# Astoria Park Elementary School

**2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Astoria Park Elementary School

## 2465 ATLAS RD, Tallahassee, FL 32303

## https://www.leonschools.net/astoriapark

## Demographics

## Principal: Cassandra Poole

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2022

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: D (37%)<br><br>2018-19: C (42%)<br><br>2017-18: D (40%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Rachel Heide |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |
| **ESSA Status** | CSI |
| * 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 Leon 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

# Astoria Park Elementary School

## 2465 ATLAS RD, Tallahassee, FL 32303

## https://www.leonschools.net/astoriapark

## 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 | 94% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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.**

The mission of Astoria Park is based on the worth and dignity of the individual child. Our school strives to create a quality and caring learning environment that fosters a positive self-image while preparing the student to become a responsible, self-motivated, independent, and contributing citizen in an ever-changing world.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To foster the development of student self-control through the display of intelligence, cooperation, responsibility, tolerance, and respect for the individuality of every person. To educate the children in citizenship skills so that they may learn to voice opinions, assume personal responsibility, respect laws, and become a contributing member of the school and community.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Poole, Cassandra | Principal | Oversee day-to-day school operations<br>Manage school logistics and budgets<br>Set learning goals for students and teachers based on state curricula<br>Monitor and report on teacher performance<br>Research new resources and techniques to improve teaching<br>Interview and hire school personnel<br>Review and implement school policies<br>Provide guidance and counseling to teachers<br>Handle emergencies and school crises<br>Ensure a safe and clean environment for students<br>Attend conferences to gain knowledge on current educational trends |
| Bradwell, Katrina | Assistant Principal | Assist the Principal in the following:<br>Oversee day-to-day school operations<br>Manage school logistics and budgets<br>Set learning goals for students and teachers based on state curricula<br>Monitor and report on teacher performance<br>Research new resources and techniques to improve teaching<br>Interview school personnel<br>Review and implement school policies<br>Provide guidance and counseling to teachers<br>Handle emergencies and school crises<br>Organize school events and assemblies<br>Ensure a safe and clean environment for students<br>Keep current on educational trends<br>All additional duties as assigned |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 1/4/2022, Cassandra Poole

**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.*
4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
34

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
513

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
1

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**
7

**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 | 77 | 87 | 98 | 88 | 98 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 522 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 31 | 31 | 28 | 33 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 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 | 38 | 43 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 50 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7 | 14 | 30 | 43 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |

**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 | 5 | 8 | 19 | 24 | 30 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |

**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 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Tuesday 7/5/2022

**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 | 70 | 86 | 97 | 82 | 81 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 493 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 13 | 29 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 31 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| 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 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

**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 | 70 | 86 | 97 | 82 | 81 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 493 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 13 | 29 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 31 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| 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 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# 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 | 29% | 57% | 56% | | | | 37% | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | | | | | | 40% | 54% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | | | | | | 48% | 47% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 26% | 47% | 50% | | | | 46% | 64% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 42% | | | | | | 56% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | | | | | | 41% | 45% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 17% | 57% | 59% | | | | 29% | 52% | 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 | 41% | 61% | -20% | 58% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 57% | -20% | 58% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 33% | 56% | -23% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -37% | | | | |

| 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 | 46% | 63% | -17% | 62% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 66% | -11% | 64% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -46% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 61% | -26% | 60% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 54% | -26% | 53% | -25% |
| 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 | 27 | 59 | | 16 | 29 | | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 56 | 59 | 26 | 41 | 36 | 15 | | | | |
| MUL | 36 | 60 | | 33 | 64 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 52 | 59 | 22 | 38 | 34 | 15 | | | | |
| 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 | 15 | 6 | | 18 | 13 | 20 | 7 | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 28 | 22 | 27 | 22 | 11 | 19 | 9 | | | | |
| WHT | 30 | | | 10 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 24 | 24 | 36 | 18 | 10 | 23 | 8 | | | | |
| 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 | 10 | 30 | 38 | 18 | 41 | 40 | 10 | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 40 | 47 | 43 | 54 | 43 | 24 | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | | | 62 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 40 | 51 | 44 | 54 | 46 | 26 | | | | |

## 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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 37 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 259 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |

| 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 | 38 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 48 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 35 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?**

Based on FSA scores, ELA proficiency declined. However, according to STAR Reading/Early Literacy there was an increase in proficiency at the Kindergarten, second, third and fourth grade levels. Also, based on STAR Math Fall and Spring Benchmarks, proficiency increased at Kindergarten, first, and second grades. Fourth grade remained unchanged and 3rd grade declined,

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

Based on FSA data grades 3-5 average proficiency is 26% in ELA and 25% in Math. STAR Reading progress monitoring data reflects students in grades 2-5 are functioning at 36% proficiency and below. Star Math indicates proficiency between 14% and 30% across grade levels 1-5.

