Zellwood Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

https://zellwoodes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Carol Grimando

Start Date for this Principal: 12/31/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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	
* 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

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

https://zellwoodes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ward, Cecelia	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Support Staff Scheduling, Staff Evaluations, Discipline, Parental Concerns, Coverage for Absences, Title IX, Threat Assessment Team, Summer School Coordinator, Skycap, MAO Liaison, etc.
Cordero, Evelisse	School Counselor	Mental Health Designee, Threat Assessment Team Coordinator, SEDNET Contact, Homeless and Foster Care Contact, Individual and Group Counseling, Child Safety Matters Facilitator, etc.
Grimando, Caroll	Principal	Budget Management, Personnel Hiring, Staff Evaluations, Discipline, Parental Concerns, Data Analysis, Public Relations, Staff Management, Mentoring, Coaching, Facilities Management
Dozier, Jamie	Instructional Coach	Professional Development, PLC support, Deliberate Practice Support, Instructional Rounds, Teachers Induction, Parent Training, Orton-Gillingham Coordinator, Technology Problem Solving, etc.
Arkison, Bethany	Reading Coach	Whole Group and Small Group Coaching, Modeling Lessons, Data Analysis, Support Teachers with Lesson Planning, Tier III Small Group Support, HOUSE System Coordinator, Skyward and Canvas Support and PLC Guidance.
Jacovino, Barbara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing Coordinator, iReady Lead, Data Analysis, Professional Development, Title I Coordinator, Textbook Coordinator, Master Calendar Coordinator, CHAMPS Lead, Teach-In Coordinator, PLC Support
Vinson De La Cruz, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Whole Group and Small Group Math Support, Model Lessons, Data Analysis, Instructional Rounds, Professional Development, PLC Support
Ruvo, Anglea	Other	MTSS Coordinator, Tier III Interventions, Progress Monitoring, Data Analysis, Intervention Materials Management, SAC Chair, Threat Assessment Team member, etc.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 12/31/2020, Carol Grimando

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
49

Total number of students enrolled at the school
580

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	31	82	112	98	102	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	14	23	35	22	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/19/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	27	97	94	91	107	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	19	13	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	8	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	27	97	94	91	107	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	19	13	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	8	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	57%	57%	47%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	58%	58%	43%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	52%	53%	42%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	63%	63%	58%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				42%	61%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				20%	48%	51%	39%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	56%	53%	54%	55%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	63%	-13%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

English Language Arts- iReady Beginning, Middle, and End of year data
Mathematics- iReady Beginning, Middle, and End of year data
Science-PMA (Progress Monitoring Assessment)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	24%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	20%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	3%	19%	29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	21%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	19%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	23%	16%	27%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11%	25%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	16%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	22%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	4%	7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5%	13%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	8%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	33%
	English Language Learners	4%	4%	11%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	13%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	5%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	9%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3%	4%	15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	4%	11%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	14%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	4%	6%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	5%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2%	11%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	4%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	5%
	English Language Learners	0%	9%	9%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	13%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	7%	11%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%	18%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	10%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	6%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62%	55%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52%	39%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners	14%	0%	14%

Subgroup Data Review

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	12	35	31	20	29	25	12				
ELL	23	36	25	29	41		22				
BLK	40	35		30	33		29				
HSP	35	39	25	33	40	33	30				
WHT	55	44		58	54		63				
FRL	26	34	40	28	34	29	26				
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	19	52	52	23	33	17	15				
ELL	40	57	65	46	38	14	48				
BLK	32	47	50	32	40	17	38				
HSP	47	60	67	51	40	17	51				
WHT	67	57	60	65	45		78				
FRL	41	55	65	45	40	19	51				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	40	40	36	50	64					
ELL	38	37	35	51	46	37	36				
BLK	28	47		51	50	40	47				
HSP	43	33	26	55	46	34	48				
WHT	63	60		66	60		67				
FRL	42	38	41	55	51	39	46				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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 students in the bottom 25% continue to score low for learning gains in the area of Math. This is a four year trend. Math proficiency levels decreased fourteen percentage points. In the area of Reading, the students proficiency level decreased eleven percentage points, the learning gains decreased twenty-three percentage points and the bottom 25% decreased thirty-four percentage points.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest decline is in both ELA and Math proficiency levels and the ELA bottom 25% learning gains. ELA proficiency decreased eleven percentage points and Math decreased fourteen percentage points. The bottom 25% in ELA decreased thirty-four percentage points.

