William Frangus Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

William Frangus Elementary

380 KILLINGTON WAY, Orlando, FL 32835

https://franguses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Decheryl Britton

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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

William Frangus Elementary

380 KILLINGTON WAY, Orlando, FL 32835

https://franguses.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 KG-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	93%

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 to 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
Britton, DeCheryl	Principal	Mrs. Britton is the building level administrator who oversees the daily school operations and curricula implementation school wide. In addition, she ensures the fiscal and non-fiscal resources are appropriately utilized to foster a well-rounded learning environment for students and staff, and routine updates to community and staff in regards to district-wide initiatives and requirements are communicated to all stakeholders.
Williams, Kenya	Assistant Principal	Dr. Williams is the Assistant Principal who oversees the daily operations of William Frangus Elementary. and assists with implementation of classroom instruction. This entails but is not limited to school wide discipline, monitoring of SIP, professional development, monthly egress drills, facilities, and supporting curriculum and instruction in the classroom for kindergarten, second grade and third grade.
Webster, Arlene	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Webster is the 3rd-5th grade ELA Coach and 4th and 5th grade Writing Coach. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. In addition, Mrs. Webster is the beginning teacher lead coordinator and the FSA testing administrator.
Glover, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ms. Glover is the Kindergarten- 2nd grade Instructional Coach for ELA and Math & MTSS Coordinator. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. As the MTSS coordinator, she oversees the intervention process for students who need additional academic support and/or a diversified educational plan.
Smith, Waletta	School Counselor	Mrs. Smith is the School Counselor who ensures that the social-emotional wellbeing of all students are taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.
Moncur, Patricia	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Moncur is the Staffing Specialist. She identifies, monitors, and staffs students based upon their needs as depicted through the MTSS process and then transitioning to the individual exceptional student plan.
Charles, Charlene	ELL Compliance Specialist	Mrs. Charles is ELL Compliance Teacher. She identifies, monitors, and staffs students based upon their language deficiency needs. She oversees the parent leadership council and monitors and maintains FTE & ELL compliance.
Stewart, Marica	Math Coach	Mrs. Stewart is the 3rd -5th Math Coach and K-5th Science Coach. She analyzes common math and science assessment data and participates in professional learning communities. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/13/2016, Decheryl Britton

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
415

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.
7

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	17	54	67	67	62	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	4	18	21	13	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/29/2021

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	13	62	71	77	86	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	15	15	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	2	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	13	62	71	77	86	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	15	15	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	0	2	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				50%	57%	57%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	52%	53%	45%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	63%	63%	50%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	61%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	48%	51%	37%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	56%	53%	41%	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	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	63%	-20%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady diagnostic ELA and Math data were used as progress monitoring assessments during the 2020-2021 school year. OCPS district assessments were used for 5th grade science progress monitoring during the 2020-2021 school year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/26%	16/28%	20/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/19%	10/26%	13/34%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	2/29%	1/17%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9/17%	15/27%	14/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/17%	9/24%	8/22%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	0/0	1/17%
	English Language Learners	1/20%	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/13%	12/19%	21/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	5/12%	11/26%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	1/14%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/8%	8/13%	13/21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/5%	2/5%	5/12%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	2/29%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	1/5%	2/11%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/15%	22/38%	21/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/15%	12/31%	10/26%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/13%	7/47%	7/47%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/2%	7/12%	18/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/3%	2/5%	8/20%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7%	3/20%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/8%	12/16%	15/20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/6%	6/12%	7/14%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/9%	2/17%
	English Language Learners	1/6%	1/6%	1/6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/1%	4/5%	12/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2%	3/6%	6/12%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	0/0	2/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7%	2/12%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/8%	16/23%	21/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/9%	10/21%	13/27%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	1/11%	2/22%
	English Language Learners	0.0	1/7%	2/14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/6%	10/15%	23/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/4%	4/9%	14/30%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	3/38%
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7%	1/7%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/53%	33/50%	35/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/45%	18/42%	21/51%
	Students With Disabilities	3/38%	3/38%	4/57%
	English Language Learners	5/50%	3/30%	3/25%

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			20							
ELL	29	36		17	27						
BLK	44	44		30	30		34				
HSP	38	30		32	30						
WHT	43			57							
FRL	34	44	40	24	29	40	25				
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	18	38	42	28	50	36	30				
ELL	41	61	62	48	47	36	53				
BLK	49	62	70	49	46	21	49				
HSP	42	45		60	50		56				

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
WHT	64	60		59	48		43				
FRL	45	55	55	48	46	29	44				
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	21	38	33	37	45	38	27				
ELL	26	40		44	40						
BLK	41	57	47	45	48	44	37				
HSP	41	38	27	59	39	9	36				
WHT	58	77		52	65						
FRL	45	56	41	48	46	37	38				

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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	335
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	34
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	40
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	38
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 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	50
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	37
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?

Based on the i-Ready diagnostic data from beginning of the year to the end of the year for ELA and Math for school year 2020-2021, the trend is showing positive growth towards students becoming proficient in both ELA and Math. Students with Disabilities, ESSA subgroup, are showing incremental gain towards proficiency in both ELA and Math.

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

The greatest gap compared to the state average on FSA 2019 is the Lowest 25th percentile (bottom 25%) in Math. This correlation is also relevant in the iReady diagnostic 2020-2021 data. However, the iReady data is showing student growth in math from beginning of the school year compared to the end of the school year.

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

Some contributing factors for the low performance encompass teacher preparation for delivery of instruction, and inconsistent student monitoring and intervening. More professional developments centered around math resources to support professional growth and instructional math strategies that yield high results for student engagement and retaining of skills/concepts.

