Apopka Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Apopka Elementary

311 VICK RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://apopkaes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Toni Buxton   Start Date for this Principal: 1/10/2022

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	No
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%)
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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

Apopka Elementary

311 VICK RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://apopkaes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	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	80%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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
Buxton, Toni	Principal	Supervise Gr 1, 3, 5 (Data Meetings, Common Planning, Evaluations, Leave); Supervise Leadership Team & Interventionists; Administrative Evaluations; Classified Evaluations (Secretary, Registrar, Clerk(s), ESOL Paras, TSR); Staffing; Budget; School Calendars; A-4s; Classroom Walkthroughs; School Improvement Plan; Student Attendance; MTSS Supervision; Supervise Digital Instruction; Weekly Communication with staff and community; Tutoring; PTA & SAC; ESOL; Guidance; Annual Stakeholder Survey Supervision;
Rivera, Milagros	Assistant Principal	Supervise PK, K, 2, 4, ESE, Special Areas (Data Meetings, Common Planning, Evaluations, Leave); Classified Evaluations (ESE Paras, PreK Para, PE Paras, Clinic); Master Schedule (Lunch, Recess, Special Areas); Discipline Contact and Data Entry; MAO Administrator; DOE Restraint Data; Summer School; Skyward Contact; Facilities Rentals; Title IX; Threat Assessments; Staff Duty Schedule (Lunch, Morning, Afternoon); School Clubs; Inventory; Drills Schedule; Student Schedules; Maintenance Monitoring; Code of Conduct Reviews; Two-Way Dual Language; Early Childhood; Volunteer Coordinator Lead; Clinic
St Gelais, Jessica	Reading Coach	Co-facilitating common planning with team leaders; Coaching classroom instruction; Support progress monitoring assessment; iReady Consultant Contact; Lowest 30% Monitoring in ELA; ELA student support groups; ELA lesson planning support/coaching; 3rd grade good cause; I-Ready ELA Usage and Monitoring; District PD and Coaching Training; Support MTSS ELA
Gary, Constance	Instructional Coach	Tier I Intervention; Designee; MTSS Coordinator; Coaching classroom instruction; Accountability Corrections; Coordinate Interventionist Schedules; Student Supervision; Support & monitor small group planning and ELA FBS; Extracurricular activities (clubs, monitoring, etc.); Field Trip Coordinator; Bus Coordinator; Partners in Education Coordinator; Social Media and School Website (Facebook, Twitter)
McCowan, Amanda	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coordinate Testing Calendar, Training and Support Schedules (FLKRS, WIDA, iReady, PMA, FSA & CFE); Train staff on testing accommodations; TWDL Coordinator; TWDL Student Applications; Collaborates with Multilingual Department; TWDL Teacher Expectations; iStation Contact; MPLC Coordinator; ELL Para Schedule; TWDL Planning Sessions; College Volunteer Coordinator
DeBauche, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Co-facilitating common planning with team leaders; Coaching classroom instruction; Support progress monitoring assessment; Symphony Math Consultant Contact; Lowest 30% Monitoring in Math; Math student support groups; Math/Science planning support/coaching; Symphony Math Usage and Monitoring; Intern Coordinator; Lead Mentor; New-hire 3 day Training Schedule; New Teacher Program; Support MTSS Math; PD Points

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Green, Michelle	School Counselor	Guidance (K-5); Teach-In Coordinator; MVP/Foster Care Coordinator; MTSS B support; Social skills groups; Enrichment Clubs; Mental Health Coordinator; Health course support; Character Ed; SOAR Mentor Coordinator; Tier III – MTSS B Targeted groups; Threat Assessments
Bekas, Cynthia	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Contact; ESE School-based PD; Maintain ESE data and documents/ evidence; Small group instruction – Tier II or Tier III; ESE Instructional Support for Teachers; Gifted Screening; Schedules Support Facilitator, ESE Para(s); Educate teachers on IEP process and services; SSI; 504 and health plans

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/10/2022, Toni Buxton

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
66

Total number of students enrolled at the school
790

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
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	25	134	156	152	137	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	5	37	34	35	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	38	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	6	32	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/20/2022

