

Orange County Public Schools

Moss Park 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 | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Moss Park Elementary

9301 N SHORE GOLF CLUB BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

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

Demographics

Principal: William Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 35% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) |
| 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 | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Moss Park Elementary

9301 N SHORE GOLF CLUB BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">25%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">67%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Osmond, Stephanie | Principal | Oversees general operations budget, hiring and instructional leadership of the school. |
| Vetter, Rob | Assistant Principal | Evaluative Observations -Oversee MTSS Process K-5 -Liaison with Middle School -Serves as principal's designee when principal is off campus. -SIP -Master Schedule -Manages the Computer Lab Schedule, Duty and Lunch Duty -Class List -Oversees Special Projects -Field Trips -Drills -Other Duties as Assigned |
| Miller, Lisa | School Counselor | Virtual School Administrator Student Special Programs (Foster care, MVP) -Works with Registrar on Child Study Team -Coordinates Red Ribbon Week 9 Week Awards -Character Ed (on Announcements) Guidance Groups SOAR School Threat Assessment School Data and Reports SEDNET Resource for Health Course Child Safety Matters Academic support (study, test taking and organizational Skills) Peer relationships Bullying awareness |
| Garcia-Jenarine, Maritza | Instructional Media | Admin/Resource Team Member -Text Book Manager -AR Program -Morning Announcements -Book Fairs -Book Clubs -Literacy Week -Classroom Media Resources Destiny Inventory -Circulation of Books -Media Center Inventory -General Supervision of Students -Digital one to one -Other duties as assigned |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Lima , Barbara | Instructional Technology | Develop and create a STEAM lab using PLTW, Coding, Makers Space. Including scheduling and support of lab Coach in Math and Science Practice (support for new teachers in use of best practice) |
| Villar, Edni | ELL Compliance Specialist | Admin/Resource Team Member ELL Compliance -WIDA Testing -PLC (ELL) Chair -Manages all ELL Records -Schedules and monitors all LEP Meetings - Pulls ELL student groups -oversees ELL paras -General Student Supervision -Intervention Groups -Other duties as assigned |
| Barrett, Aimee | Other | -testing coordinator -community engagement -lead mentor -Beginning Teacher support |
| Gardner, Diane | Dean | -Dean -MTSS Support -504 coordinator |
| Borgerding, Jeana | Instructional Coach | Ms. Borgerding will support teaching and learning through planning processes, professional development and data analysis as well as through supervision of students. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, William Harris

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.*

3

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Total number of students enrolled at the school

851

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

4

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

4

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 | 22 | 122 | 153 | 184 | 168 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 851 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 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 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 29 | 162 | 191 | 164 | 203 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 909 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 29 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 29 | 162 | 191 | 164 | 203 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 909 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 29 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 0 |
| 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 | | | | 72% | 57% | 57% | 76% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 58% | 58% | 60% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 50% | 52% | 53% | 50% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 75% | 63% | 63% | 78% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69% | 61% | 62% | 68% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44% | 48% | 51% | 51% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 72% | 56% | 53% | 62% | 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 | 75% | 55% | 20% | 58% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 58% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 54% | 18% | 56% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 62% | 13% | 62% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 70% | 63% | 7% | 64% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 57% | 17% | 60% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 54% | 15% | 53% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used for each grade level was the iReady diagnostic test for the beginning, middle and end of the year. For 5th grade science we utilized the Districts Progress Monitoring Assessments give three times a year.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40 / 29% | 50 / 34% | 72/ 50% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/ 23% | 55 / 22% | 18 /35% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 / 38% | 2 / 22% | 2 /29% |
| | English Language Learners | 4 /18% | 3 /13% | 5 /22% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 34/25% | 52 /36% | 81/57% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7/14% | 7/13% | 21/40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/14% | 1 /11% | 1/14% |
| | English Language Learners | 6/29% | 4/17% | 8/36% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40 / 23% | 67/ 38% | 91 /51% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 /16% | 56 /23% | 24 /43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 /7% | 1 /7% | 2 /14% |
| | English Language Learners | 7/19% | 9 /23% | 12 /30% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 18/11% | 45/26% | 62/35% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6/11% | 11/20% | 17/30% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/14% | 1/7% | 2/23% |
| | English Language Learners | 6/29% | 5/13% | 8/36% |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 47 /30% | 79/ 49% | 98/ 60% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 /23% | 61 /41% | 32 /52% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 / 9% | 1/ 8% | 2 /17% |
| | English Language Learners | 8 /22% | 13 /35% | 17 /46% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 5/ 3% | 39/25% | 80/49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0/0% | 11/18% | 24/39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 1/8% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/5% | 9/4% | 17/46% |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 51 / 27% | 68 /36% | 88 /46% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 / 20% | 69 /23% | 27 /39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 / 6% | 1 /5% | 2 /10% |
| | English Language Learners | 6/ 12% | 11/ 22% | 14 /27% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 20/11% | 48/25% | 83/46% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3/4% | 11/16% | 16/25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/12% | 1/5% | 2/10% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/4% | 9/18% | 17/35% |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 29/ 20% | 38 /25% | 49 /33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 / 20% | 45 / 20% | 12/ 28% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 / 8% | 2 /15% | 2/ 18% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/ 8% | 1 /4% | 3 /11% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 23/16% | 36/24% | 77/51% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5/11% | 11/16% | 22/50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/8% | 1/5% | 2/15% |
| | English Language Learners | 3/16% | 0/0% | 10/36% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 117/80% | 111/75% | 121/82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34/77% | 31/70% | 32/76% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/50% | 6/50% | 4/36% |
| | English Language Learners | 17/65% | 16/64% | 17/68% |

