Pineloch Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pineloch Elementary

3101 WOODS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

https://pineloches.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Gerai Mays

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: F (31%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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 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

Pineloch Elementary

3101 WOODS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

https://pineloches.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

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
Mays, Gerai	Principal	Ms. Mays serves as the instructional leader of Pineloch Elementary School. She monitors instructional delivery of the benchmarks and allocation of resources to ensure students are being provided with a high-quality education. The principal facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with timely and actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Ms. Mays establishes systems of guidance that result in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. In addition, she provides avenues for teachers to collaborate, plans rigorous lessons, and contributes input for the optimal functioning of the school. The principal engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources that directly impacts student achievement.
Gaspar, Maria	Assistant Principal	Ms. Gaspar facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with timely and actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. She partners with the principal to implement systems and structures, as well as analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. Assistant Principal Gaspar monitors discipline processes to ensure a safe learning and working environment.
Brown, Ranita	Dean	Ms. Brown assists with the school-wide discipline plan. Through collaborative efforts, she develops and supports the implementation of a universal system through proactive expectations that are utilized to encourage appropriate behaviors. Additionally, Ms. Brown provides teachers and support personnel with professional development in classroom management, restorative practices, and effective strategies to aid students with successful academic, personal, and social development. Dean Brown works in conjunction with the guidance counselor and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) coordinator to collect data and develop differentiated intervention services for students in need of Tier II or Tier III support.
Guardascione-Wolf, Lisa	Math Coach	Ms. Guardascione-Wolf serves as the math/science instructional coach. As the academic coach, she facilitates ongoing professional development to build teacher capacity. She utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in need of Tier II or Tier III support. Additionally, she provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments.
Melecio, Frances	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Melecio ensures compliance with English Language Learners' policy, procedure, and initiatives.
Plowdeniz, Valerie	School Counselor	Ms. Plowdeniz provides a comprehensive curriculum focused on academic, as well as social and emotional learning for all students. She incorporates character education, prevention, and intervention services

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		to meet the diverse needs of the student body. Her primary purpose is to remove barriers to learning and promote academic success by ensuring students have access to resources necessary for academic and social development.
Weidner, Sarah	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Weidner ensures compliance with Exceptional Student Education policy and procedures.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Gerai Mays

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.*

2

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

16

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

5

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	69	126	131	135	113	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	677
Attendance below 90 percent	16	65	60	50	47	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	1	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	51	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	54	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
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	3	1	9	53	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/8/2022

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	55	134	129	119	99	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	8	43	46	63	50	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
One or more suspensions	2	10	3	21	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	29	42	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	6	2	12	7	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	55	134	129	119	99	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	8	43	46	63	50	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
One or more suspensions	2	10	3	21	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	29	42	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	6	2	12	7	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	25%	56%	56%				39%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						51%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						58%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	30%	46%	50%				40%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	39%						41%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%						33%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	25%	61%	59%				37%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	27%	55%	-28%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	63%	-23%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	6	21	29	11	8	11	3				
ELL	21	36	37	27	40	45	19				
BLK	24	36	33	28	37	29	26				
HSP	28	32	32	34	41	21	19				
FRL	23	35	32	26	34	29	23				

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	2	35	27	7	33						
ELL	22	43	47	22	38	33	21				
BLK	23	41	50	27	27	22	18				
HSP	22	39		20	35		35				
FRL	24	47	53	27	34	29	37				

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	14	33	40	11	15	20	20				
ELL	31	50	54	42	43	37	29				
BLK	34	46	57	32	38	33	32				
HSP	42	55	59	51	44	33	43				
WHT	80			70							
FRL	38	48	62	38	40	31	32				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
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 the analysis of the school data, ELA proficiency remained fairly constant when comparing last year's 24 percent proficient to this year's 25 percent proficient. As for ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains of the lowest 25 percent, significant percentage point drops occurred where a decline of six percentage points in ELA learning gains and 12 percentage points in ELA learning gains of the lowest 25 percent occurred. In the area of Math, majority of the components showed an increase of three percentage points and in Math learning gains a seven percentage point increase was demonstrated. However, when compared to their counterparts, African American students underperformed in math proficiency. Students with disabilities and ELL students were in the lowest groups for both ELA and Math proficiency.

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

The data component, based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is the ELA proficiency for 3rd through 5th grade students with 25% proficient. Math proficiency in primary grades based on the end-of-year progress monitoring assessments is considered another component needing attention. There is a need to bring more students in the intermediate level to proficiency. Learning Gains percentages were much higher than proficiency. Science proficiency is also a major need, as it dropped 5% within one year; it went from 30% to 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?

There was not a focused effort on working with students at their specific ability levels to try to raise their proficiency continuously. Small group instruction will be closely monitored and planned for during the school year to better address students' needs. Although there were some learning gains at the end of the year, as evidenced by the state test, there was not sufficient tracking of data to assist in helping students grow to their fullest potential. There needs to be a systematic way of working with teachers to utilize data in order to streamline and focus small group instruction. Data meetings will be scheduled biweekly with teachers to review information collected from the standards-based unit assessments and any other diagnostics given.

