

Orange County Public Schools

# Clay Springs 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Clay Springs Elementary

555 N WEKIWA SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Rebecca Mcdaid**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2020

<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>	No
<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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%)
<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>	ATSI
* 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Clay Springs Elementary

555 N WEKIWA SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://clayspringses.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	75%

### 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.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

### 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
McDaid, Rebecca	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems</li> <li>- Oversee instruction and serves as the curriculum leader of the school</li> </ul>
Long, Sallie	Assistant Principal	Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Serves as an instructional and curricular leader</li> </ul>
Rock, Patrick	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Oversees the MTSS process; focusing on implanting and monitoring intervention for the Lowest 25%, provides student support to Tier 3 students, provides support to Data Leads of each grade level to ensure understanding of data collection and use</li> <li>- Responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing ELA and instruction</li> </ul>
Richardson, Erika	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assess all 1-3 students 3X per year (BOY, MOY, EOY) in F &amp; P</li> <li>- Provide small group direct instruction to students in 1-3 based on F &amp; P/ and iReady</li> <li>- Monitor Guided Reading instruction K-3</li> <li>- Support teachers as needed with modeling/grouping/data collection pertaining to small group reading instruction</li> <li>- Provide PD on Guided Reading</li> <li>- Monitor Guided Reading book room</li> </ul>
Naughton, Christina	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides Social and Emotional learning support to students</li> <li>- Provides SEL instruction to students PK-5</li> </ul>
Proudfoot, Hope	Math Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide small group direct instruction to targeted students as needed</li> <li>- Monitor math instruction in grades K-5</li> <li>- Support teachers as needed with modeling/grouping/data collection pertaining to math instruction</li> </ul>

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/17/2020, Rebecca McDaid

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14



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

46

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

640

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

14

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

17

## 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	41	98	110	122	118	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	13	29	32	30	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	37	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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 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	23	116	122	125	100	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	8	33	26	28	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	23	116	122	125	100	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	8	33	26	28	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

#### 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	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

#### 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	53%	56%	56%				53%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						42%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						38%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	46%	50%				70%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%						66%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						46%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	61%	59%				54%	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	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	63%	8%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	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	22	38	33	24	38	33	19				
ELL	35	52	47	44	47	38	41				
BLK	50	70		41	48		43				
HSP	48	59	48	53	57	46	48				
MUL	56	70		67	70						
WHT	65	67		64	50	30	72				
FRL	48	59	46	49	56	48	52				
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	29	42	26	33	31	12				
ELL	33	32	18	47	46	25	21				
BLK	29	35		38	20		19				
HSP	44	40	33	55	50	36	27				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	66	37		67	53		45				
FRL	40	37	33	50	45	35	25				
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	21	32	36	26	32	18					
ELL	40	43	39	66	70	57	38				
BLK	39	29	27	55	58	20	43				
HSP	46	44	42	70	68	53	48				
MUL	40			40							
WHT	66	44	41	78	69	57	64				
FRL	41	38	33	63	62	43	43				

### 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	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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	46
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	50
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	53
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	
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	58
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	53
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?

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, proficiency performance in ELA showed a 3-point gain from the previous year bringing the proficiency back to the level it was in 2019. There was a 21-point gain on learning gains in ELA and 6-point growth in the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%. Proficiency performance in math dropped one point from the previous year. There was a 19-point gain on learning gains in math and 25 point growth in learning gains of the lowest 25% in math. Science showed a 20 point increase from the previous year. The SWD subgroup continues to be an area of concern across all grade levels in ELA, Math, and Science

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

We are placing a heavy emphasis on Learning Gains of all assessment components- ELA and Math. We want to ensure that all our students continue to grow and make at least a year's worth of growth. An intense focus is on our ESSA subgroups that are below 41%. These include SWD and Black students.

#### 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 school is making gains in all components of ELA. The action steps put into place last year have had a positive impact and will be continued. The actions put into place last year have also had a strong impact on the learning gains in math. These will be refined and continued. The model of instruction for the SWD subgroup is being changed to a hybrid model of support facilitation and direct services for instruction. This will provide a better continuum of services at the school.

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

The learning gains for ELA and math and the learning gains of the lowest 25% in math showed the most improvement.

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

Walk to Intervention model for ELA, targeted instruction for the lowest 25%, gifted and high achieving cluster in 4th and 5th grades, hands-on science labs, acceleration model of instruction for science and math during tutoring, small group instruction using science reading text.

