Sadler Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sadler Elementary

4000 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://sadleres.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Lindsey Smestad   Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (45%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Sadler Elementary

4000 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://sadleres.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	86%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		D	D

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smestad, Lindsey	Principal	The school principal, Lindsey Smestad, will ensure a safe learning environment, monitor all student data, ensure implementations of instructional best practices and coach teacher to perform to the best of their ability. The school principal will also monitor instruction and data and provide timely and actionable feedback for improving classroom instruction.
Mott, Rachel	Assistant Principal	The school assistant principal, Rachel Mott, will help Ms. Smestad with ensuring a safe learning environment, monitoring all student data, ensuring implementation of instructional best practices and coaching teachers to perform to the best of their ability. The assistant principal will also monitor instruction and data and provide timely yet effective feedback for improving classroom instruction.
Gaston, Brooke	Instructional Coach	Ms. Gaston will provide on-going professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to instruction.
Kuhns, Rebecca	Math Coach	Ms. Kuhns will provide on-going professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to math and science instruction.
Lorenz-Clark, Mary	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lorenz will provide on-going professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to instruction. She will support our new and beginning teachers through ongoing and targeted professional development.
Castro Mercado, Grisselle	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Castro is responsible for coordinating the staffing and educational planning process for students with IEPs and 504s on campus. She provides professional development when necessary to the staff.
Rodriguez Rivera, Carmen	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Rodriguez will provide on-going professional development and resources to teachers as it relates to instructional techniques, supports, and scaffolds for English Language Learners.
Gelabert, Griselle	Other	Ms. Gelabert will provide on-going professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers as it relates to the MTSS process and all school wide interventions in Reading and Math.
Hines, Ann	Reading Coach	Ms. Hines will provide on-going professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to ELA instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/1/2021, Lindsey Smestad

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

717

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

22

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	109	127	116	164	88	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	719
Attendance below 90 percent	9	50	47	51	14	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	34	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	20	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	38	66	100	44	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	24	22	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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

Friday 9/9/2022

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	36	111	128	109	115	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	13	30	42	28	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	

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	36	111	128	109	115	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	13	30	42	28	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	26%	56%	56%				35%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						50%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						47%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	46%	50%				41%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						45%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						26%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	61%	59%				37%	56%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	23%	55%	-32%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	32%	62%	-30%	62%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	63%	-21%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	57%	-19%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	44	58	19	31	36	20				
ELL	22	58	69	34	65	59	29				
BLK	45	56		40	63	64	53				
HSP	22	57	73	33	63	58	28				
FRL	29	54	64	38	62	57	33				

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	5	17	23	9	40	64	19				
ELL	16	28	29	21	26	48	25				
BLK	19	27		25	24		41				
HSP	18	32	32	22	30	52	28				
FRL	18	31	50	22	25	44	31				

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	11	36		22	36	9					
ELL	30	46	45	39	44	27	34				
BLK	41	60	55	49	54	38	63				
HSP	33	47	43	37	41	25	33				
WHT	62	73		31	36						
FRL	36	51	44	41	48	27	38				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

According to FSA, Sadler is well below the state average in proficiency for ELA, Math, and Science. Sadler had 26% of students achieve proficiency in ELA and 36% of students achieve proficiency in math. Sadler continues to have an achievement gap with our ELL and ESE subgroups, having a larger gap in reading: ESE ELA: 10% proficient, ESE Math: 19% proficient, ELL ELA: 18% proficient, ELL Math: 34% proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Sadler's ELA proficiency demonstrates the greatest need for improvement overall, as well as with ESE and ELL subgroups. Overall ELA Achievement: 26%, ESE ELA Achievement: 10%, ELL ELA Achievement: 19%.