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

As indicated on the 2019 Science Assessment, 5th grade science performance increased by 10 points from the 2018 Science Assessment (41% to 51%). In addition, 5th grade science district progress monitoring assessments for the 2021-2022 data represent positive student growth- PMA 1 56% PMA 2- 56% PMA 3- 57%.

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

Science teachers and leadership team created lesson plans that supported the standards coupled with hands-on experiments to scaffold student learning and deepen their understanding of science concepts. Science Saturday enrichment also played a vital part in the academic success.

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

Providing after school and Saturday school learning experiences focusing on the upcoming academic standards in reading, math and science are a few strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate student learning and increase student academic achievement.

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.

Teachers will be provided online and face to face professional development at the district level through the Minority Achievement Office and school based level by trained leadership staff on how to effectively implement the acceleration learning model.

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

Monitoring with fidelity student data, teacher classroom data, delivery of instruction, and effectiveness of leadership team members in order to sustain a culture of continuous improvement that will yield positive academic gains and increased professional pedagogies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 FSA data shows a trend of the bottom 25% in math continuing to drop in academic performance. 2020-2021 i-Ready data shows growth but proficiency is still an overall concern.
Measurable Outcome:	The expectation is that the bottom 25% in math will increase from 27% to 40% as measured by the FSA 19 Math state assessment compared to FSA 22 Math assessment.
Monitoring:	Math coach and administration will monitor desired outcome through common assessment data, iReady diagnostic data, and remediation data. Math coach and administration will monitor through classroom walks/observations on a regular basis and provide feedback to teachers on instructional methodologies to improve academic discourse and writing across the content area to improve classroom instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marica Stewart (marica.stewart@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated small group instruction based on whole group and common assessment data. This will be monitored through mini assessment data and teacher observations. In small groups students will use math academic vocabulary to orally communicate with peers and teacher as well as in written form to deepen their understanding of the math concept/skill. Monitoring will be done through peer observation, coach, and principal observation with actionable feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through these multiple processing methods, students will gain greater automaticity with mathematics concepts as they will see the content, write it, and speak it many times.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will collaborate during common planning to plan for differentiated whole group and small group instruction that is culturally relevant. Professional learning communities will meet to discuss common assessments and next steps for targeted instruction. In addition, teachers will conduct student data chats to hold students accountable for their learning and academic success.

Person Responsible	Marica Stewart (marica.stewart@ocps.net)

Provide teachers with ongoing various professional learning opportunities that allow them to gain more competence in the area of engaging students in academic discourse conversations and writing across the content area. In addition, teachers will share successful strategies during professional learning communities to continue to promote a growth mindset towards development of self efficacy.

Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
Measurable Outcome:	Anticipated impact of a culture and climate on student achievement
Monitoring:	The school based SEL team, will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Class meetings Second Step curriculum Counseling groups
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Waletta Smith (waletta.smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. 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 professional learning through the analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults 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 team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organization improvement and change.

Action Steps to Implement

Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data.

Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

Staff will implement CASEL strategies for social and emotional learning. Teachers will connect SEL to instructional strategies through the strategies learned during District Professional Learning Community.

Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The achievement gap for the Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below was 41% as indicated on the ESSA FSA 2019 performance.
Measurable Outcome:	The expectation is that the Students with Disabilities subgroup performance will increase to 42% or higher on the ESSA FSA 22 state assessment performance.
Monitoring:	Professional Learning Community- analyzing common assessment data and identifying actionable next steps through the continuous improvement model process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase our systematic use of explicit instruction during whole group.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit instruction will provide the opportunity for more examples and non-examples as well as language to facilitate student understanding, anticipate common misconceptions, highlight essential content, and remove distracting information.

Action Steps to Implement	
ESE professional development on learning strategies through district and school-based professional development opportunities.	
Person Responsible	Patricia Moncur (patricia.moncur@ocps.net)
General Education teacher, Support Facilitator and Staffing specialist will collaborate and determine best practices for explicit instruction based on the standard during common planning, professional learning communities, IEP meetings, and ESE data teacher data chats.	
Person Responsible	Patricia Moncur (patricia.moncur@ocps.net)
The leadership team will monitor the use of explicit instructional strategies by classroom observations, common assessment data and i-Ready weekly data outcomes.	
Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 16% of 4th grade students and 9% of 5th grade 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 43% to 53%.
Monitoring:	The data will be monitored through i-Ready Diagnostic middle of the year and end of the year data along with Growth monitoring 3 times a year. In addition, standards based common assessment data and classroom walkthrough data, will be used to make revisions to the instructional delivery model, provide remediation- Plan, Do, Check, Act (continuous improvement model), and increase the instructional pedagogy of the teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale for Strategy Selection: It is important for students to have a strong foundation in all 6 areas of reading. By focusing on phonics in the primary grades, this will help student confidence regarding fluency and comprehension.

Resources/Criteria: The following strategies/resources were selected because they are evidence-based practices that address the identified need. IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. Schoolwide Improvement Plan Evidence Based Strategies |

Action Steps to Implement	
Strengthen the common planning process. *Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions *Include foundational planning in K-2	
Person Responsible	Arlene Webster (arlene.webster@ocps.net)
Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.	
Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@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	

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

Person Responsible DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@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 Ashley Glover (ashley.glover@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.

Frangus' school incident ranking is in the high category- #926 out of 1,395 elementary schools. However, for the total reported suspensions, Frangus is ranked very low. Through the character education program, positive behavior support system and the social and emotional school environment, discipline data will be monitored and appropriate interventions will be provided when applicable to decrease school incident ranking.

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. 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 school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, 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 district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

School Counselor- will ensure that the social-emotional wellbeing of all students are taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.

SEL Site Team- will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

All Staff - will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organization improvement and change through the distributive leadership model.