

Orange County Public Schools

# Orange Center Elementary



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Orange Center Elementary

621 S TEXAS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Erin Albert**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (47%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Orange Center Elementary

621 S TEXAS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://orangecenteres.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	98%

### School Grades History

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

### 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 an 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
Brooks, Fredrick	Principal	The principal's primary duties/responsibilities are to promote and maintain the highest level of academic, social, and emotional achievement for all students by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing, and communicating information to enforce school, District, and State policies. The principal; maintains a safe school environment, coordinates site activities, and communicates information to staff, students, parents, and community members. The principal is responsible for interviewing, hiring, and supervising school employees to ensure the highest performance standards.
Brown, Kristi	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal (AP) supports the principal in the overall administrative operations of the school. The AP assists the principal in providing instructional leadership to staff, including curriculum planning, review, implementation and professional development. The role also includes helping to ensure the overall safety and wellbeing of students, staff, and school visitors; supports in school discipline, and enforces school, district, and state policies.
	Instructional Coach	The ELA coach is a reading and writing resource for our teachers and provides support in a nonjudgmental way. Most of the coach's time is spent working directly with teachers. When working with teachers, the ELA coach is focused on interpreting the standards, assessment data, planning, instruction, demonstration, collaboration, observation, and peer feedback.
Robinson, Deedra	School Counselor	To provide assistance and developmentally appropriate lessons for students regarding their social, emotional, and intellectual growth that interfere with their educational or personal development.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Erin Albert

**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.*

0

**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.*

0

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

31

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

290

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

1

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

3

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	23	18	15	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	



**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/22/2022

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	23	18	15	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	23	18	15	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

#### 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	38%	56%	56%				39%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						43%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						46%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	46%	50%				39%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						41%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						27%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	61%	59%				45%	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	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	63%	-30%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
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				9							
ELL	60			80							
BLK	39	65	53	54	77	58	47				
HSP	36	50		64	81						
FRL	35	59	52	53	77	60	42				
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				10							
ELL	25			18							
BLK	22	24		25	12		32				
HSP	26			30							
FRL	26	29		26	18	10	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		10		8							
ELL	7			21							
BLK	39	43	52	40	40	26	48				
HSP	41	38		34	38						
FRL	38	44	55	38	40	29	46				

### 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	53
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	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	5

Students With Disabilities	
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	56
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	56
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	52
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	
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	54
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 Florida State Assessment data showed a significant increase across all contents, grade levels, and subgroups.

- ELA proficiency increased by fourteen percent.
- ELA Learning gains increased by fifty-five percent
- ELA Learning gains the lowest twenty-five percent increased by thirty-five percent.
- Math proficiency increased by thirty percent.
- Math Learning gains increased by sixty-two percent
- Math Learning gains the lowest twenty-five percent increased by fifty-four percent.
- Science showed a twenty percent increase.

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

ELA overall achievement is thirty-eight percent which demonstrates the greatest need for achievement. However, there was a fourteen percent increase in ELA achievement from previously recorded data. i-Ready-

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

Tier I instruction was not as consistent across grade levels due to instructional vacancies. Tier I instruction is important when it comes to concept mastery. Important strategies are necessary for processing information and gathering information to determine concept deficiencies and attainment that take place during Tier I instruction.

Stand-alone professional development and job-embedded professional development targeted toward improving Tier 1 instruction.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA results, Math learning gains presented the greatest amount of improvement. There was a sixty-two percent increase in Math learning gains; from seventeen percent to seventy-nine percent.

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

Consistent data analysis informed decisions about what students knew and were able to do. Administrators, Instructional Coaches, and Teachers were responsive in creating support and interventions to help students that continued to show academic deficiencies.

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

Targeted focus on Tier I instruction in implementing the newly adopted BEST standards. Implementing processing strategies important to concept attainment. These strategies include but are not limited to, think-aloud, visualizing questioning, inferencing, finding key details, implementing collaborative structures, and monitoring comprehension.

**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.**

Understanding and implementing the BEST standards for Math and Reading. - To help teachers understand the BEST standards and the implementation thereof.  
Instructional best practices for Tier I instruction (Gradual Release, Collaborative Structures, Close Read Strategies, etc.)- Improving teacher pedagogy to strengthen core instruction.

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

An Interventionist will be assigned to every grade level. The main purpose of the interventionist is to provide support for the lowest 25% during Tier I instruction. This support will look different from grade level to grade level as it is dependent upon the needs of the 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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

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

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:  
 Increase overall academic achievement in reading and math  
 Increase positive social interactions  
 Increase positive attitude towards school  
 Improve school attendance  
 Reduce misconduct and risk-taking behaviors

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

Improvement in the following data sources, Early Warning Systems indicator data, Panorama survey data.

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

Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

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

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support and nurture positive organizational culture and climate.

**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.

Identify how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies.

**Person Responsible** Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)

Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students.

**Person Responsible** Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)



Examine the current school climate and culture  
 Culture/Climate Surveys  
 Check-ins

**Person Responsible** Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@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 following percentage of students did not meet proficiency based on the End-of-Year i-Ready Diagnostic for the 2021-2022 school year.

