2023, we expect to see 50% of students meeting grade level proficiency in both ELA and math as evidenced on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.).

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School-based leadership team members, in collaboration with district personnel, will conduct classroom observations to determine if core instruction and student artifacts meet the full intent of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Additionally, teachers will be provided with immediate feedback via conferences, email, and iObservation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional development on the topics of standards-based instruction and authentic engagement strategies will be provided to teachers to increase their pedagogy throughout the school year. Professional development will be presented in workshops, facilitated common planning and during the coaching cycle.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for

i-Ready EOY student data indicates 38% of KG - 5th grade students are proficient in reading and 41% are proficient in math. Classroom observation data indicates teachers need additional support implementing pedagogical practices to include collaboration activities that would engage students during instruction.

selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify and tier teachers in need of support: Leadership team will discuss all teachers to determine unique strengths, weaknesses, tier level, and areas of focus. Once teachers' areas of need are identified, coaches will implement the coaching cycle. Teachers are supported through PLCs, modeling, and co-teaching.

Person Responsible Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Teachers requiring additional support will participate in the coaching cycle with a resource teacher. The resource teacher will document the strategies that are being implemented with the teacher and the progress of the coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Laquanda Fedrick (laquanda.fedrick@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teachers require additional support and guidance with closing the achievement gap. Our aim is to raise teacher awareness around the notions that learning is not linear and students progress at different paces. Furthermore, research tells us that differentiated active learning promotes faster growth than passive learning.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June 2023, learning gains for all students will meet or exceed 60% in all content areas.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School-based leadership and district team members will monitor the implementation and execution of differentiation practices by way of classroom observations. Effective implementation will be measured utilizing progress monitoring data from i-Ready, F.A.S.T., and classroom common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will be provided professional development centered on effective differentiation practices. School-based leadership and district resource teams will conduct classroom observations looking for successful transfer of professional development to practice. The trends derived from the observations will inform future professional development offerings, as well as provide evidence of where additional support is required.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In ELA, learning gains did not meet the 60% goal that was established for the school year. This is also true for our students in the lowest quartile. Furthermore, our ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities (SWD), had no students meet proficiency in ELA or math.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Development Focused on Differentiation: We will provide professional development for all teachers on effective differentiation strategies.

Person Responsible Laquanda Fedrick (laquanda.fedrick@ocps.net)

School-based coaches and administrators will conduct classroom observations looking for the transfer of knowledge to practice. Where necessary, teachers will be provided with side-by-side coaching and

modeling. Content area coaches will identify model classrooms and develop observation schedules that allow teachers to view their colleagues implementing effective practices.

Person Responsible Laquanda Fedrick (laquanda.fedrick@ocps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The instructional practice specifically relating to ELA that will be the area of focus for grades K-2 is small group instruction. Small group instruction provides opportunities for flexible and differentiated learning. With the smaller number of students, students have more chances to participate. Teachers are able to monitor the students better, thus providing better and more individualized feedback and support. Our 2021-2022 primary grades i-Ready end-of-year diagnostic results revealed 45% proficiency in ELA, whereas our 2020-2021 results revealed 49% proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The instructional practice specifically relating to ELA that will be the area of focus for grades 3-5 is differentiated instruction. The first trend that emerges across grade levels is a slight increase in ELA performance in our intermediate grade levels as evidenced on i-Ready end-of-year assessments (EOY). Our 2021-2022 EOY results revealed 30% proficiency in ELA, whereas our 2020-2021 results revealed 21% proficiency. The second trend that emerges across grades 3-5 is with our ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWDs). Data indicates a significant lag when compared to their peers. In ELA, the EOY diagnostic indicated 0% proficiency.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, we expect to see 50% of K-2 students meeting grade level proficiency in ELA as evidenced on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) progress monitoring tool.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, we expect to see 50% of 3-5 students meeting grade level proficiency in ELA as evidenced on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.).

