

Orange County Public Schools

Laureate Park Elementary



2022-23 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Laureate Park Elementary

7800 LAUREATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32827

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

Demographics

Principal: Suzanne Workum

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2017

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (71%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%)
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	N/A
* 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Laureate Park Elementary

7800 LAUREATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32827

<https://laureateparkes.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	No	17%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

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
Workum, Suzanne	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the school improvement goals -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant and standards based -Common Planning - Supports assigned grade levels
Ramsey, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Discipline -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant and standards based -Common Planning - Supports assigned grade levels -Threat Assessment Team Member -Conducts Observations
Downs, Megan	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversee discipline -Investigate problems of a disciplinary nature, document information and report findings and decisions to appropriate individuals. Counsel with students and parents where behavioral problems exist. -Work closely with the school resource officer
Okraska, Maria	ELL Compliance Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELL Compliance -ELL Progress Monitor -Coaching Observation -Arrival Duty -Caught Being Kind -Mentors -Hispanic Heritage/Black History Month
Davey, Olivia	Staffing Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success - Facilitates and supports data collection activities - Assists in data analysis - Supports the implementation of Tier I, II and III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP. -Supports ESE students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and compliance -Monitors FTE -Threat Assessment Team Member
Furio, Judy	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees the Media Center -Creates POs for purchases for the Media Center (books and resources) -Oversees the News Crew -Manages Destiny -Holds literacy lessons -Conducts annual book inventory
Levenson, Lisa	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversee and facilitates all of the MTSS process -Instructional Support/Progress Monitor -Gifted Facilitator/PLC -Coaching Observation -Social Media
Thompson, Kathleen	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Social Skills Training -Threat Assessment Leader -Counsels Students
Harrington, Jantez	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees and coordinates all school, district and state testing throughout the year. -Math/Science Night -Partners in ED/Teach In -Coaching Observation -Tutoring -Oration
Guidish, Megan	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress Monitor/MTSS -Spelling Bee -Literacy Night -Caught Being Kind -Arrival Duty
O'Sullivan, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress Monitor/MTSS -Spelling Bee -Literacy Night -Caught Being Kind -Arrival Duty

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/17/2017, Suzanne Workum

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.*

4

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,024

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

8

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

18

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	165	171	190	183	170	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	26	19	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	2	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	

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	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	11	128	147	131	125	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	12	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	11	128	147	131	125	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	12	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	82%	56%	56%				80%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	73%						69%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						61%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	82%	46%	50%				83%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%						76%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						64%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	61%	59%				77%	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	84%	55%	29%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	63%	21%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	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	44	48	41	46	52	44	29				
ELL	73	73	62	79	66	53	48				
ASN	88	79		93	90		87				
BLK	74	63		81	68		67				
HSP	77	68	54	79	64	56	60				
MUL	95	92		76	75						
WHT	84	77	62	83	72	71	82				
FRL	67	69	46	72	61	63	55				
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	37			41							
ELL	63	67	50	68	71		53				
ASN	94	100		91	62		85				
BLK	84			64							
HSP	73	66	53	67	54	33	63				
MUL	93			93							
WHT	90	67		85	60	60	84				
FRL	71	56		60	42	27	65				
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	34	50	53	34	68	60	27				
ELL	65	71	63	70	77	75	56				
ASN	92	81		97	76		80				
BLK	65	67		76	75						
HSP	74	69	64	79	75	77	65				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	84	67	50	82	77	46	93				
FRL	69	75	75	69	78	71	52				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
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	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	71
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	64
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	85
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
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?

Reviewing iReady diagnostic data for the 2021-2022 school year, All grade levels, K-5, demonstrated significant growth from the fall diagnostic to the spring diagnostic in both ELA and Math. ELA fall diagnostic data results indicated 58% of all students were at the proficient level. ELA spring diagnostic data increased to 87% proficient, a growth of 29%. Conversely, in Math the fall diagnostic data results indicated 39% of all students were at the proficient level. The Math spring diagnostic data increased to 82% proficient, a growth of 43%.

Students in grade 5 did not demonstrate the same growth as students in grades K-4 on the ELA diagnostic with only a 9% increase in proficiency from the fall to the spring diagnostic. In addition, when analyzing data within the subgroups, Students with Disabilities did not demonstrate the growth goal of 50% established on both the ELA and Math diagnostics.

2021-2022 FSA ELA data results: 81% scored level 3 or higher; 74% made learning gains and learning gains for the lowest 25 % was 53%. 2021-2022 FSA Math data results: 81% scored level 3 or higher; 64% made learning gains and learning gains for the lowest 25 % was 62%. 5th grade Science data results: 72% scored level 3 or higher.

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

The ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile components had the lowest performance for the 2021-2022 school year. Ninety one students did not demonstrate proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment with 48% of these students classified as either ELL, ESE or have a 504 plan

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

Contributing factors could include but not limited to lack of properly identifying students for MTSS, fidelity in implementing the MTSS process/interventions, and incorporating ESE and ELL accommodations consistently throughout instruction. Actions to overcome these factors include ongoing professional development on MTSS and strategies for incorporating accommodations for ESE and ELL students. In addition, the teachers will be tiered and provided more targeted professional development based on iObservation data and Classroom Walk-Through data.

