

Orange County Public Schools

Little River Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Little River Elementary

100 CASWELL DR, Orlando, FL 32825

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

Demographics

Principal: Tracey Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

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)	100%
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Little River Elementary

100 CASWELL DR, Orlando, FL 32825

<https://littleriveres.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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

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 our families and 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
Gibson, Tracey	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement to include the 5th year of implementation of District Professional Learning Communities -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups -Assists in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings -Monitors the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions -Implements the processes for academic instruction and monitoring for ESE and ELL student groups as part of the ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement
Oleson, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develops documents to monitor data and address areas of need. - Ensures implementation of DPLC cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. - Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. - Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. - Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.
Walters-Phillips, Barbara	Science Coach	<p>The instructional coach will provide guidance, support, mentoring, and modeling of rigorous K-5 instruction aligned to the depth of knowledge of the Florida Standards in math and science. The coach will partner with teachers to create lesson plans and common assessments as well as facilitate the collection and analysis of data of student learning. Furthermore, the instructional coach will provide professional development on math and science content and strategies. The coach will also work with new teachers to the county and to the profession to provide individualized coaching and mentoring.</p>
Johnson, Tiffany	Staffing Specialist	<p>Duties and responsibilities to include conducting staffing meetings, initial evaluations, and re-evaluations for exceptional educational students. In addition, screening for gifted students. Also, meeting and coordinating with all teachers both school based and district based, to schedule and ensure that</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>IEP's are being followed. Participates in student data collection, monitors the implementation of all 504 plans and collaborates with general education teachers to ensure SWD are receiving differentiated and rigorous instruction.</p>
Schofield, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates and supports data collection activities -Monitor Students With Disabilities Data as part of the ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement -Monitor English Language Learner Students Data as part of the ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP -Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP -Ensure practices are in place for the best practices in inclusive education
Richards, Erin	School Counselor	<p>Works directly with the student population to support, monitor and guide students using social and emotional learning programs. Supports teachers and students who may need assistance with behavioral structures and facilitate support groups, Provides staff with professional development related to working with students, monitors student data and classroom performance. Holds Threat Assessment meetings. Member of the SELL school team.</p>
Stanton, Merrill	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach will provide guidance, support, mentoring, and modeling of rigorous K-5 instruction aligned to the depth of knowledge of the Florida Standards in ELA for 3rd-5th grade and new BEST Standards in K-2. The coach will partner with teachers to create lesson plans and common assessments as well as facilitate the collection and analysis of data of student learning. Furthermore, the instructional coach will provide professional development on deconstructing standards, the instructional framework, and DPLC initiatives. The coach will also work with new teachers to the county and to the profession to provide individualized coaching and mentoring.</p>
Martinez, Margie	ELL Compliance Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides support and assistance to teachers on ELL strategies and compliance - Supports implementation of the DUAL Language program in our select K-2 classrooms - Provides Professional Development to support MTSS implementation of Tier 1, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans - Facilitates grade level meetings focusing on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning through intervention and enrichment strategies - Identifies systematic patterns of student needs with teachers to incorporate appropriate and evidence based intervention strategies

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Tracey Gibson

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

396

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

1

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

14

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	24	73	47	69	72	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	6	19	13	13	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	6	16	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	2	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/22/2021

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	35	51	66	73	79	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	13	17	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
-----------------------------	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
--	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	2	3	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	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	35	51	66	73	79	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	13	17	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	3	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	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				46%	57%	57%	57%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	58%	58%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	53%	31%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	63%	63%	62%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				35%	61%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	48%	51%	38%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	56%	53%	52%	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	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	57%	-30%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready K-5 for ELA and Math
 PMA Data for 5th Grade Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/49 24%	12/49 24%	16/48 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/37 22%	9/37 24%	12/37 32%
	Students With Disabilities	0/2 0%	0/2 0%	0/2 0%
	English Language Learners	2/8 25%	0/8 0%	0/8 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/49 12%	5/49 10%	14/48 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/37 11%	3/37 8%	8/37 22%
	Students With Disabilities	0/2 0%	0/2 0%	1/2 50%
	English Language Learners	1/8 13%	0/8 0%	1/8 13%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/61 20%	17/64 27%	25/67 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/42 14%	6/43 14%	14/45 31%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7 0%	0/7 0%	0/7 0%
	English Language Learners	2/15 13%	2/16 13%	2/16 13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/61 10%	13/64 20%	21/66 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/42 10%	5/43 12%	11/45 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0/7 0%	0/7 0%	0/7 0%
	English Language Learners	2/15 13%	1/16 6%	1/16 6%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11/66 17%	19/68 28%	18/69 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/51 14%	13/53 25%	12/54 22%
	Students With Disabilities	0/10 0%	0/10 0%	1/10 10%
	English Language Learners	1/19 5%	2/19 11%	3/20 15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/64 6%	9/68 13%	10/69 14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/49 0%	6/53 11%	5/54 9%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10 10%	0/10 0%	0/10 0%
	English Language Learners	1/19 5%	0/19 0%	2/20 10%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/68 12%	15/71 21%	17/70 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/51 8%	9/53 17%	9/54 17%
	Students With Disabilities	0/14 0%	0/14 0%	0/14 0%
	English Language Learners	2/18 11%	2/18 11%	1/18 6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/68 6%	4/71 6%	16/70 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/51 6%	3/53 6%	11/54 20%
	Students With Disabilities	0/14 0%	0/14 0%	0/14 0%
	English Language Learners	0/18 0%	0/18 0%	3/18 17%

