

Orange County Public Schools

Dr. Phillips Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

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

Demographics

Principal: Autherene Leighvard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2019

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)	35%
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: B (60%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (72%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

<https://drphillipses.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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">35%</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;">52%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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
Rogers, Christine	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Meets weekly with the Leadership Team as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Oversees supervision of all personnel, instructional focus for all grade levels and subjects, and individual student progress, safety, and wellbeing.
Hargreaves, Alexis	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Coordinates all school-wide state and district assessment. Coaches teachers with instructional focus for Math and Science. Member of the MTSS team supporting Kindergarten, 2nd, and 5th grade teachers and students.
Wallick, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Assigned to coach all teachers with pedagogy and instruction. Assists teams with developing common assessments and lesson plans as well as selecting complex texts to use for standards-based instruction. Member of the MTSS team supporting 1st, 4th, and 5th grade teachers and students.
Williams, Madeline	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Assigned to support all ELL students with proper placement and testing. Supports teachers with instruction to support ELL students achieve success. Coaches teachers will instructional focus for mathematics. Member of the MTSS team supporting 3rd grade teachers and students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/12/2019, Autherene Leighvard

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school

46

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

2

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

14

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	74	101	139	109	119	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	684
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	2	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/28/2022

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	89	128	110	112	135	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	17	12	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	89	128	110	112	135	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	17	12	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	71%	56%	56%				80%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						69%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						58%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	76%	46%	50%				83%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						82%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						73%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	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	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
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	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	16	28	27	40	53	43	38				
ELL	60	56	35	70	62	38	58				
ASN	93	83		93	67						
BLK	42	20		32	36		10				
HSP	63	62	36	72	62	29	59				
WHT	77	64	48	82	69	64	76				
FRL	57	47	28	61	62	39	46				
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	35			26			33				
ELL	67	77	60	71	69	50	60				
ASN	91	79		88	64		88				
BLK	53	50		35	40		45				
HSP	68	57	57	73	68	53	62				
WHT	76	69		77	75		82				
FRL	63	51	55	63	63	46	54				
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	35	38	40	35	69	67	33				
ELL	76	73	74	83	81	76	72				
ASN	89	82		96	88						
BLK	62	48		59	74	69	54				
HSP	73	63	53	82	83	83	78				
WHT	86	76	70	86	81	63	80				
FRL	68	61	47	74	82	78	63				

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
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	84
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	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	
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	67
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	49
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?

4th and 5th grade saw decreases in ELA performance and learning gains, where as an increase was seen in 3rd grade achievement.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline: -2% Achievement, -2% Learning Gains, and -18% Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, the school experienced turnover in 4th and 5th grade teaching positions in addition to teachers being on a leave of absence or having a high number of absences. New actions for the present school year have resulted in hiring or placing new grade level teams, and hiring for a Tier 1 Interventionalists position. Additional support will be scheduled to support ESE and students in the Lowest 25%.

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

Overall math achievement showed the greatest improvement resulting in a two percent increase from the 2021-2022 school year.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, the school focused on differentiating instruction during the math intervention block, in addition to reinforcing foundational skills.

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

In order to accelerate learning, students will be grouped for FBS/Enrichment based on learning needs for reading. Teachers will also utilize acceleration model to pre-teach vocabulary in reading and in math to support students with foundational skills.

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.

During pre-planning all teachers will be provided their students academic data to understand all students learning needs. Professional development and planning sessions will be provided to support planning for differentiated instruction in reading and in math.

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

In order to sustain improvement, teachers will be provided a paid planning day to review and reflect on instructional practices and continue to differentiate instruction using common assessment data.

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.

The leadership team and teachers will plan and implement small group instruction that is differentiated to meet the learning needs of ESE students.

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

By differentiating small group instruction and supporting students with foundational skills in reading, we will narrow the achievement gap in reading and in math for our ESE students.