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

The Covid pandemic has resulted in a significant decrease in student learning opportunities and therefore, impacted student performance as well as student enrollment which is reflected in a decline in student scores. New actions include increased instructional staff to assist with interventions both academic and social emotional. Professional development for faculty and staff along with consistent effective intervention materials targeted for specific deficiencies. The admin team will place a strong emphasis on monitoring student achievement data and alignment of evidence based instructional materials to the BEST standards.

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

Based on the STAR Reading Progress monitoring data, reading revealed the most improvement.

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

Because of the vast number of students needing Tier 3 intervention (and a lack of human resource to adequately provide them), Astoria revamped the reading intervention model mid-year to include reading endorsed classroom teachers providing their own Tier 3 interventions as opposed to a pull-out model utilizing one teacher. Astoria also partnered with FLDOE Just Read, Florida who provided resources and professional development to faculty on best practices for instruction in Tier 1, 2, and 3.

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

Implement walk and read, improve Tier 1 instruction, increase time for tier 2 and 3 intervention at minimum 30 minutes a day 5 times per week outside of the reading block, additional reading interventionists on staff for push in and small group settings. Provide increased family support, and a stronger prescriptive, targeted evidenced based intervention materials.

**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 opportunities include training from Heggerty on their reading intervention program, training provided by LCS on new reading curriculum SAVVAS and BEST Standards. Reading and Math Coaches will also provide training for teachers as well as professional development opportunities provided by FCRR.

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

Astoria will partner with FSU's Education Department to increase the number of volunteers to assist with one-on-one interventions for struggling students, the number of reading endorsed teachers will also increase which will help ensure sustainability. Astoria has also increased family engagement opportunities through curriculum nights, stem nights, etc.

**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 Math** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Instructional Practice related to math is determined to be a critical need based on 2021 FSA data reflecting that only 17% of third grade students, 38% of 4th grade students and 21% of 5th grade students were proficient. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Astoria Park will increase math proficiency to at minimum 45% for third, fourth, and fifth 3rd grade students. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Progress monitoring will be completed through use of Acaletics quarterly assessments, FAST, daily exit tickets to assess benchmarks, teacher assessments (pre, mid, and post), walkthroughs, monthly data chats and curriculum diagnostics |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cassandra Poole (poolec@leonschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Teachers will employ the strategy of explicit, systematic instruction using standards based curriculum. This strategy will be implemented with fidelity consistently over time. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | According to research found at the IRIS Center, use of this strategy has indicated that teaching mathematics in this manner is highly effective and can significantly improve a student's ability to perform mathematical operations as well as to solve word problems. This strategy has been shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities and ELLs. This strategy is also in direct alignment with the districts evaluation tool Leon Leads. |

| **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. |

1. Review the math data with Administration, teachers, math coach
2. Select the high impact students from PM1, baseline and previous year data.
3. Select the benchmarks and on grade level material
4. Assess student gaps and specifically select targeted interventions using the data from Acaletics, State Pm data, and class assessment. The deficient areas will be taught through small group intervention time on those targeted areas identified from student work and assessments.
5. Plan and train staff to implement the instruction, begin.

**Person Responsible**         Cassandra Poole (poolec@leonschools.net)

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | According to 2021 FSA data 15% of students with disabilities in third grade are proficient in ELA, followed by 45% in fourth grade and 14% in fifth grade. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Students with disabilities in third, fourth, and fifth grade will increase proficiency to 41% or higher in ELA |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Progress Monitoring will be conducted thru admin walk through's, data chats, FAST, Heggerty, SAVVAS and Unique data, teacher assessments, and IEP reviews |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Katrina Bradwell (bradwellk@leonschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | Teachers will employ the strategy of direct and explicit instruction when teaching students with disabilities to increase word recognition skills. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | This evidence based strategy was chosen because based on the data analysis, this population of students have challenges with word recognition skills such as decoding, phonics and phonemic awareness. In an article by K. Stanberry and L. Swanson, it is noted that "The most important outcome of teaching word recognition," Dr. Swanson emphasizes, "is that students learn to recognize real words, not simply sound out 'nonsense' words using phonics skills." Direct instruction appears the most effective approach for improving word recognition skills in students with learning disabilities. Direct instruction refers to teaching skills in an explicit, direct fashion. It involves drill/repetition/ practice and can be delivered to one child or to a small group of students at the same time. |