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

Aside from the pandemic and students moving in and out of face to face and virtual instruction, many students and teachers were quarantined and there was inconsistent instruction. There are also a significant amount of children who are missing foundational reading skills who struggle with decoding the text on the FSA. Further, the teachers did not have allotted time in their schedule for Math intervention. Also, teachers were not making time in the math block to pull small groups. To mitigate this, the Math Coach will work side by side with the teachers to assist them with managing their time and to ensure that teachers are working with students in small groups on targeted areas of deficit. Interventionists will assist teachers in the classroom to work with at-risk students and assist in closing the achievement gap.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The students in the bottom 25% in the area of Math increased by one percentage point (20 percent to 21 percent).

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

The school developed a Friday "Morning Math Blitz" where the students worked on Reflex Math and charted their success. It is believed that the consistent use of this program helped improve computations skills.

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

The teachers will utilize the Math Intervention block to ensure the students in the bottom 25% are making learning gains by filling gaps in learning and helping them better understand and practice grade level concepts. Also, they will structure the whole group block to allow for differentiation and ensure individual students' needs are being addressed daily.

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.

Our schoolwide professional development calendar will consist of reviewing the Scope and Sequence of ELA, the ELA framework and the newly adopted district resource, WONDERS. Teachers are also being trained in Orton Gillingham, engagement strategies and effective best practices for small group reading. For math professional development, staff is being trained in the proper use of the Math Framework, Math Intervention materials including Number Worlds and Math Boot Camp and effective utilization of math manipulatives.

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

Skilled coaches, with proven track records, have been hired to support professional development, model lessons, support lesson planning, enhance student engagement and increase teacher capacity. Skilled interventionists will support the most fragile students in each grade level and work to close learning gaps for these students through small group, targeted remediation and acceleration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 FSA ELA data, 40 percent of our students scored proficiency with only 35 percent making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Our students will increase proficiency in Reading from 40% to 50% on the FSA. Also, the students in the bottom 25% will increase from 29% to 50% on the FSA.
Monitoring:	i-Ready data from BOY to Moy to EOY will be used as a progress monitoring tool. Additionally, Unit Summatives will be used for monitoring acquisition of the standards. Orton-Gillingham assessments will be used in the primary grades for additional progress monitoring. DIBELS will be used for tracking progression of fluency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership Team members will coordinate data analysis with grade level PLCs, Tier 1 interventionists, and members of the school coaching team. Information from the data analysis will be used to drive instructional practice, including reteaching and reassessment efforts, targeted intervention and to provide actionable instructional practice feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected as there is an evident need for improvement of Tier 1 standards-based instruction as well as increasing teacher capacity in order to effectively respond to data and make informed instructional decisions that will positively impact student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

The addition of a dedicated ELA Coach and a part-time Instructional Coach will help support teachers through modeling lessons/strategies/skills, reviewing data and providing feedback to teachers to improve upon the skills and strategies necessary to drive small group instruction. The coaching cycle will be used with fidelity to identify areas of focus, analyze and collect data, provide actionable feedback and time for reflection. Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized and data analysis will help monitor the effectiveness of the instructional practice.

Person Responsible	Bethany Arkison (bethany.arkison@ocps.net)

Conduct Professional Development in Orton-Gillingham, Wonders, Kagan and B.E.S.T. Standards in order to have students reach academic proficiency in ELA. Coaches, Kindergarten and First Grade teachers will receive Orton-Gillingham training to help address the foundational skills in phonics and phonological awareness with students. This will allow the teachers and coaches to collaborate and address the student areas of need in a systematic manner.