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	21	145	122	141	118	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	701
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	28	28	11	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	2	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	21	145	122	141	118	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	701
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	28	28	11	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	2	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	56%	56%				59%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						60%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						53%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	46%	50%				65%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						64%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						46%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	61%	59%				58%	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	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	63%	2%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
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	25	40	30	31	61	50	14				
ELL	39	56	47	47	66	48	42				
BLK	56	60	42	72	81	70	53				
HSP	43	50	43	54	65	48	41				
MUL	76	58		71	58						
WHT	69	69		72	73		50				
FRL	44	50	38	57	68	50	38				

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	26	33		29	39		41				
ELL	34	35		42	29		33				
BLK	57	43	17	52	38	29	38				
HSP	45	38	23	46	33	17	38				
MUL	59			65							
WHT	60	61		62	44		62				
FRL	45	32	13	46	35	11	36				
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	33	39	37	43	42	31	33				
ELL	48	55	48	58	62	57	44				
BLK	60	60	42	55	68	46	61				
HSP	52	53	51	63	58	42	52				
MUL	64			64							
WHT	67	68		80	71		71				
FRL	52	58	53	56	60	46	54				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
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	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	50
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?

There were increases in all areas for ELA, Math, and Science, with the greatest gains in Math learning gains (+33%), and learning gains of the bottom 25% in Math (+29%). Proficiency rates in all subject areas increased, with a gain of 1% in ELA, 11% in Math, and 4% in Science. Progress monitoring assessments show Students with Disabilities (SWD) continuing to perform below the grade-level proficiency rate in ELA and Math. English Language Learners (ELL) are also performing below the grade-level proficiency in all subject areas.

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

Based on FSA preliminary data, students in the bottom 25% continue to demonstrate the greatest need in the area of ELA learning gains (42%). Although this is an increase of 23% from the prior assessment, there is still opportunity for improvement. Progress monitoring assessed through the i-Ready program was consistent with the learning gains of students in the lowest quartile, with 39% of those students demonstrating a learning gain. Of the students in the lowest quartile, approximately one-third of the students are also represented in the SWD subgroup.

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

Students in the tested grades spent two years in and out of face to face and virtual learning, with inconsistent opportunities for intervention in prior years when foundational skills should have been developing. Students will be receiving increased intervention support to focus on foundational skills and reteaching daily grade level concepts to those who do not demonstrate proficiency. For those students significantly below grade level, implementation of research-based interventions by classroom teachers and Tier I Intervention teachers will be used in small group and intervention blocks. One of the factors that contributed to the need for improvement in ELA was the large class sizes during Tier II instruction. To address this need, those receiving Tier II instruction will be strategically grouped by targeted need in a small group setting. Teacher instructional capacity will be increased by sending teachers to Orton Gillingham training.

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

The component that showed the most improvement is the percent of students in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains on FSA Math assessment. The amount of students who achieved learning gains for FSA Math assessment was 72%. In the 2021-2022 school year 39% of students achieved learning gains for FSA Math assessment, which is an improvement of 33%. In addition, the amount of

students from the lowest quartile achieving math learning gains was 55%. This is an improvement of 29% from the students tested in the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement included collaborative planning with a focus on backward design, administration presence at common planning, and weekly monitoring of implementation of planned lessons by administration and coaches. An additional contributing factor was decreased use of non-research based curriculum materials. The new actions the school took to assist with these improvements include common planning, backward planning from common assessments aligned with standards based instruction, and the increasing the level of student engagement through the use of manipulatives and accountable talk.

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

Strategies that need to be implemented to accelerate learning include targeted interventions with effective progress monitoring through the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process, increased time collaborating around planning for standards based instruction, and targeted planning of small group instruction with a strategic focus on specific standards, based on student data. Tier I Intervention teachers will push into small group rotations using differentiated, evidence-based resources to address all components of the B.E.S.T. Standards.

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.