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 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 24 | 29 | 27 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 64 | 76 | 57 | 52 | 46 | 68 | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | | | 84 | | | 100 | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 63 | 68 | 65 | 57 | 44 | 70 | | | | |
| MUL | 76 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 54 | | 74 | 59 | | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 54 | 60 | 55 | 46 | 50 | 72 | | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 34 | 27 | 34 | 53 | 35 | 19 | | | | |
| ELL | 55 | 56 | 50 | 70 | 65 | 59 | 62 | | | | |
| ASN | 84 | 76 | | 94 | 81 | | 69 | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 48 | | 59 | 50 | | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 60 | 51 | 73 | 70 | 54 | 70 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | 45 | | 70 | 67 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 62 | 52 | 78 | 69 | 39 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 71 | 58 | 49 | 68 | 64 | 48 | 64 | | | | |
| 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 | 29 | 33 | 28 | 31 | 17 | 17 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 61 | 61 | 54 | 73 | 67 | 69 | 50 | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | 73 | | 88 | 67 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 55 | | 68 | 50 | | 57 | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 63 | 50 | 74 | 67 | 52 | 51 | | | | |
| MUL | 100 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 54 | 44 | 82 | 73 | 54 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 62 | 56 | 68 | 64 | 53 | 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 | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 497 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 61 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 91 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 65 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 63 |
| 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 | 79 |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 57 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

While our data is higher overall than both the state and the district and while we do demonstrate growth over the course of the school year, when looking at longitudinal data Moss Park trends with high achievement but low gains. This is consistent in each of the assessed content areas that use growth scores. Over all we do see growth in our sub group data at a rate that is consistent with our overall data.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and the 2019 assessments, the data component with the greatest need for improvement is overall math proficiency. This is the lower data point in all grade levels and sub-groups.

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

A contributing factor to this performance was the lack of consistent small group support in math as well as the need for targeted and timely intervention in math.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and the 2019 assessments, science achievement showed the most improvement when compared to the previous year. A gain in proficiency percentage in the PMAs compared to the 2019 assessments can be seen.

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

An increased focus on preparing for the PMAs gave rise to an increase in the Science Achievement score.

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

In order to accelerate learning Moss Park will be implementing pull out learning labs using research based programs during the school day as well as before and after school. Strategic groups of students has occurred in order to ensure that specific students are able to have content front loaded prior to instruction. MTSS and early intervention will occur daily in both math and ELA allowing for struggling students to attain concepts prior to their introduction in class.

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 has been delivered by the district to 10% of our staff on acceleration of learning as well as early intervention in phonics. Site based professional development will continue on the adoption of new curriculum and standards as well as programs that can support fundamental skills based learning.

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

Additional services will include tutoring for identified students, intervention within the the school day via small groups. We will be implementing a social emotional curriculum that we feel will enforce SEL Competencies for long term improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. 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:

Measurable Outcome: Early Warning Systems indicator data
 Alex Incident/SESIR data
 Panorama survey data
 Surveys found in the Caring Schools Community Program including Student and staff Survey on School Climate, Sense of Belonging and observational data for CASEL Competencies
 Professional Learning About SEL
 Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate
 Culture & Climate Continuum data

Monitoring: Sense of Belonging data for CASEL Competencies will increase by five percentage points when compared to the previous year.
 Increases in response rate and positive responses regarding Culture & Climate Continuum data
 Classroom Walkthrough trend data containing SEL concepts
 Evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data
 Qualitative data from students, staff, and families

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@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.
 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 Evidence-based Strategy: 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

