Ocoee Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ocoee Elementary

400 S LAKEWOOD AVE, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://ocoeees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Kandace Goshe

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2022

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: C (46%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%)
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	TSI
* 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.](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

Ocoee Elementary

400 S LAKEWOOD AVE, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://ocoeees.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	81%

School Grades History

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

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
Goshe, Kandace	Principal	Principal - leads the school by providing a common vision based upon the utilization of data-based decisions, as well as ensuring that instruction is standards-based.
Brzakala, Lisa	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor - social/emotional classes per grade level, offers parent/family/student counseling, outreach and support services, partners in education.
Rafferty, Leslie	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach/Curriculum Resource Teacher - testing and training, computer programs for student advancement and support, Title 1 procedures, parent training modules and MTSS.
Williams, Dana	Math Coach	Math and Science Coach - providing teachers with best practices in Science and Math instruction.
Menelas, Arnetta	Other	Resource Teacher - working with teachers identifying best practices and providing professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/21/2022, Kandace Goshe

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

686

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

2

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

8

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	44	108	94	122	77	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	13	34	27	26	10	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	19	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	14	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	14	12	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	35	83	105	102	109	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	10	22	23	25	31	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	8	14	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	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	35	83	105	102	109	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	10	22	23	25	31	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	8	14	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	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	43%	56%	56%				52%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						58%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						60%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	46%	50%				56%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	48%						51%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						55%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	61%	59%				41%	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	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	63%	-15%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	53%	-12%
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	14	17	23	17	9	13	21				
ELL	31	55	58	41	45	31	19				
BLK	52	64		41	57		48				
HSP	38	59	63	42	47	38	25				
WHT	51	61		53	42		70				
FRL	39	55	59	43	46	36	36				

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	19	30		19	20						
ELL	26	41	47	29	34	35	21				
BLK	55	68		41	36		42				
HSP	33	41	50	34	36	40	30				
WHT	55	71		46	47		65				
FRL	38	52	44	32	41	31	35				

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	17	42	38	15	23	29	11				
ELL	43	60	67	50	48	53	17				
BLK	58	63		53	45		26				
HSP	50	57	63	55	54	58	36				
WHT	55	59	62	58	48	46	60				
FRL	50	59	63	56	50	49	38				

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	52
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students 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	55
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	48
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?

The data indicates an overall increase in reading and math proficiency in both 3rd and 4th grades. The reading data shows 3rd grade ELA increased from 31% to 37%, which is a 6% increase, math moved from 36% to 56%, which is a 20% increase. In 4th grade reading student proficiency in ELA was 35% and increased by 3% to 38%, while math data indicates a 2% increase moving from 32% to 34%. In fifth, grade student proficiency decreased across all subjects. There was a 4% decrease in math from 42% to 38%, ELA decreased 8% moving from 55% to 47%, and Science a 2% decrease from 38% to 36%. The data also shows a gap in the proficiency of our ELL students compared to the overall population, however the gap decreased in ELA and Math from the 2021 to 2022 school years. There was a 9% increase in math proficiency moving from 20% to 29%, and 2% in ELA moving from 13% to 15%. In Science we saw a decrease of 5% from 11% to 6%.

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

The data components that showed the lowest performance were reading proficiency, math lowest 25% learning gains, and science proficiency. Reading proficiency stayed stagnate at 43%. Learning gains for the lowest 25% in math increased by 1% from 36% to 37%. Science proficiency decreased by 2% from 40% to 38% proficiency.

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 contributing factors include a lack of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of individual learners. The lowest 25% group consists of many students who have a limited understanding of academic English language skills.

Actions needed to address this area of improvement include targeted professional development in addressing the needs of your lowest 25% in math. The professional development will focus on how to move students from concrete, to representational to the abstract. In science, instruction needs to focus on using informational text reading strategies to address science content. A focus should also be on using inquiry based instruction getting students actively involved in science.

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

The data components which showed the most improvement were math learning gains which increased by 10% from 38% to 48% for the 2022 school year.

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

The actions that contributed to this increase was the implementation of focused data-driven small group instruction and intervention groups. Teachers used common assessment data to create groups and determine skills for remediation. Those skills were readdressed and reassessed during intervention.

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

To accelerate learning strategies focus needs to be on ensuring students are moving through the stages of math fluency (exploring, procedural reliability, procedural fluency, and automaticy). Strategies also need to focus on moving students from concrete, to representational, and finally to abstract problem solving. In science, strategies for inquiry based instruction, reading informational text, and using the High 5 science strategies will be the focus. Tier 1 teachers will work with small groups

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.