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

School-based leadership team members, in collaboration with district personnel, will conduct classroom observations to determine if core instruction, small group instruction and student artifacts meet the full intent of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Effective implementation will be measured utilizing progress monitoring data from i-Ready, F.A.S.T., and classroom common assessments. Additionally, teachers will be provided with immediate feedback via conferences, email, and iObservation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stephens, Nate, nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based practices that will be implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in grades K-2 include but are not limited to, targeted small group instruction, professional development, modeling and co-teaching.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Teachers have limited knowledge and experience with applying research-based instructional strategies using the Florida B.E.S.T Standards. We will use research-based instructional strategies, and the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards to collaboratively plan, deliver, and monitor lessons for all tiers of instruction to increase student proficiency on state assessments. Teacher collaboration and modeling, with support from a school-based and/or district coaches, will strengthen teachers' understanding and instructional delivery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Additionally, teachers require additional support and guidance with closing the achievement gap. Our aim is to raise teacher awareness around the notions that learning is not linear and students progress at different paces. Furthermore, research tells us that differentiated active learning promotes faster growth than passive learning.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Teachers will attend PLCs three times per week to go over details of upcoming lessons, plan text-based and benchmark-based questions, and plan for student responses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made. - Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content. - Assessment - Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and make adjustments to future lessons. EOY and FSA data are being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the groups as changes are being made in the data. - Professional Learning - Available in SIPPS, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. Benchmarks. 	<p>Stephens, Nate, nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net</p>
<p>MTSS process will be structured as students are properly placed in fluid Tiers based on their needs. Extra hour of reading will be used to provide additional, differentiated instruction 4 times per week in fluid, homogeneous, student groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literacy Leadership - The Leadership Team will monitor Functional Basic Skills (FBS), Extra Hour Instruction and Small Group Instruction by utilizing classroom walkthroughs. - Literacy Coaching - Lessons for small group instruction will be addressed during the PLC process. - Assessment - Assessment information gathered from FBS, Extra Hour Instruction and Small Group Instruction will be utilized to make adjustments to the student groups. - Professional Learning - Training opportunities in SIPP, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. standards will be available. 	<p>Stephens, Nate, nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net</p>

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Mollie Ray Elementary strives to cultivate a positive school culture and environment by ensuring all stakeholders are informed and involved in school decisions. Mollie Ray seeks to be a welcoming place for all students and their families. Numerous opportunities are provided for parents and families to be involved and engaged in their child's education. Curriculum nights, as well as School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings are held monthly. Parents are encouraged to attend these workshops and activities to receive information about curriculum, testing, and strategies to use at home to help their child succeed.

At the start of each school year, Mollie Ray welcomes parents and families to our school through a variety of programs. During the summer, a kindergarten orientation is conducted to introduce families to the school, kindergarten curriculum and requirements. Kindergarten parents are also given a first day of school breakfast where they receive additional information pertaining to the school year. All parents are invited to join their child(ren) on campus during "Meet the Family" and "Open House" to familiarize themselves with school initiatives and procedures.

To keep stakeholders abreast of school information, communication is provided through the school's website, newsletters, ConnectED messages, ClassDojo messages and posts, flyers, and social media.

The Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL), in collaboration with the school faculty and staff, works closely with parents to assist with strategies when working at home with students.

Counseling and mentoring services are provided to students to help support their social emotional needs. The guidance counselor provides counseling services to small groups and individual students. A full-time ALPHA counselor is on campus to support the social-emotional needs of students in kindergarten and first grade. Referrals for mental health counseling to outside agencies are provided when necessary. A mentoring group for boys and girls will be provided during the upcoming school year.

This year we will implement the inaugural Lion University (LU). Lion University, modeled after the Flamboyan Foundation's Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) initiative, is grounded in the notion that schools can thrive when families and teachers work together, as genuine partners, to maximize student learning inside and outside of school. The approach is research-based and aligns grade-level learning concepts, student performance data, and family-teacher communication and collaboration.

The implementation of LU is also a direct response to our Panorama data that revealed our parents' desire to be more involved academically. As such, our primary goal is to supplement and elevate the efforts of traditional parent conferences by expanding opportunities for families and teachers to collaborate. The format will create systematic pathways for teachers to share grade-level information, tools, and strategies that families can apply at home and in the community to accelerate student learning. Lion University also forces our school to take responsibility for engaging in collaborative processes that build strong relationships with their students' families and to empower those families to make concrete contributions to student growth and achievement.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. All parents, students, faculty and staff, and the community will work together to create a culture of social and emotional learning at Mollie Ray Elementary. Faculty and staff will encourage and support students throughout the day. Building relationships with students will be a big initiative in an effort to cultivate strong bonds. Community members will be actively pursued and encouraged to support appropriate school functions. 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.