Person Responsible	Bethany Arkison (bethany.arkison@ocps.net)

Utilize the Media Specialist to support the Wonders curriculum and standards, provide media lessons and develop a reading incentive program.

Person Responsible	Barbara Jacovino (barbara.jacovino@ocps.net)

The addition of grade level "Tier I Interventionists" will allow for additional small group support for students who fall within our low performing ESSA sub-groups. Tier 1 interventionists will provide differentiated

reading instruction, skills remediation and pre-teaching that aligns with the standards to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Math FSA, only 38% our our students scored proficiency with only 38% making learning gains. Also, only 21% of the student in the bottom 25% made learning gains; one percentage point above 2018-2019.
Measurable Outcome:	Our students will increase proficiency in Math from 38% to 50% on the FSA. Additionally, the Bottom 25% will increase from 21% to 50% on the FSA.
Monitoring:	i-Ready data from the BOY, MOY and EOY will be utilized to progress monitor math performance. Unit summative assessments will also be used to measure progress toward acquisition of grade level standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership team members will coordinate data analysis with grade level PLCs, Tier 1 interventionists and members of the school coaching team. Information from the data analysis will be used to drive instructional practice, including reteaching and reassessment efforts, targeted intervention and to provide actionable instructional practice feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected as there is an evident need for improvement of Tier 1 standards-based instruction. There is also a need to increase teacher capacity in order to effectively respond to data and make informed instructional decisions that will positively impact student achievement. With the addition of mandatory math intervention into the master schedule, there will be a need to ensure this is happening daily, with fidelity and that teachers are intentionally planning for this time. We must also ensure that all Math teachers are effectively making use of manipulatives to ensure math concepts are comprehensible and students can successfully problem solve.

Action Steps to Implement

The addition of a part-time Math Coach and part-time Instructional Coach, will allow teachers to participate in coaching cycles, observe coaches deliver classroom lessons and learn new instructional strategies to implement during their math block. The coaches will assist the teachers with data analysis in order to make instructional adjustments and plan for differentiated Math interventions.

Person Responsible	Rachel Vinson De La Cruz (rachel.vinsondelacruz@ocps.net)

The addition of grade level "Tier I Interventionists" will allow for additional small group support for students who fall within our low performing ESSA sub-groups. These Interventionists will work closely with grade-level Math teachers to ensure whole group instruction is comprehensible for these targeted students and that manipulatives are used daily in order to ensure acquisition of the standards. Pre-teaching of academic vocabulary and upcoming content will accelerate their learning.

Person Responsible	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

Administration and Coaches will work closely with teachers to design effective use of the shortened Math block and the addition of the formal "Math Intervention" time in order to maximize opportunities for differentiated instruction and targeted remediation. Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized and data analysis will help monitor the effectiveness of the instructional practice.

Person Responsible	Rachel Vinson De La Cruz (rachel.vinsondelacruz@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) provides a foundation for safe and positive learning, and enhances students' ability to succeed in schools, careers and life. Through CASEL's Five Competencies, students will learn the skills to be successful.
Measurable Outcome:	To measure the effectiveness of the Social Emotional instruction at Zellwood Elementary, we will look at the number of discipline referrals and "high flyers" from the school year 2020-2021. With the implementation of the Second Step program in every classroom and the creation of the "House System", we will see a decrease in referral numbers and high flyers. We will also see an increase in Panorama Data to a 70% on Social Awareness.
Monitoring:	Monitoring of referrals, threat assessment data and Panorama and school-generated survey data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Second Step is a research-based program that will help teachers provide SEL lessons through a variety of engaging and structured lessons delivered during their Health block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating a "House System" will promote a positive climate and culture while bringing a sense of community and fellowship. It will also increase students' feelings of connectedness and school pride. Providing targeted SEL lessons as well as implementing daily SEL classroom practices. It will increase students' ability to express their emotions and problem solve in socially-acceptable ways. Working to build relationships with students who are frequently referred for disciplinary action will minimize time spent out of the classroom. These students will be taught coping skills and have opportunities to practice more socially appropriate responses to frustration and anger.