B.E.S.T. Standards training will be embedded into Professional Learning Community (PLC) and data meetings throughout the school year for the teachers. Professional development opportunities will include strategies on implementing SWD accommodations/IEP implementation, use of processing, scaffolding, and monitoring strategies, and the effective use of resources (curriculum). Training on Orton Gilligham will be provided to specific teachers to build content knowledge about ELA foundational skills for instruction with students who are one or more grade level below proficiency and Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPs) to all teachers to increase instructional proficiency with foundational reading skills.

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

The school support team composed of the principal, assistant principal, literacy coach, math/science coach, and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) coach, will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities through data analysis at Professional Learning Community meetings. The focus of the data meetings will be to monitor the students' responses to common assessments and determine the level of reteaching that is needed to support students in being successful at the end of unit assessments. MTSS will continue to be aligned to students' performance on assessments and performance tasks. Tier I will focus on planning for small group instruction. Tier II instruction will be strategically scheduled outside of the core instruction block using a "walk-to" model with students grouped by need, and monitored by the school support team, classroom walkthroughs, and reviewing student data. Tier III instruction will focus on providing additional instruction for students outside of the reading block who require below grade level standards based instruction to address their individual needs.

Our school support team will monitor the identified groups of students with two or more Early Warning System Indicators and provide mentoring support services through small group counseling, parental

support meetings, and active participation at grade level PLC meetings to monitor the level of planning to support the academic needs of our identified groups of students.

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 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.	Based on FSA data, Students with Disabilities performed below the 41% Federal Index Threshold with a level of 25%, with only 31% making learning gains. In comparison, in the previous year, 36% of tested Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA. This subgroup has been an area of focus for several years, so we would like to close the gap between students with and without disabilities in both proficiency and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The measurable outcome the school plan intends to achieve is to increase the ELA proficiency of Students with Disabilities subgroup population above the 41% Federal Index Threshold by 11% on the Every Student Succeeds Act. This will indicate a Federal Index Threshold of 42% for the 2022-2023 school year of Students with Disabilities. In order to support the measurable outcome, a focus will be to increase the amount of Students with Disabilities achieving ELA learning gains to 46%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings with the staffing specialist, administration and teacher leaders on the implementation of IEP services. Administrators and content area coaches will use classroom walkthroughs to monitor that interventions are implemented as planned. Following each unit assessment, PLCs will review student data on common assessments and make instructional decisions based on individual student needs. Administrators will monitor the implementation of the support facilitation schedule and progress toward IEP goals will also be used to measure for the desired outcomes. Teachers will be responsible for documenting implementation through lesson plans, keeping data current, and IEP meeting notes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	During the 2022-2023 school year, teachers will make content, skills, and concepts explicit by modeling thinking while solving problems, enacting strategies, completing tasks, and classifying concepts. During instruction, teachers will provide opportunities for students to process new content and will focus on appropriate use of scaffolding with students to ensure students understand content and concepts, apply skills, and complete tasks successfully and independently. The literacy strategies will be monitored when the school support team conducts classroom walkthroughs and classroom observations.

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.**	In order for effective student meaning making to occur, learners must be actively engaged in processing content through the teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. High yield instructional strategies, such as helping students process new content, helping students elaborate on content, non-linguistic representation, and organizing students to process content (cooperative learning), will be implemented focusing on individual and small group instruction for students.

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.

Create ongoing professional development facilitated by the Staffing Specialist and the District ESE department that will focus on implementing accommodations in a general education classroom that address the academic and social needs of Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

ESE teachers will be active participants at Professional Learning Community meetings with reviewing data, forming intervention groups, and sharing ideas with PLC team members of high yield instructional strategies for Students with Disabilities. Administration will analyze data of academic performance of Students with Disabilities on common assessments and progress monitoring checkpoints with classroom teachers and ESE teachers.