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

Math proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25 learning gains improved from the 2021 assessment to the 2022 assessment.

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

The math coach was very involved in PLC discussions to make sure that teachers understood how to teach correctly to the depth of the standard and monitor for understanding. The school also used math resources to help students with math foundational skills at their level.

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

There will need to be a more strategic focus on MTSS processes in order to reach students at their level of reading and math and have a clearer picture of the steps needed for them to reach proficiency. Lesson plans will need to be written and followed in a way that allows for small group and differentiated instruction to propel learning.

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

The teachers will have an increased number of PLC meetings per week, and members of the School and District leadership team will help to facilitate the meetings. The PLCs will focus on specific teaching strategies aimed at reaching students and bringing them to proficiency in Reading, Math and Science. This job embedded PD opportunity will also include MTSS discussions where data of specific students is discussed, including what resources are being used to aid them in their learning.

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

The school will aim to set up a strong PLC procedure, an effective MTSS process, and sustainable routines for providing differentiated interventions in Reading and Math. Once these systems and routines have been set, teachers will make adjustments in lesson planning and delivery which will positively impact the teaching and learning processes.

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.	Pineloch Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning standards-based lessons coupled with delivering rigorous instruction to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of B.E.S.T standards Based on the results from the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), there is a need for instruction to be more rigorous by building the instructional capacity of the classroom teachers. In ELA and Math. Less than 75% of students were proficient in Reading and less than 70% were proficient in Math FSA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 45% of tested students will achieve a proficient score on the F.A.S.T. state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Area of Focus will be monitored using beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments. The school leadership team will conduct observational walk-throughs to ensure effective implementation of planned instruction and its alignment to common planning. After the completion of observations, school leadership will provide actionable feedback to teachers on the alignment of benchmarks to their lessons. Focused walk feedback will be shared during the weekly PLCs and during school-based meetings. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data, and data such as i-Ready to ensure the effectiveness of instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maria Gaspar (maria.gaspar@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Data driven instructional coaching will be used, including modeling, facilitation of practice and regular feedback to align instruction to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks. Instructional coaching will be used as a form of job-embedded support for teachers in building capacity through the coaching cycle provided by school-based and district-based coaches.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that coaching actions predict teacher and student outcomes. The coaching cycle is a structured plan to help teachers and coaches learn and improve. The outcome of the coaching cycle is to ensure that coaching becomes more impactful

| **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | through a three step process which helps identify, learn and improve partnerships with teachers, assists in goal setting and positively impacts students' lives. |

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 attend PLCs three times per week to go over details of upcoming lessons, plan text based, standards based questions, and plan for student responses.

| **Person Responsible** | Maria Gaspar (maria.gaspar@ocps.net) |

Leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs in classrooms to verify that lessons are being taught to standard and with fidelity. Trend data will be used to give feedback both individually and in PLCs.

| **Person Responsible** | Maria Gaspar (maria.gaspar@ocps.net) |

Assessment data will be reviewed to properly provide differentiation in grouping students to meet their targeted needs and strengthen foundational skills.

| **Person Responsible** | Maria Gaspar (maria.gaspar@ocps.net) |

Teachers will be tiered based on assessment data and daily walkthrough data. They will be identified for either side by side or push in coaching support on a biweekly basis depending on the need. Feedback will be provided by the coach and assessing administrator daily.

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

#2. 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.**	Multiple subgroups performed below 41% proficiency. Overall Federal Index, English Language Learners (ELL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged are the subgroups performing below 41%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, all subgroups will increase from 25% to 41% in ELA proficiency and from 30% to 41% in Math proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitored by tracking MTSS data along with diagnostic and common assessment data. There will also be quarterly data meetings with teachers to review their students' data. Teachers will be trained to help students track their own data as well, and incentivize student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	A multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) is a data-based, research-proven approach to raising student achievement. The school will put into place a comprehensive MTSS model to support students academically, behaviorally and socially. Students will be provided specific and targeted support based on their progress through the tiers. The school will also use data-based decision making and problem solving.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The MTSS strategy has been proven effective for closing achievement gaps and raising student proficiency. This process ensures that all students receive the level of support necessary to achieve academic success. In addition, it identifies students who are at risk for low outcomes, and it encourages collaboration between students and teachers.

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.

Students will be tiered based on a combination of end of year data from SY 21-22 and beginning of year diagnostic data from 22-23.

Person Responsible	Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Students will be given appropriate, documented Tier II and Tier III interventions (using iReady reading/ math, Heggerty, SIPPS, etc.).

Person Responsible   Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Documentation and data chats with teachers will be used to monitor that students receive their ELL and ESE accommodations as needed.

Person Responsible   Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Regular MTSS/Data meetings with Leadership Team will be used to target and refocus efforts as needed based on data.