### 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.

1. Review the math data with Administration, teachers, math coach
2. Select the high impact students from PM1, baseline and previous year data.
3. Select the benchmarks and on grade level material
4. Assess student gaps and specifically select targeted interventions using the data from Acaletics, State Pm data, and class assessment. The deficient areas will be taught through small group intervention time on those targeted areas identified from student work and assessments.
5. Plan and train staff to implement the instruction, begin.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Katrina Bradwell (bradwellk@leonschools.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**

The rationale for this area of focus is that ELA Instructional Practice is the area that will have the highest impact on student achievement as it impacts all other subject areas. This area was identified based on the Spring 2021-2022 Star data reflecting that 37% of second graders are proficient in ELA. Grades K and 1 are 87% and 53% proficient.

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

The rationale for this area of focus is that ELA Instructional Practice is the area that will have the highest impact on student achievement as it impacts all other subject areas. This area was identified based on the 2021-2022 FSA data that reflects 3rd grade performing at 30% proficiency followed by 4th grade at 32% and 5th grade at 25%

**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)**

Astoria will increase proficiency to a minimum of 58% in ELA for second grade students based on progress monitoring tool.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Astoria will increase proficiency to a minimum of 45% in ELA for third, fourth and fifth grade students based on progress monitoring tool.

**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.

Progress Monitoring will be conducted through weekly instructional reviews focusing on "look fors" demonstrating high levels of rigor, administrator walk through's, FAST, weekly data chats, progress monitoring tools, iReady and Lexia diagnostics, teacher assessments, collaborative planning and SAVVAS data.

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

Poole, Cassandra, poolec@leonschools.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?

Grades K-3 will utilize the Heggerty reading program as a supplement to the core curriculum to address deficits in phonemic awareness. In addition, Early Reading Interventions, Seeing Stars and Visualizing and Verbalizing will be used to assist with Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Grades 4-5 will use Heggerty Bridge The Gap, SRA Corrective and Visualizing and Verbalizing to assist with decoding and comprehension skills. We will provide targeted and prescriptive Tier 2 interventions a minimum of three days a week for 30 minutes in small groups and Tier 3 interventions five days a week for a minimum of 30 minutes in small groups. The strategies used will be inclusive of comprehension strategies including text preview, predictions, context clues, re-read, read aloud, graphics, identifying the main idea, paraphrasing and summarizing.

**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 rationale for selecting the above practices/programs is based on 2021-22 FSA and STAR data which reflects that less than 50% of students in grades 2-5 were proficient in ELA. We know based on research found at the Florida Center of Reading Research that small group reading instruction is a powerful resource for reading instruction and when coupled with the research based strategies listed above reading achievement for students will increase proficiency scores.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Leadership<br>a) Identify leadership team which will include Principal, AP, Dean, Guidance Counselor, Reading and Math Coach and media specialist<br>b) develop an action plan<br>c) Lead systematic instructional planning<br>Literacy Coaching<br>a) focus instruction on essential curriculum elements<br>b) make sure sound instructional programs are in place and implemented correctly and consistently<br>c) conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback<br>Assessment<br>a) clearly define and identify learning outcomes<br>b) collect and analyze data<br>c) adjust/improve programs following results of learning outcomes<br>Professional Learning<br>a) measure and determine what needs to be learned<br>b) reflect on practice<br>c) change and improve practice<br>d) gain/share expertise | Poole, Cassandra, poolec@leonschools.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.**

Astoria Park utilizes several avenues to build a positive school culture and environment. Our PBIS team works diligently to promote pride and positive behaviors. Astoria will recognize AB honor roll students every nine weeks. PRIDE parties monthly and a cumulative celebration at the end of the year for students who

exhibit and practice kindness, respect, integrity, demonstrate improvement, and effort (P.R.I.D.E.). Curriculum nights and PTO sponsored educational nights help build family relationships. Team building activities monthly coupled with cultural and sunshine committees provide learning opportunities for faculty, staff and students to observe and celebrate each other.

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

Administration makes daily appearances on the morning news to keep students, faculty and staff informed and provide positive motivation as well as communicate with families through list serve and social media. Community partners help sponsor school supply drives, and often celebrate staff and students. The PBIS team creates opportunities to celebrate students for positive behavior including a recreation room and PRIDE parties. Faculty and staff participate in team building activities monthly and celebrate each other. Students show PRIDE to help ensure kindness and respect and positive behaviors flourish.