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

Subgroup data will be monitored through PLC data meetings. Grade-level teachers will review previously compiled assessment data as well as analyze the performance of students in specific subgroups. Leadership and teachers will discuss next steps including differentiating instruction and monitoring for student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

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

By differentiating small group instruction, teachers will be able to plan to meet the needs of all students.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, the school will use data to differentiate instruction for students through centers. The data showed ESE students and students in the lowest quartile have the largest need to close the achievement gap.

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.

Leadership team will facilitate professional development during pre-planning for teachers to identify learning needs of their students, in addition to identifying subgroup data.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

Teachers will engage in ongoing planning to use data to plan for differentiated small group instruction in reading.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

The leadership team will monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction in reading centers.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

The leadership team will facilitate PLC data meetings to identify trends for the grade level and for subgroups.

Person Responsible Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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

Teachers will plan and implement high yield student engagement and accountable talk strategies to engage students with grade-level tasks.

During the 2021-2022 school year, proficiency dropped in all achievement categories: -2% ELA ACH., -2% Math ACH., and -5% Science ACH.

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

By focusing on high yield student engagement and accountable talk strategies, we will engage students with grade-level tasks to increase student achievement in reading, math, and science.

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

Student achievement will be monitored through PLC data meetings. Grade-level teachers will review previously compiled assessment data as well as analyze the performance of students with common assessments. The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of student engagement strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

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

By implementing high yield student engagement and accountable talk strategies, students will be engaged with grade-level tasks aligned to the BEST standards.

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

The school will focus on providing professional development on high yield strategies, accountable talk, and provide classroom resources to facilitate engagement.

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.

Coaches will provide professional development and review resources for accountable talk during pre-planning.

Person Responsible

Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

The leadership team will support teachers with planning student engagement and accountable talk with grade-level lesson plans.

Person Responsible

Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@ocps.net)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor student engagement and accountable talk.

Person Responsible

Christine Rogers (christine.rogers@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

Close reading strategies, and Kagan engagement strategies for student processing.

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

Close reading strategies. Kagan engagement strategies for student processing. RACE strategy.

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)

65% or more of students will be on track to be at or above grade level by the end of the year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

70% or more of students will be on track to be at grade level by the end of the year.

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.

Summative and progress monitoring assessment data will be reviewed on a regular basis. The leadership team will work with grade level teams to plan differentiated instruction and FBS structures to meet the needs of all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rogers, Christine, christine.rogers@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. Â§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?

Teachers will use the BEST standards to plan grade level, standards based instruction, using resources aligned to the benchmarks. Students in 2nd through 5th grade will use Reading Plus to support building fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension skills. Students in K-1 will use Reading A-Z to support student's reading comprehension.

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?

Reading Plus has a strong correlation when used with fidelity to show student grow in reading comprehension. Reading A-Z when used with fidelity has support students with reading comprehension.

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
1. Kagan training with high yield engagement strategies during pre-planning. 2. Ongoing grade level planning using BEST benchmark and engagement strategies. 3. District SUBAs to assess students understanding. Data is used to form FBS/ Enrichment groups.	Rogers, Christine, christine.rogers@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.

Dr. Phillips Elementary School builds a positive school culture through relationships and supporting students and staffs Social Emotional Learning. This is achieved by having school wide norms and strategies. Students are taught how to positively collaborate with peers through accountable talk and engagement with Kagan strategies.

Teachers meet weekly in PLCs to collaborate to support student's learning. Each grade level team shares ideas, strategies, and resources in order to ensure all students are supported. Student of the Month recognizes student leaders who exhibit a specific character trait and a leader among their peers. Students are recognized for their positive behavior and celebrated.

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

All faculty members are involved in establishing and maintaining a positive school culture and climate. Teachers spearhead the culture and climate in their classroom, creating a safe and engaging learning environment. Classified staff support the overall school's climate either through supporting students in the classroom, supporting parents and the community, or both. The school leadership team collaborates with all

staff members to establish and maintain a positive and engaging school culture and environment. This is accomplished through monthly team meetings with grade level leaders, weekly PLC grade level meetings, monthly SAC and PTA meetings, quarterly parent/community events, and ongoing daily support within the school.