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum Pilot Caring Schools Community
Ensure a school team receives training on implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum
Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum
Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Person Responsible Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@ocps.net)

Integrating Aligned Instructional and SEL Strategies
Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction
Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard
Interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible Jeana Borgerding (jeana.borgerding@ocps.net)

Deliberate School SEL Supports for Families
Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:
Strengthening Communication
Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)
Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources
Building Community
Establish a family resource center where families can access resources and information to support student and school success
Create a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected (staff greetings, office appeal)
Host events, workshops and opportunities that are relational, connected to family interests and culture, and are linked to learning
Creating Connections
Establish a family -friendly system with multiple ways to gather and respond to families' questions, suggestions and needs
Create flexible events and opportunities for families (e.g. different times throughout the day, face to face, virtual, pre-recorded sessions, multiple languages)

Person Responsible Lisa Miller (lisa.miller3@ocps.net)

Monitor, Measure, and Modify
Evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices
Implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership that uses cycles of professional learning.

Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts

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 Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: With a focus on standards aligned instruction, planning for small group instruction and support with fast facts an increase of proficiency and learning gains in math for the lowest 25% will occur. (Division Priority – Accelerate Student Performance and Accelerate Student Performance)

Measurable Outcome: There will be a three percentage point increase in the Math Lowest 25th percentile resulting in students making learning gains. Overall math achievement will increase from 75% to 77%.

Monitoring: -Common Assessments
-Program Use
-Walk throughs during intervention time blocks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will create and implement differentiated instruction geared toward meeting the needs of their lowest 25%. The Instructional leadership team will monitor data from common unit assessments, implementation of iReady usage and pass rate for the math component, implementation and use of Reflex Math for fast facts. The instructional leadership team will support the development and implementation of small group instruction for math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis will help teachers better understand their students' differences and needs. Through analyzing will be able to make informed instructional decisions. These informed decisions will help them create small group learning for their students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan for purposeful, rigorous, standards based lessons, including regular use of common unit assessments.

Person Responsible Barbara Lima (barbara.lima@ocps.net)

Instructional Coach will assist in best practice planning for differentiated instruction including the use of centers and manipulatives.

Person Responsible Jeana Borgerding (jeana.borgerding@ocps.net)

Teachers will remediate and reteach skills in small groups considering the needs of our SWD first (Aligns with district BPIE indicator #5) This will incorporate MTSS for Math during the specific intervention block.

Person Responsible Diane Gardner (diane.gardner@ocps.net)

Leadership Team members will visit classrooms to identify standards being taught and strategies being used.

Person Responsible Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@ocps.net)

Additional student support in the form of before/after school tutoring in line with MAO Acceleration will be initiated by October 1.

Person Responsible Rob Vetter (robert.vetter@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Moss Park Elementary School is ranked 910 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide and 32 of 126 elementary schools in Orange County for incidents that occur on campus. There are three categories for incidents that may occur at schools. These three categories include: Violent incidents, Property Incidents and Drug/ Public order incidents. Moss Park has had a total of nine violent incidents (four threats, two bullying, two personal attack and one fighting) with an enrollment of 1,184 this averages .76 violent incidents per 100 students for the 2019-2020 school year. There are five ranks ranging from Very Low to Very High. Moss Park has a ranking of high for the nine incidents that occurred in 2019-2020. Since threats have been a concern, our dean and guidance counselor have focused on social emotional learning that centers on the five core competencies of self-awareness, self management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decisions- making. Proper discipline procedures as well as the code of conduct were reviewed each marking period with students and during the referral process our dean identified different strategies that could be used in lieu of threats.

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

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. 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.

Additionally Moss Park is one of 25 schools to be selected as a Caring School Community pilot program. Classroom teachers were trained on the curriculum prior to the 2021-2022 school year. A committee was formed to support the roll out including a deep look at the culture and environment in order to make adjustments to better facilitate a positive school culture and environment.

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

SELL Team Including guidance, primary, intermediate, ESE and Specialized teachers - Support District SEL Initiative

Caring Schools Community team Including Guidance and Instructional Leadership and Dean - to support the piloting the new SEL Curriculum

SOAR Committee including Dean and teacher stakeholders - To support onboarding of new and return students in the school wide discipline plan

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$70,000.00 |
|---|----------|--|---|----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 1582 - Moss Park Elementary | General Fund | | \$64,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional support provided for implementation of new curriculum</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 1582 - Moss Park Elementary | General Fund | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional Development Coverage</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$64,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 2160 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 1582 - Moss Park Elementary | Other | | \$64,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Tutors are hired to support acceleration in this area</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$134,000.00 |