Grade 5				
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/52 8%	7/55 13%	11/56 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/37 0%	3/38 8%	4/38 11%
	Students With Disabilities	0/5 0%	0/5 0%	0/5 0%
	English Language Learners	0/21 0%	0/22 0%	1/22 5%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	0/52 0%	6/54 11%	12/56 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/37 0%	1/37 3%	6/38 16%
	Students With Disabilities	0/5 0%	0/5 0%	0/5 0%
	English Language Learners	0/21 0%	1/22 5%	2/22 9%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Science	All Students	18/56 32%	21/56 38%	24/57 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/38 18%	10/36 28%	10/35 29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/3 0%	0/4 0%	0/4 0%
	English Language Learners	3/20 15%	4/22 18%	6/22 27%

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	4			4							
ELL	28	35		28	35		24				
BLK	46			26							
HSP	40	42		41	46	30	34				
FRL	37	38	45	31	34	30	24				
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		23			23	30					
ELL	24	31	35	39	48	50	13				
BLK	46	53		52	35		46				
HSP	43	44	46	47	38	43	39				
FRL	38	41	50	41	32	38	40				

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	26	33		21	33						
ELL	32	38	25	34	23	13					
BLK	55	33		60	67						
HSP	56	49	30	62	48	27	50				
WHT	69	80		62	40						
FRL	53	48	32	57	48	36	50				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
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	35
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	36
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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 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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
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?

Though iReady data shows below district averages, trends show an increase in all grade-level data and core content area data. There is inconsistency among the subgroups of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners.

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

The data component that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement was Math. Based on state assessment data, the Over Math Achievement decreased from 62% in 2018 to 48% in 2019, the Learning Gains decreased from 51% in 2018 to 35% in 2019, and the Lowest 25% decreased from 38% in 2018 to 24% in 2019.

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

The contributing factors for improvement included the different Instructional Models available to students and the changing of those Instructional Models frequently throughout the school year. Another contributing factor is the loss of instruction at the end of the 2019-2020 school year. The new actions that will need to be taken to address this need include designating a specific time for math intervention during the school day along with differentiating instruction based on assessed skill loss.

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

The ELA data component showed the most improvement. On the 2019 state assessment, the Lowest 25% increased from 31% to 45%. On progress monitoring data, the overall data increased across all grade levels.

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

The contributing factors were using the Coach resources online during small group and intervention to help provide differentiated instruction. Extra resource support was added to help ensure that students were receiving direct instruction. Another contributing factor was when the students changed their instructional model to Face-to-Face and could receive direct instruction during the school day on campus. A new action that was incorporated last school year were establishing Saturday school with students in grades 3-5 and online Tutoring for our virtual students.

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

The strategies that will be implemented include the incorporation of the MAO acceleration model in our tutoring program. We are adding 2nd-grade students to the tutoring program this coming year. We are also adding the "Read to Success" program targeting 2nd-grade students needing additional support during the school day. We are adding four Tier 1 Core Interventionists to help support the needs of our students.

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.

Professional development will be focused on instructional practices related to differentiation. We will hold monthly mentoring sessions with newer staff. We will also hold monthly staff development sessions focused on topics including centers, small group instruction, guided reading, and scaffolding.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement would be adding an ESOL compliance specialist to support our DUAL Language program and all of our ELL students on campus.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the review of our data, the subgroups of SWD and ELL showed consistently lower scores on iReady than their grade-level peers. Both groups were below the federal index of 41% in 2019. (SWD-15% and ELL 37%) On the most recent Florida Standards assessment (FSA), data indicated that 56% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts. (ELA) and Math data indicated that 60% were below a level 3.

Measurable Outcome: The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 10 percentage points from 46% to 56%. Based on the 2020 – 2021 ELA school-wide Proficiency i-Ready EOY data of 3% for Students with Disabilities and 8% for English Language Learners, the school plans to increase ELA Proficiency to 41% for Students with Disabilities and 41% for English Language Learners on the FSA ELA State assessment. Based on the 2020- 2021 Math school-wide Proficiency i-Ready EOY data of 3% for Students with Disabilities and 11% for English Language Learners, the school plans to increase Math Proficiency to 41% for Students with Disabilities and 41% for English Language Learners on the FSA Math State assessment. the 2022 Math FSA will show an increase of at least percentage points from 40% to 55%.