On-going targeted professional development will be provided for ELL strategies, progressing students through the different stages in math, as well as fluency strategies, and inquiry based science instruction. Professional development will also focus on B.E.S.T. ELA and math strategies.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement data will be continuously monitored during data chats with teachers and students. Ensuring subgroups (SWD, ELL) are monitored, learning gaps are addressed during common planning and data meetings, and additional training for classified staff who provide push-in support. Coaches will facilitate the coaching cycle for teachers identified as needing additional support to enhance instructional practices. Targeted professional development to improve teacher pedagogy by analyzing assessments; studying and practicing deliberate practice strategies; observing best practices; co-teaching; and effective common planning focusing on curriculum, instruction and assessment. For math 3 teachers have been identified and will become our BEST problem solvers. They will participate in professional development that has been constructed as a train-the-trainer model. They will work to provide professional development with the staff.

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 Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The Science proficiency data showed a decline during the 2021-2022 school year, therefore focusing on increasing instructional practices specifically relating to science will lead to an increase in science proficiency. Rationale: The science FCAT assessment data from 2020 - 22021 school year showed a proficiency rate of 40%, the 2021-2022 school year proficiency rate is 38%, which is a 2% decline.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	On the 2021-2022, FCAT Science assessment proficiency level was at 38%. The anticipated outcome is to increase the achievement level in science to 43%, which in an increase of 5% for the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through the district's progress monitoring assessments (PMA) and classroom walk-throughs. PMA data will be discussed during data meetings following the assessment. Actionable feedback will be provided to teachers based on observation from classroom walk-throughs. Data chats with teachers and students will be held periodically to review student progress and to address needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kandace Goshe (kandace.goshe@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Inquiry-based instructional strategies will provide teachers opportunities to implement rigorous standards-based instruction. Teachers will also use Close Reading strategies and text-dependent questions during instruction. Study Island science will also be used for standards based practice daily.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	Inquiry-based strategies are an approach to learning that emphasizes the student's role in the learning process. Rather than the teacher telling students what they need to know, students are given an opportunity to analyze and synthesize information by actively applying the information to create logical explanations and answer questions using science vocabulary. Close reading in science helps students focus on the text. It helps students extract meaning from complex text in any content when reading. Study

selecting this specific strategy.	
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Island improves mastery and retention by offering practice items built from the state standards with flexible modes to improve proficiency.

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.

Targeted areas of standards-based instruction will be determined during data meetings following common assessments.

Person Responsible	Dana Williams (dana.williams@ocps.net)

Teachers will be required to attend training on the use of Study Island.

Person Responsible	Dana Williams (dana.williams@ocps.net)

Teachers will be required to attend district and school-wide professional development throughout the school year on inquiry-based instruction.

Person Responsible	Dana Williams (dana.williams@ocps.net)

STEM Science will be offered for selected students in grade 5 during enrichment daily by the Math/ Science Coach.

Person Responsible	Dana Williams (dana.williams@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The largest growing population within Ocoee Elementary is the English Language Learner (ELL) population. In addition, the ELL subgroup is below the percent of point index of 41. Due to this combination of factors, improving instruction of ELL students is a critical need for the 2022-2023 school year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The English Language Learner percent of points index was 35. The specific, measurable outcome for the 2022-2023 school year is to increase from 35 to 41.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will take place through assessment and programmatic data including: common assessments, Imagine Learning, i-Ready online instruction, WIDA, and FAST. Administrators and instructional coaches will extrapolate data for ELL students in connection to these resources and bring these data to PLCs. Teachers will analyze the data with instructional coaches and determine effectiveness of instructional strategies and necessary adjustments. In addition, classroom walkthrough forms will include a segment pertaining to look-fors on instruction of ELL students to allow for meaningful and specific feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kandace Goshe (kandace.goshe@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Administration will train teachers on the WIDA Can-Do descriptors to assist teachers in scaffolding for the ELL students in order to increase language acquisition and increase access to content knowledge and skills necessary for success. These descriptors are not specific to content and can empower teachers to confidently build the skills of ELL students across the various curricula.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific	These descriptors are not specific to content and can empower teachers to confidently build the skills of ELL students across the various curricula.

**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.

Action Step 1: Provide professional development on the WIDA Can-Do descriptors to all instructional staff during preplanning on August 8, 2022.

Person Responsible	Kandace Goshe (kandace.goshe@ocps.net)

Action Step 2: Administrators and coaches spend planned time at each PLC discussing strategies in connection to the Can-Do descriptors and how to scaffold to mastery from those descriptors.

Person Responsible	Leslie Rafferty (leslie.rafferty@ocps.net)

Action Step 3: Administrators and coaches regularly disaggregate common assessment and programmatic data to monitor progress and to share the progress with teachers during PLC in order to determine strategy effectiveness and possible adjustments.

Person Responsible	Kandace Goshe (kandace.goshe@ocps.net)

Action Step 4: Administrators and coaches monitor for Can-Do instructional strategies during classroom walks.

