Orangewood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Orangewood Elementary School

4001 DELEON ST, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://owd.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jami Browder

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: A (63%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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

Orangewood Elementary School

4001 DELEON ST, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://owd.leeschools.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	78%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

At Orangewood Elementary, diversity is celebrated in both academics and individual talents. As a safe and welcoming community, we strive to create a student-driven culture that builds confident, life-long leaders. By practicing the 7 Habits, we develop the whole person enabling ALL to achieve their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring a passion for learning through leadership.

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
Browder, Jami	Principal	
Peters, John	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/20/2021, Jami Browder

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.*
6

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
607

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

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

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	105	109	99	95	98	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	18	14	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	4	10	19	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	2	6	19	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
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	4	8	22	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	2	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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				55%	57%	57%	49%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	50%	53%	53%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	62%	63%	61%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	65%	62%	70%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	54%	51%	51%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	52%	53%	61%	54%	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	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	62%	16%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	50%	-4%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	7/13.7	19/35.2	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/15.4	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	3/6.1	14/26.9	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/50	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7.7	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	15/22.7	30/44.8	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/14.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/10	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	5/7.6	11/16.4	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/23.3	33/31.7	44/41.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	0/0	1/6.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.9	24/23.8	36/34.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7.1	1/6.3

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/33	38/39.6	42/42.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	1/12.5	2/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/16.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/6.3	20/20.8	36/36.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/8.3

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/33.7	42/42.7	47/52.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/18.2	2/15.4	2/15.4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/24.7	33/37.9	42/46.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/9.1	2/15.4	2/15.4
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/23.6	47/54.0	55/62.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/12.5
	English Language Learners	1/9.1	3/25	6/50

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	17			13	9						
ELL	26			29							
BLK	35	41	31	37	34	18	27				
HSP	44	38		51	50		43				
MUL	57			71							
WHT	69	67		79	67		83				
FRL	41	43	39	44	43	18	37				
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	26	37	42	57	83	81	35				
ELL	40	47	40	60	74	69	21				
ASN	92			100							

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
BLK	33	44	48	63	67	68	17				
HSP	53	64	62	73	80	74	45				
MUL	80			100							
WHT	79	61		86	89		84				
FRL	46	54	53	69	75	69	37				
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	18	48	63	23	36	28	21				
ELL	32	50		41	44						
ASN	90			100							
BLK	28	45	52	42	66	55	41				
HSP	49	60	50	63	67		61				
WHT	79	56		89	78		95				
FRL	41	51	53	54	66	50	52				

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	44
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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

English Language Learners	
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	34
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	46
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
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	39
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?

We show trends of scores dropping from the previous FSA Assessment in ELA and Math. Attendance was a great concern from last school year and as well as this year.

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

ELA demonstrates a high level of need from FSA and iReady progress monitoring. Our progress monitoring also shows that students are struggling in ELA than Math. The declines shown are great than just a summer slide for all students, even our high performing students showed a decline. Students still struggle in both areas.

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

We had large issues with student absences due to COVID last year and the start of this year. Absences this school year are improving. Multiple instructional options that kept students out of school versus face to face instruction added to declines as well. We saw students not working or staying on task and had a large about of parent support, which is not a true picture of what students can do. We are continuing to reward positive attendance trends as well as really working with parents to get students back in school sooner.

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

Science was our area of greatest improvement! We showed a positive trend by increasing our Science proficiency from 49% to 51%.

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

In Science, we instituted Science Days to focus on hands-on skills to gain understanding for our students. Teachers also used Science journals to keep notes and have it easily accessible for students to study. We also had days during our daily intervention block dedicated to Science.

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

We will continue on this trend in Science, but also we have added in more hands-on days and they are using data to plan those days. The standards that are the lowest will be taught using this method. This data will come from our quarterly checks, teacher input, and some classroom assignments.

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.

Promethean Boards
ActiveInspire
Monthly Play by Play PD
Authentic Engagement
Kagan - monthly structures taught and incorporated
Common Configuration Boards

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

Our training plan is monitored by our PCT as well as admin. We are incorporating our PLC facilitators to help lead and follow up on trainings to build capacity. Teams are using PLC conversations to help guide needed trainings so that we can get it scheduled for those teams. The Wonders curriculum is requiring multiple training and planning sessions with district officials. This is directly attended by teachers and admin/resource team members. This helps build capacity as well.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ELA data for Orangewood Elementary School shows a 47% proficiency rate. This is 8 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need. The ELA data for Orangewood Elementary School shows 44 % learning gains. This is 13 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need. The ELA data for Orangewood Elementary School shows 36% L25 learning gains. This is a 21 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need.
Measurable Outcome:	Orangewood Elementary will increase our ELA learning gains from 44% to 46% as measured by the ELA FSA assessment.
Monitoring:	Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars and iReady. Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet. PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ Resource teachers lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jami Browder (jamimb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliablity School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, and ourLeader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCT/Resource Teacher support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research.

Action Steps to Implement	

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible	John Peters (johnmp@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ELA data for our ELL subgroup at Orangewood Elementary School shows a 13% proficiency rate. This is 2 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need. The ELA data for our ELL subgroup at Orangewood Elementary School shows 35% learning gains. This is 5 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need. The ELA data for our ELL subgroup at Orangewood Elementary School shows 37% L25 learning gains. This is 3 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need.
Measurable Outcome:	Orangewood Elementary will increase our ELA learning gains for our ELL subgroup from 35 to 37% as measured by the ELA FSA assessment.
Monitoring:	Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars and iReady. Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet.
	PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ Resource teachers lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives.
	Our LY students are supported by our ESOL paraprofessionals and also use the Imagine learning software. This data is monitored weekly and support is given to teachers as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jami Browder (jamimb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliablity School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, and ourLeader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCT/Resource Teacher support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties.
	Our ELL students benefit from all of these strategies as well as specific support from our ESOL paraprofessionals and specific curriculum support from the instructional guides.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research. Instructional strategies for ELL learners are documented in lesson plans and are evidence based.
Action Steps to Implement	

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal.

Imagine learning is monitored weekly by our PCT and support is given to teachers when needed. Our ESOL paraprofessionals work weekly with our ELL contact to get support and training.

Person Responsible	John Peters (johnmp@leeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ELA data for our African American subgroup at Orangewood Elementary School shows a 35% proficiency rate. This is 4 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need. The ELA data for our African American L25 subgroup at Orangewood Elementary School shows 31% learning gains. This is a 9 percentage points below the 2018-19 FSA results. Due to the pandemic and this drop in scores, we feel that this is a critical area of need. This subgroups learning gains did go up but only by 1 percentage point.
Measurable Outcome:	Orangewood Elementary will increase our African American subgroup L25 ELA learning gains from 31% to 33% as measured by the ELA FSA assessment.
Monitoring:	Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars and iReady. Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet. PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ Resource teachers lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jami Browder (jamimb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliablity School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, and ourLeader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCT/Resource Teacher support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible	John Peters (johnmp@leeschools.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.

Orangewood Elementary School will maintain discipline data which is consistent with SafeSchoolsforAlex.org.

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.

.

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

.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**