Person Responsible Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Provide intervention support to Students with Disabilities who are taking the F.A.S.T. assessments in our Exception Education self-contained classrooms based on needs indicated by progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

#2. 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.	Based on changes to instructional standards, a focus area is teacher understanding and implementation of B.E.S.T. standards within all classrooms. This will directly relate to the upcoming F.A.S.T. assessment, as well as support classroom instruction. The rationale for this area of focus is to increase the number of students achieving ELA proficiency from 55% to 60%. This data component was in alignment with the district average of 52% of students achieving ELA proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The intended outcome is to increase teacher understanding and effectively implement the B.E.S.T. standards. The measurable outcome of the school plan is to increase the number of students performing at the proficient level on the ELA F.A.S.T. assessment from 53% to 60%. This will indicate a 7% increase from the 2021-2022 ELA FSA Assessment. In addition, the percentage of third grade students who will perform at the proficient level on the ELA F.A.S.T. assessment will increase 49% to 60%. This will indicate a 11% increase from the 2021-2022 school year and lower the achievement gap in comparison to the state average.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Implementation of instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards will be monitored by coaches and administrators through classroom walkthrough trend data of whole group, small group, and intervention blocks; analysis of grade level common assessment data during PLCs, and progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	To increase ELA proficiency teachers will be collaboratively planning lessons that include strategies and structures that facilitate participation, meaning making and intellectual engagement by all students in reading. During planning teachers will anticipate misconceptions, determine how they plan to monitor that students are meeting the learning target, and identify appropriate scaffolding techniques to use with those students who are not meeting the learning target.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	Based on last year's classroom walkthrough trend data, processing and scaffolding is a school-wide area of need. Directly linking use of these strategies to effective instruction of the B.E.S.T standards will increase ELA proficiency.

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

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

School-based coaches will facilitate PLC meetings during which teachers will closely examine the B.E.S.T. standards and determine the appropriate processing and scaffolding instructional strategies to use during instruction. Teachers will incorporate new knowledge of standards, and incorporate effective scaffolding techniques and evidence based instructional strategies that will help students process standards.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Administration and coaches will conduct weekly walkthroughs specifically targeted to analyze the transfer of knowledge of B.E.S.T. standards based on instruction planned during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Based on walkthrough trends and data, administrators will identify specific areas needing improvement directly related to school-wide understanding of implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on Panorama school survey data, 30% of teachers reported favorable perception of the amount and quality of feedback faculty and staff receive. More specifically, 26% of teachers responded favorably to the question, "How often do you receive feedback on your teaching?" and "How much feedback do you receive on your teaching?" The least favorable responses, at 19%, was regarding the question, "How much do you learn from the teacher evaluation processes at your school?"
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Teacher perceptions of feedback and coaching will increase from 30% to 50% on the Panorama spring survey. Classroom walkthrough data will indicate an increase from the spring 2022 baseline to EOY 2023 in the following areas: alignment to grade-level benchmarks from 57% to 70%; increase use of monitoring strategies from 67% to 75%; use of processing strategies from 52% to 70%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom walkthrough data trends will be monitored by the school support team (SST) with a focus on instructional and task alignment to grade-level benchmarks, use of strategies and structures that facilitate participation and meaning making by all students, appropriate scaffolding, intellectual engagement, and use of monitoring strategies. SST will calibrate the quality of feedback monthly, and quarterly teacher focus groups will be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The school support team will provide specific feedback to teachers through classroom walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and as part of the evaluation process. Observations will focus on providing feedback about the effectiveness and appropriateness of the processing, scaffolding, and monitoring strategies used during instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to allow for school support team members to provide specific teacher feedback to ensure teachers are providing sufficient opportunities for students to engage in intellectual work, have opportunities to demonstrate learning, and to apply learning to new tasks. Samplings of feedback provided to teachers will be reviewed during school support team meetings, with trends noted to determine next steps for coaching and modeling.

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.

Professional development and coaching will be conducted with teachers focusing on processing, scaffolding, and monitoring during lesson segments to include whole and small group instruction, and intervention blocks.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Monthly school support team meetings will be held to review teacher feedback during observations and identify trends from classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Tiered support of teachers, through which they receive coaching, modeling, co-teaching, peer observation, and review of data analysis.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Teachers will be randomly selected to provide quarterly feedback through focus groups on perceptions of feedback and coaching, including suggestions for next steps that the school support team may implement.

Person Responsible   Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging life skills as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools teach life skills to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture and connect cognitive and cognitive strategies to support student success.

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

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps.

Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.