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, the data component which showed the most improvement was Math Lowest 25th Percentile.

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

The Leadership Team met with grade level PLCs to review student math data to develop a more targeted focus for student deficits which was focused on during small group math instruction and math centers. In addition, the Interventionist worked with Tier III students to provide more individualized support in math.

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

Laureate Park Elementary will be continue implementing the After-School Acceleration Program. In addition, gifted and high achieving students are clustered in each grade level allowing the gifted-endorsed teacher(s) to accelerate learning. In ELA and Math, enrichment activities are embedded during WIN intervention time to provide acceleration for our students who are on or above grade level.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will focus on teachers learning the new B.E.S.T. standards and the new F.A.S.T. progress monitoring tool to analyze student data to determine focus skills to be written into lesson plans and daily instruction in order to increase overall student performance.

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

Students in grades 3-5 who demonstrate deficits in ELA or Math skills will be provided the opportunity to participate in Before/After School tutoring. An additional service provided to students is our MTSS Teacher Interventionist. The intervention teacher works with students who have been identified as Tier III in reading or math through the MTSS process.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

All students will be taught grade level, standards-based instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards to increase student achievement within core content. This standards-based instruction will ensure that students have the opportunity to access the content and skills outlined within each grade level B.E.S.T. standard. Students are more likely to learn and increase their academic achievement because the instruction is focused and because the students are assessed on what they are being taught.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

As a result of instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards in core content areas, 80% of our students will demonstrate at least one year of growth based on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking progress monitoring. Student growth and learning will be monitored through formative assessments and progress monitoring tools.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students' Formative, Summative and Diagnostic data along with Classroom Walk-through and i-Observation data will be reviewed to track trends and make adjustments. Lesson plans will also be checked especially with a focus on small group instruction to build foundational skills and to close gaps in learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will document in their lesson plans about small group instruction, practice they are providing to students as well as strategies being taught and assessed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These evidence based strategies will allow the teacher to make instructional decisions and provide students with support.

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.

Teachers will provide appropriate scaffolding within their small groups targeting specific needs.

Person Responsible Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

Teachers will implement the MTSS process with fidelity using data to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible Lisa Levenson (lisa.levenson@ocps.net)

Teachers will participate in B.E.S.T. standards and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring professional development to develop a deeper understanding of the new standards and the assessment component for progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

An analysis of assessment performance of the ELL students at Laureate Park from the year 2017-18 through 2020-21 shows this group of students' average proficiency is 36.9%

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

As a result of instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards in core content areas, along with the implementation of ELL strategies across core content areas, 80% of our ELL students will demonstrate at least one year of growth based on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking progress monitoring. Student growth and learning will be monitored through formative assessments and progress monitoring tools.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

ELL students' Formative, Summative and Diagnostic data along with Classroom Walk-through and i-Observation data will be reviewed to track trends and make adjustments. Lesson plans will also be checked especially with a focus implementation of ELL accommodations and on small group instruction to build foundational skills.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Okraska (maria.okraska@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers will document ELL accommodations in lesson plans. In addition, small group planning will be monitored and observed for the incorporation of ELL accommodations and intervention resources outlined in the CRMs that the teacher chooses.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

These evidence based strategies will allow the teacher to collect data on ELL student(s) performance to make informed instructional decisions to support learning and growth.

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.

Teachers will provide appropriate ELL accommodations and strategies within their small groups targeting specific needs.

Person Responsible Kathleen Ramsey (kathleen.ramsey@ocps.net)

Teachers will implement the MTSS process with fidelity using data to monitor ELL student progress.

Person Responsible Lisa Levenson (lisa.levenson@ocps.net)

Teachers will participate in B.E.S.T. standards and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring professional development to develop a deeper understanding of the new standards and resources available to implement with ELL students

Person Responsible Maria Okraska (maria.okraska@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.

A positive school culture through collaborative efforts is created among staff, parents and students which is key to increasing academic growth for students. By incorporating parents as partners in their children's education as well as increase the opportunities for all stakeholders to better communicate, the school will produce the positive environment needed to foster learning. Parents and community members are invited to join ADDitions, PTA and SAC. Students are encouraged to participate in opportunities that will facilitate the development of enjoyment in the school process, leadership skills and ownership of the school community.

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

Leadership -

-Suzanne Workum, Principal and Kathleen Ramsey, Assistant Principal

Guidance Counselor-

-Kathleen Thompson- to monitor and oversee the social-emotional well-being of students and staff

Teachers - to provide a structured and caring classroom environment that is conducive to learning. Create trusting relationships with students and staff to promote social-emotional stability and a positive culture at Laureate Park.

PTA - to make every child's potential a reality by engaging and empowering families and communities to advocate for all children.

SAC - to serve as a resource for the school principal and to assist in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan

Partners in Education - to share resources, both in people and materials.