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

According to the i-Ready 2021-22 beginning-of-year Reading Diagnostic, 17 out of 338 students, or 5% of students in grades 3-5, were on or above grade level in Reading. i-Ready Reading Diagnostic data also indicates 258 out of 338, or 76% of students in grades 3-5 are performing 2 or more years below grade level. This indicates a significant learning gap in 76% of our students in grades 3-5. Additionally, Sadler continues to struggle with high tardy and absence rates school-wide. Sadler also had a difficult time fully staffing the school, including leadership instructional coach positions. To address this need, Sadler will need to fully staff their school and continue to provide professional development on scaffolds and supports, specifically with ESE and ELL students. Sadler will also add a position that focuses on attendance, fill an Instructional Coach position, and hire a MTSS coach that will focus on monitoring academic progress of all students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Overall, learning gains showed the most improvement. Sadler showed a 28% increase in ELA Learning Gains, a 33% increase in ELA Learning Gains in students in the lowest quartile, and a 36% increase in Math Learning Gains.

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

In the 2021-22 school year, Sadler implemented a walk-to intervention model in both reading and math. In reading, students were ability-grouped, and their deficiency was targeted using research-based programs in a small group for 45 minutes for 4 days per week. In math, students were ability-grouped, and specific standards/skills were targeted daily for 30 minutes. Instructional staff collected data bi-weekly to progress monitor student growth, and adjustments were made based on data. Additionally, targeted students received additional small group support with expert coaches.

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

In order to accelerate learning, an intense focus on targeted student learning will happen throughout the school year through the walk-to intervention models in reading and math.

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.

The following professional development will be provided in order to accelerate learning:
Student-Centered Processing
Monitoring Techniques
ESE/ESOL strategies
Foundations of Reading
Gradual Release Model of Instruction
CHAMPS
Zones of Regulation
MTSS
Research-based reading and math intervention programs

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

Sadler will use the acceleration model of instruction during after-school learning opportunities and small group instruction.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Student achievement data indicates an achievement gap in ELL and ESE subgroups in reading, math, and science. ELL and ESE subgroups will improve in reading, math, and science when teachers provide effective small group, differentiated instruction to meet learner needs based on data.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	According to State Assessment Data: ELA Proficiency will increase from 26% to 36%. ELL ELA Proficiency will increase from 18% to 28%. ESE ELA Proficiency will increase from 10% to 20%. Math Proficiency will increase from 36% to 46%. ELL Math Proficiency will increase from 34% to 44%. ESE Math Proficiency will increase from 19% to 29%. Science Proficiency will increase from 32% to 42%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The administration, school leadership team, and teachers will participate in ongoing data analysis in order to ensure students receive remediation and/or enrichment based on individual performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The school leadership team will support, expand opportunities for, and monitor teacher implementation of small group, differentiated instruction in core instruction, intervention, and after-school acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria**	With additional instructional staff to support small group learning, students will be provided the opportunity to engage in targeted small group instruction based on individual needs. Students will engage in research-based interventions, utilize the online platforms of i-Ready Reading and Symphony Math which will provide students with instruction based on their greatest areas of need, and engage in accelerated tutoring, which is a research-based strategy to help our fragile students gain confidence, and accelerate more rapidly.

**used for selecting
this strategy.**

Teachers will be provided with professional development in the areas of Reading, Math, and Science to ensure a full understanding of the standards, effective instructional strategies, student engagement, active monitoring, and adjustments based on monitoring.

Person Responsible	Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches will provide strategies/modeling to teachers during collaborative planning that meet the needs of all learners in their classrooms, as well as in the classroom on an as needed basis.

Person Responsible	Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)

The Leadership Team will collaborate to develop small group rotational models, intervention groupings, and acceleration groupings for ELA, Math, and Science. These groupings will be consistently monitored, and adjusted based on data.

Person Responsible	Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)

The Leadership Team will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the effectiveness of small group, differentiated instruction and provide teachers with immediate and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible	Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)

i-Ready Reading and Symphony Math programs will be implemented with fidelity. Instructional staff will be trained on the program, and learn to monitor student progress. Students will work for 45 minutes a week on i-Ready Reading and Symphony Math, and the Leadership Team will monitor implementation, usage, and pass rates. Students will be given data folders to track progress.