- Monitoring:**
- Monthly progress monitoring
 - PLCs
 - Classroom Walkthroughs
 - Fluid grouping for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention
 - i-ready Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring
 - District Standards Based Unit Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to build our culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success, we will increase our systematic use of explicit instruction by setting an expectation of maximizing instructional time. Teachers will meet twice a week to discuss standards-based instruction, implementation of instruction, and data analysis of common assessments. Instructional coaches will communicate support and monitor these strategies during weekly PLCs with teachers. Teachers will identify the students that are in our ESSA subgroup (Students with Disabilities & English Language Learners) and collaboratively plan specific questions for their Tier 2 & Tier 3 students. Teachers will be provided resources to support students and students will receive intervention daily. Teachers will monitor students using research-based resources and make data-driven decisions as needed. Coaches will work with teachers to incorporate differentiated small group instruction to meet the needs of the students and prepare them to answer and analyze scientific questions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In reviewing the 2020-2021 Progress Monitoring data for ELA , the rationale for selecting these strategies are to provide teachers with effective strategies to make data-driven instructional decisions about student performance from common assessment results. It is important to have teachers engaged in the continuous improvement model. When teachers are intentional and analyze their instructional practices, they will present instruction with a focus on student achievement. Teachers will use data from common assessments to drive instruction of the standards that were at a deficit. The coaches and teachers will use the data analysis to determine which standards will be incorporated for differentiated small group instruction, intervention, and tutoring programs. This allows for teachers to provide the necessary support needed to lessen the deficits of particular standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Systematically identify the Lowest 30% of students in ELA and create standards-based intervention groups based on identified areas of need and progress monitor regularly. Students identified in our ESSA subgroup (Students with Disabilities & English Language Learners) will be invited to attend tutoring programs.

Person Responsible Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net)

2. Provide opportunities research based PD to teachers on how to support students with a focus on differentiation and provide teachers with additional resources to support our ESSA subgroup (Students with Disabilities & English Language Learners)

Person Responsible Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Description: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally
 Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school’s culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
 -Decreasing in Level 3 referrals

Measurable Outcome: The number of incidents for intimidation and threats will decrease from 2.7 reported incidents per 100 students for the 2019-2020 school year to 1.0 reported incidents per 100 students during the 2021 – 2022 school year.

Monitoring: - PLCs
 - Mentoring groups
 - Monitoring the Early Warning Systems indicator data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices
2. Implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership that uses cycles of professional learning.
3. Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts

4. Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture

Person Responsible Erin Richards (erin.richards@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the most recent Florida Standards assessment (FSA), data indicated that 56% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts. (ELA).

Measurable Outcome: The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 10 percentage points from 44% to 54%.
 i-Ready Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring
 SIPPS Mastery Assessments
 Classroom Walkthroughs
Monitoring: District Standards Based Unit Assessments
 District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The selected instructional practice, "Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words", has a strong level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. We have 56% of our students identified as below level in reading. Their word attack skills are weak which is affecting their fluency and comprehension of grade level text.

Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen the common planning process through offering extra planning days throughout the year
 *Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions
 * include foundational planning in K-2 using BEST standards.

Person Responsible Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)

Ensure the 90 minute reading block contains statutory requirements.
 *6 components of reading (as noted in Florida’s Formula for success)
 *Daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction, and differentiated small group instruction

Person Responsible Jennifer Oleson (jennifer.oleson@ocps.net)

Standards Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.

Person Responsible Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)

Provide targeted ELA PD based on teacher needs (consider B.E.S.T. ELA Canvas course, recorded sessions from the Early Literacy Summer Institute, and when applicable, ELA IMPACT).

Person Responsible Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure

*Students are appropriately identified.

*Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.

*Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible Jessica Schofield (jessica.schofield@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

Based on the 2019 - 2020 discipline data, our area of concern that will be monitored for the upcoming school year will be the area of intimidation and threats. Other school-wide improvement priorities include implementing our Culturally Responsive School Plan and embedding SELL strategies throughout instruction. We will implement practices to support our school and families to be successful by way of a culturally responsive school plan. Implementation of the district-wide instructional strategies will aid in the facilitation of improving instructional practices across all content areas. The school plan will include a mentoring program to support our students who have made intimidations or threats and provide strategies on how to handle various situations.

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, all schools 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, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district 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.

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

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. The 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. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$53,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	100-Salaries	1141 - Little River Elementary	Other Federal		\$34,000.00
<i>Notes: Saturday Planning Days</i>						
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	1141 - Little River Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$15,000.00
<i>Notes: Materials for Tutoring, Intervention groups</i>						
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	1141 - Little River Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$2,500.00
<i>Notes: Classroom read-aloud books for vocabulary during FBS.</i>						
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1141 - Little River Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: District professional development on Differentiation</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	1141 - Little River Elementary	Other		\$1,000.00
<i>Notes: SELL District trainings</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
Total:						\$54,500.00