24% of the Kindergarten students

66% of students in 1st grade

70% of students in 2nd grade

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;
- Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words
- Recommendation 4. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

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

The following percentage of students did not meet proficiency based on the 2022 ELA FSA for the 2021-2022 school year.

54% of students in 3rd grade

68% of students in 4th grade

65% of students in 5th grade

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA strong level of evidence requirements, Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9:

Recommendation 3: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text

Part 3A. Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text

Part 3B. Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read

Part 3C. Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text

Part 3D. Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

### **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)**

ting proficiency to 12%

In 2022, 70% of our students in Second Grade did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA i-Ready Diagnostic. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 90% of students in First Grade will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of students meeting proficiency to 10%. In 2022, 24% of our students in Kindergarten did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA i-Ready Diagnostic. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 100% of students in Kindergarten will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of students meeting proficiency to 0%.

In 2022, 66% of our students in First Grade did not meet proficiency in ELA as assessed by the end-of-year ELA i-Ready Diagnostic. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide progress monitoring system, 88% of students in First Grade will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of students mee

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

In 2022, 54% of our students in 3rd grade did not reach proficiency or a level 3 on ELA FSA. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide FAST, 66% of third-grade students will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of proficiency to 15 students and decreasing the number of level 1s from 54% to 34%.

In 2022, 68% of our students in 3rd grade did not reach proficiency or a level 3 on ELA FSA. By May

2023, as assessed by the statewide FAST, 52% of third-grade students will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of proficiency to 25 students and decreasing the number of level 1s from 54% to 48%.

In 2022, 65% of our students in 3rd grade did not reach proficiency or a level 3 on ELA FSA. By May 2023, as assessed by the statewide FAST, 55% of third-grade students will meet proficiency at a level 3, decreasing the number of students not meeting the identified level of proficiency to 21 students and decreasing the number of level 1s from 65% to 45%.

### **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.

Orange Center will monitor in a variety of ways to evaluate the implementation of the action plan and the impact on student achievement.

Leadership team members will conduct weekly walkthroughs through reading and intervention instruction using the classroom walkthrough tool to determine data trends to guide decision-making related to professional development and classroom support.

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and learning community leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brooks, Fredrick, fredrick.brooks@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?

For students in grades K-3, developing awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words meet Florida's strong level of evidence-based requirements as documented in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade. The above practices also align with the OCPS's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and the B.E.S.T. foundational reading benchmarks.

For students in grades 4 and 5, building students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic

words meet Florida's strong level of evidence-based requirements as outlined in the Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9. Providing this intervention to identified students is in alignment with OCPS's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan. Having the ability to decode multisyllabic supports B.E.S.T. reading and writing standards.

#### **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?

Teachers will make use of the district-created daily foundational reading slides to support the practice of teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. (Recommendation 3)

Heggerty will be used in K-2 classrooms to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

The SIPPS program will be used as an intervention for identified students to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. (Recommendation 3) This program also builds 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy Coaching</li> </ul> <p>Leadership will be tiered according to efficacy in the knowledge of the BEST Standards and Tier 1 instructional delivery. The Literacy Coach will implement coaching cycles based on the instructional walkthrough data.</p>	Brooks, Fredrick, fredrick.brooks@ocps.net
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment (ELA assessments provided monitoring reading)</li> </ul> <p>The school team will analyze various assessment data to determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies. This will be done within PLCs and with the leadership team when assessments are administered.</p>	Brown, Kristi, kristi.brown@ocps.net
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional Learning related to ELA Instruction and Intervention</li> </ul> <p>School-based - The Teachers will participate in PD related to the implementation and understanding of B.E.S.T Standards. District-provided - Selected Teachers will attend the district's Impact trainings related to ELA.</p>	

### 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.

Positive school culture and environment begin with relationships. Building a supportive and fulfilling environment from the front office, to individual classrooms within our school and throughout the community is a matter of cultivating and maintaining positive relationships. It takes commitment and consistency from the whole team—administrators, teachers, support staff, students, parents, and community stakeholders are all vested.

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

Together as stakeholders, we will create a shared vision of our school; including developing consistent school rules and ways of defining and maintaining student behavior. Motivation, success, and feeling valued are what drive individuals at any level and in any profession. In the school setting, it is critically important that we recognize and celebrate the outstanding things that our school community accomplishes, both inside and outside of our school. Daily school announcements, weekly staff, student and parent previews, and messaging are just a few ways to publicly recognize and incentivize accomplishments. We are committed to working jointly with

parents and families to develop a plan for activities and workshops that support the high-quality instruction needed for all learners to be successful. We will host multiple curriculum nights aligned to grade-level standards to model instructional strategies for home and school. Teachers will also continue to unpack the state standards with the understanding that multiple objectives/standards can be taught at the same time and

how. Title II funds will be

used to further unpack the standards and implement the District Professional Learning Community initiatives, through in-house professional learning communities, staff development, and additional planning days.