Person Responsible	Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Student achievement data indicates that teachers will benefit from additional support and professional development on the MTSS framework and the disaggregation of data to be used to drive instruction in Professional Learning Communities. In addition, specific resources will be aligned to individual student needs when providing all Tiers of instruction in common planning. Sadler Elementary will continue to implement the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to meet the needs of all students and increase student achievement and monitor and adjust in Professional Learning Communities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	State Assessment Data will be added once provided: According to the FAST assessment, ELA Proficiency will increase from 26% to 36%. Math Proficiency will increase from 36% to 46%. Science Proficiency will increase from 32% to 42%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The administration, school leadership team, and teachers will participate in ongoing data analysis in order to ensure students receive remediation and/or enrichment based on individual performance in professional learning communities. In addition, administration and school leadership will ensure Tier 1 instruction is standards-based, student-centered, and differentiated in weekly professional learning communities for reading, math, writing, and science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will discuss student data during data meetings and common planning meetings in Professional Learning Communities. During the monthly MTSS meetings, teachers will identify and discuss students with significant academic deficiencies, analyze data, and develop next steps. During the meetings, teachers and coaches will review data and provide students with appropriate interventions based on student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	Student achievement data indicates that teachers will benefit from additional support and professional development on the MTSS framework, disaggregating data, and using data to drive instruction. As a result of the implementation of Professional Learning Communities focused on the MTSS framework, student achievement will increase.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

During Professional Learning Community meetings, student achievement data will be reviewed and reteaching plans will be developed.

Person Responsible | Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@ocps.net)

Weekly support in Professional Learning Communities will be given to teachers through focused common planning sessions targeting Tier I and Tier II instruction to ensure that fewer students move to Tier III.

Person Responsible | Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@ocps.net)

The Leadership Team will monitor the implementation of strategies, adjustments, and lessons discussed at Professional Learning Community meetings through weekly classroom walkthroughs and monthly Leadership data meetings. Student groups, lesson plans, and strategies will be adjusted in response to the data.

Person Responsible | Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@ocps.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

On the most recent i-Ready Diagnostic Reading assessment, data indicated that 96% of students are performing one or more grade levels below in Reading. We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention and small group, which will support an increase in students performing on grade level by 40%.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 74% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention, which will support an increase in ELA proficiency by 10%.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The i-Ready Reading Diagnostic will show an increase in students performing on grade level or above for students in grades K-2 of at least 40% percentage points from 4% (i-Ready On Level) to 44% (i-Ready On Level).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The 2023 ELA FAST will show an increase in ELA achievement for students in grades 3-5 of at least 10% percentage points from 26% proficient to 36% proficient.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment
SIPPS Mastery Assessments
Classroom Walkthroughs
District Standards-based Unit Assessments
F.A.S.T.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in primary and intermediate grades to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words through a research-based program, SIPPS. SIPPS will be used 4 times per week, with fidelity, for 30-45 minutes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The strategy above was selected because there is strong evidence to support the fact that teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers.

Additionally, this selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf#page=28

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide professional development and ongoing training for SIPPS, a research-based instructional program to help students learn to decode and build word attack skills.	Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@ocps.net
Provide assessment materials and dates for Intervention Team to complete diagnostic assessments for our lowest 25%, and intermediate non-readers.	Gelabert, Griselle, griselle.gelabert@ocps.net
Have MTSS child study team use diagnostic data to place students in researched based supplemental reading intervention programs (SIPPS). Our intervention team will provide daily SIPPS lessons four days a week, with mastery checks monitored for progress. Ongoing SIPPS PD will be provided to support implementation of SIPPS, as well as actionable feedback during lessons. Student adjustments to groupings will be made based on data.	Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@ocps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

The school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of discipline data with a School-wide Plan for Expectations. Students will be taught to put school-wide CHAMPS and Zones of Regulation guidelines into action. We will keep parents informed of student responsibility via dojo, newsletters, and phone/all calls. The importance of teaching and re-teaching the expectations will remain ongoing throughout the school year, with character education, Safety Maters Lessons, classroom and campus individualized lessons, small group social skills training, quarterly review of the Code of Student Conduct, and social emotional reminders and tips on morning announcements.

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

The following stakeholders will assist in promoting a positive culture and environment of the school:
1. Faculty and staff will set and clearly define behavior expectations, and also explicitly teach and model those
expectations.
2. Families will support and reinforce the Code of Conduct and Behavior expectations laid out for
their child. Families can communicate with staff via Dojo, e-mail, or phone to keep students on the right
path.
3. Students will follow schoolwide expectations and the Code of Conduct consistently.