Person Responsible   Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

During both informal and formal classroom walkthroughs, teachers will be provided feedback on how they respond to, probe, and accommodate SWD and ELL students using a checklist.

Person Responsible   Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@ocps.net)

Feedback will be provided to ESE resource teachers and ELL compliance teacher to monitor the quality of support that SWD and ELL students receive, and coaching schedules will be revised as needed based on data.

Person Responsible   Gerai Mays (gerai.mays@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

The proficiency level for grades K-2 was 47% according to the 2022 EOY results from the i-Ready diagnostic tool. The following is the breakdown for primary grade levels:
1. In Kindergarten, 65% of students were proficient on the District's i-Ready EOY diagnostic.
2. In First grade, 38% of students were proficient on the District's i-Ready EOY diagnostic.
3. In Second grade, 39% of students were proficient on the District's i-Ready EOY diagnostic.

_____

For Grades K-2:
The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:
- - - - - - - - - -
Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
*To prepare students to read words and comprehend text.
- - - - - - - - - -
Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
*To allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

_____

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

The proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows according to the "RAISE Schools Identification 2022-2023" document:
1. In Third grade, 26% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
2. In Fourth grade, 27% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
3. In Fifth grade, 24% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

_____
For Grades 3:
The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:
- - - - - - - - - -
Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
*To prepare students to read words and comprehend text.
- - - - - - - - - -
Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
*To allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

_____
_____
For Grades 4-5:
The following IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA strong level of evidence requirements :Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9:
- - - - - - - - - -
Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
* To think analytically and follow increasingly intricate series of events.

_____

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)

By the end of the year, at least 57% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____
1) By the end of the year, at least 70% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____
2) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____
3) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the year, at least 41% of tested students in grades 3-5 will achieve a proficient score on the state assessment.
_____
1) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____
2) By the end of the year, at least 38% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____
3) By the end of the year, at least 35% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
_____

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.

The Area of Focus will be monitored using beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through F.A.S.T. as well as i-Ready. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data, and data gained from documented MTSS interventions provided to students at the Tier II and Tier III levels (such as SIPPS, Heggerty, etc.) Biweekly data meetings will occur with teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made for student learning.

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

Mays, Gerai , gerai.mays@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?

The school is a part of the School Transformation Office, and will use evidence-based programs such as i-Ready and SIPPS for instruction and monitoring. The school will align with the District's expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted professional development, and differentiated instruction for students who are identified as needing Tier II and Tier III support. The school will use the District approved streamlined walkthrough tool weekly to monitor instruction and identify trends.

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 evidence-based practices mentioned have a proven record of predicting student proficiency and identifying student needs.

The following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with Heggerty and SIPPS meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA subgroups:

-use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)

-Heggerty (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)

-SIPPS (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. And Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

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
Teachers will attend PLCs three times per week to go over details of upcoming lessons, plan text-based and benchmark-based questions, and plan for student responses. _____ - Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made. _____ - Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content. _____ - Assessment - Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and make adjustments to future lessons. EOY and FSA data are being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the groups as changes are being made in the data. _____ - Professional Learning - Available in SIPPS, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. Benchmarks. _____	Mays, Gerai , gerai.mays@ocps.net
MTSS process will be structured as students are properly placed in fluid Tiers based on their needs. Extra hour of reading will be used to provide additional, differentiated instruction 4 times per week in fluid, homogeneous, student groups. _____ - Literacy Leadership - The Leadership Team will monitor Functional Basic Skills (FBS), Extra Hour Instruction and Small Group Instruction by utilizing classroom walkthroughs. _____ - Literacy Coaching - Lessons for small group instruction will be addressed during the PLC process. _____ - Assessment - Assessment information gathered from FBS, Extra Hour Instruction and Small Group Instruction will be utilized to make adjustments to the student groups. _____ - Professional Learning - Training opportunities in SIPP, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. standards will be available. _____	Mays, Gerai , gerai.mays@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment
A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

The school will use a Positive Behavioral Support System which will include tangible positive reinforcement and school-wide recognitions. This will be implemented for both students and staff. Students will be rewarded with daily recognition for positive behavior and stellar citizenship. Students will also be rewarded tangibly at the end of each nine weeks for maintaining positive behavior or improving their behavior. Staff will be provided weekly concrete rewards for citizenship and behaviors that strengthen the school community.

The school will continue to provide Guidance lessons, which teach students to be good citizens and great advocates. This will be reinforced with SEL curriculum provided by the District. The school will also set up a mentoring program to pair students with positive role models to guide and monitor their behavior. Family nights will be held quarterly to increase parental involvement and a sense of community.

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

The Administrative Team will take the lead in setting a supportive culture, actively rewarding and recognizing students and staff regularly. Teachers will follow the school wide behavior management plan to provide consistent behavioral interventions. The Behavioral Team will take the lead in interventions for student behavior, including proactive initiatives such as rewards, behavior lessons, and mentorship. The Parent Engagement Liaison will take the lead in planning and promoting family events at the school, and actively recruiting parents to volunteer and be involved in the school.