Action Steps to Implement

The House System - The students will be randomly placed in one of five houses ("nests") that represent positive character traits. The nests are named in such a way that they incorporate a variety of cultures representing the school's diverse population. Utilization of the House System will build a sense of community and pride while increasing social awareness and relationship skills.

Person Responsible	Bethany Arkison (bethany.arkison@ocps.net)

Promote "Ohana Program" to encourage kindness and inclusivity as well as social-awareness. The "Ohana Means Family" Awards will be rewarded on a monthly basis. One student per classroom will be selected and recognized based on the character trait of the month. The Ohana Program will develop students' self-awareness, self-management as well as responsible decision-making.

Person Responsible	Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

Ensure classroom SEL practices are put into place including morning meetings, journaling, calming techniques, etc...Implement classroom SEL lessons through the use of the Second Step program, that will be provided by the district. Implement small group guidance lessons and individual counseling.

Person Responsible	Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

Implement targeted mentoring program (Starfish Program) of behavioral "high-flyers", including check ins and outs, individual point sheets and positive reinforcement strategies. This will assist our most behaviorally fragile students to develop greater self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, decision-making and relationship-skills.

Person Responsible Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When looking at discipline data on the SafeSchoolsforAlex website, Zellwood is ranked "high" for discipline incidents, ranking 1,075 out of 1395 elementary schools for safety. There were 8 violent incidents for the year. Students need to be taught alternative ways to express frustration and anger in a more socially acceptable manner rather than reacting with physical aggression. SEL strategies including class meetings, journaling, role playing and character building activities, together with consistent SEL lessons will build the social/emotional capacity of students. Establishing a "mentoring program" will also support the most behaviorally at-risk student while forming crucial and meaningful adult connections.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Zellwood will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, Zellwood will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from our school, which includes our guidance counselor, principal, one primary teacher, one intermediate teacher and one special area teacher, will attend district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team will work with a broader school team and will be charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families,

based on school and community needs. The school Leadership Team will collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Our school will strategically utilize our Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) as well as other key Leadership Team members to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources and build a culture for authentic family engagement.

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

School staff, parents, students and community members are all stakeholders responsible for promoting a positive culture and environment at Zellwood. School staff will develop positive relationships with all other stakeholders, set consistent expectations for school-wide behavior, build personal relationships with students based on trust and understanding while providing a safe and inclusive atmosphere for learning. Parents will be treated as educational "partners" and their involvement will be solicited and welcomed. Parents will be provided tools through workshops and weekly communications so they can better support their children educationally. Students will be encouraged to meet high behavioral expectations, learn self-management strategies and be active participants in their own academic and social development. Community partners will support the school's efforts by providing incentives and rewards to be used with staff and students to promote a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$420,759.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	General Fund		$77,138.00
			Notes: Resource Teacher - ELA			
	5100		0461 - Zellwood Elementary			$12,000.00
			Notes: Orton Gillingham Training and Resources			
	5100	100-Salaries	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	General Fund		$293,052.00
			Notes: Tier I Interventionists (4)			
	5100	100-Salaries	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	General Fund		$38,569.00
			Notes: 1/2 Instructional Coach			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	General Fund		$0.00
			Notes: WONDERS, Curriculum (Textbooks)			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$66,469.67
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	General Fund		$38,569.00
			Notes: Resource Teacher - Math Instructional Coach Tier 1 Interventionists			
		239-Other	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	Title, I Part A		$20,734.72
			Notes: Number World Materials			

		239-Other	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	Title, I Part A		$7,165.95
			Notes: J & J Math Boot Camp Materials			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$487,228.67**