Person Responsible	Kandace Goshe (kandace.goshe@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

After analyzing the data students in K-2 struggle with phonemic awareness and phonics. These students need support in foundational skills that support reading for understanding. If we focus on developing their awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters, as well as teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words, it will strengthen their ability to read for understanding.
Rationale: Based on the 2022 i-Ready end-of-year diagnostic assessment 38% of our kindergartens, 50% of our 1st graders, and 39% of our 2nd graders are performing one or more levels below grade level. In Phonemic Awareness 28% of the kindergartners, 41% of the 1st graders, and 21% of the second graders are performing below grade level, while in phonics 40% of kindergarteners, 45% of 1st graders, and 60% of 2nd graders are performing below grade level.

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

After analyzing the data students in grades 3-5 struggle with phonics and vocabulary. These students need support in some foundational skills that support reading for understanding. If we build students' ability to decode words, analyze words parts, and write and recognize words, as well as build their vocabulary it will strengthen their ability to read for understanding.
Rationale: Based on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment 62% of our 3rd grades, 61% of our 4th graders, and 51% of our 5th graders are performing below Level 3. Based on the 2022 i-Ready end-of-the-year diagnostic assessment 41% of our 3rd graders, 36% of our 4th graders, and 20% of our 5th graders are performing below grade level in phonics, while in vocabulary 49% of the 3rd graders, 62% of the 4th graders, and 65% of 5th graders are performing below grade level.

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)

Based on 2022 i-Ready end-of-the-year diagnostic assessment data 62% of our kindergarten students scored on/above grade level. This year our goal is for 67% of our students to show proficiency on the STAR Early Literacy assessments, which will be a 5% increase with a Scale Score of 690 or higher.

Based on 2022 i-Ready end-of-the-year diagnostic assessment data 50% of our 1st grade students scored on/above grade level. This year our goal is for 55% of our students to show proficiency on the STAR Early Literacy assessments, which will be a 5% increase with a Scale Score of 751 or higher.

Based on 2022 i-Ready end-of-the-year diagnostic assessment data 61% of our 2nd grade students scored on/above grade level. This year our goal is for 66% of our students to show proficiency on the STAR Reading assessments which will be a 5% increase with a Scale Score of 867 or higher.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment data 38% or our 3rd grade students scored a Level 3 or above. This year our goal is for 43% of our students to score at Level 3 or above on the FAST assessment, which will be a 5% increase of students scoring at Level 3 or above.

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment data 39% or our 4th grade students scored a Level 3 or above. This year our goal is for 44% of our students to score at Level 3 or above on the FAST assessment, which will be a 5% increase of students scoring at Level 3 or above.

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment data 49% or our 5th grade students scored a Level 3 or above. This year our goal is for 54% of our students to score at Level 3 or above on the FAST assessment, which will be a 5% increase of students scoring at Level 3 or above.

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.

During this school year school administrators and coaches will conduct weekly reading walkthroughs. We will also conduct monthly data meetings to review district-created standard based unit assessments, review FAST progress monitoring assessments, as well as monitoring response to intervention data, with our learning community leadership.

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

Rafferty, Leslie, leslie.rafferty@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?

Heggerty will be used in Kindergarten for students to engage in phonemic awareness and phonic skills. In 1st and 2nd grade will be using the SIPPS program which is a research based intervention program focusing on phonological awareness, phonics, and sight words. In grades 3 - 5 we will be using Phonics for Reading which is a research based intervention program focusing on phonics instruction. Each program has mastery checks for understanding that are given after a specific number of lessons. These will be used to determine progress or lack thereof which will guide our next steps.

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?

Heggerty is used to develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. SIPPS teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Phonics for Reading helps 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
Conducting monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Goshe, Kandace, kandace.goshe@ocps.net
Literacy coach will attend district coach meetings. The coach and administration will use data to identify personnel who would benefit from support, as well as their area of need. The coaching cycle will be implemented using modeling, PLC planning support, specific feedback, etc... to fit the area(s) of need.	Rafferty, Leslie, leslie.rafferty@ocps.net
FAST, i-Ready diagnostic, Heggerty assessments, district created standards based unit assessments, district created foundational unit assessments, and Phonics for Reading assessments will all be used and analyzed to determine interventions and support needs of students.	Rafferty, Leslie, leslie.rafferty@ocps.net
Teachers will be provided with professional learning opportunities on SIPPS, Phonics for Reading, and WIDA Can DO Descriptors. Other opportunities will be determined based on progress monitoring data.	Goshe, Kandace, kandace.goshe@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.

Through a distributive leadership model, we use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, we use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. Our core team consists of teachers and an administrator, which includes a mental health designee. 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. Our school leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, analyze Panarama data, 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. Opportunities are planned throughout the year, for examples Math Night, STEM Night, Progress Report night, etc. to help parents get involved and be a part of our family.

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

School Guidance Counselor - will ensure the social-emotional well-being of all students is taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.

SEL Site Team - will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

All Staff - will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change through the distributive leadership model.