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

Continue the walk to intervention model for the FBS block. One or two intervention groups at each grade level will use the Minority Achievement Office model of acceleration. The math interventionist will provide support for the full year. Continue the gifted/high achieving cluster in 4th and 5th grade. Instructional changes to the 5th grade model.

**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.**

All instructional staff was trained on the MAO model of acceleration in the 2021-2022 school year. The instructional coaches at the school will continue to provide professional development and support to teachers this year. PLC's will focus on small group instruction. Professional development will focus on small group instruction, questioning, cross-curricular connections, and teaching vocabulary in context.

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

The model of instruction for the SWD subgroup is being changed to a hybrid model of support facilitation and direct services for instruction. This will provide a better continuum of services at the school. The master schedule has been designed to provide common planning time for the teachers in the self-contained ASD units. This will allow the team to meet for PLCs and have a more fluid model for the students in the units. A program assistant position has been added to help facilitate the inclusion of students from the ASD units into some general education classes. Increased focus on small group instruction and monitoring this through classroom walkthroughs and student data.

**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.

Promote a positive culture and environment to create a community of inclusiveness, support, and self-efficacy.

### Measurable

#### Outcome:

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

Increase in student attendance rates  
Increase in student/family participation at school, PTA, and SAC function  
Increase student self-management

### Monitoring:

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

Behavior calls and discipline referrals will be tracked by admin staff. Attendance will be monitored by Clerk/Registrar. Student's sense of self-management, self-efficacy, and participation will be monitored through Panorama, DESSA, classroom walkthroughs, and SEL lessons. Parent participation will be monitored through attendance of events, PTA membership, survey response rates, and interactions on DOJO/Social Media.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Naughton (christina.naughton@ocps.net)

### Evidence-based

#### Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will continue to implement the Caring School Community SEL curriculum to develop student SEL student SEL proficiency, and develop student self-efficacy.

### Rationale for Evidence-based

#### Strategy:

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

Students have a strong need for school to be a positive place. At Clay Springs we strive to equip our students with the strategies they need for self-efficacy and give them the ability to interact with their environment positively. Our panorama results indicate a need for more support for students in the areas of self-management and school 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.

1. Implement a SEL curriculum, Caring School Community, school-wide.
2. Provide professional development for staff members.
3. Implement class opening and closing meetings.
4. Implement SEL lessons into the Health block.

5. Provide monthly guidance lessons to support students in developing SEL proficiency.
6. Implement a cross grade level buddy system to support students in building relationships and strengthen school community.
7. Monitor classroom implementation and provide support as needed for teacher implementation,

**Person Responsible** Christina Naughton (christina.naughton@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****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 the 2021-2022 FSA data, proficiency performance in ELA showed a 3-point gain from the previous year bringing the proficiency back to the level it was in 2019. There was a 21-point gain on learning gains in ELA and 6-point growth in the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase ELA Proficiency by at least 3%. The 2023 ELA FSA will move ELA proficiency to 56%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student progress will be monitored three times during the year. Progress monitoring standards-based assessments will be used after each unit of instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Erika Richardson (erika.richardson@ocps.net)

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

Weekly PLC's will be strengthened by using Coach-led planning. There will be a focus on small group instruction, questioning, cross-curricular connections between reading and science, vocabulary in context, and scaffolding.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Based on a comparative analysis of school and individual student data, Leadership has identified small group instruction, vocabulary in context, and scaffolded support to be areas of need. As a result, specific resources have been identified to assess, support, and track student growth in ELA. These resources are as follows:  
SIPPS Program  
Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment  
Acceleration Model of instruction (Minority Achievement Office initiative)

**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.

- A. Increase implementation of standards-based small groups: increased support for planning implementation/monitor through strategic walk-throughs
- B. Coach-led planning which will incorporate teaching vocabulary in context in lessons
- C. Planning for scaffolded support for ELL and ESE students
- D. Provide PD on small group instruction

**Person Responsible**

Erika Richardson (erika.richardson@ocps.net)

- A. Implementation and monitoring of differentiated walk-to intervention model during WIN block grades 1-5
- B. Implementation of SIPPS to support building student foundational skills
- C. Utilizing a reading interventionist to provide targeted support to the lowest 25%
- D. Provide extra support for teachers and students through monthly child study team meetings and MTSS meetings

**Person Responsible**

Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

- A. Implementation of the hybrid model of support facilitation and direct instruction for ESE students
- B. Monitor ESE groups
- C. Implement the Minority Achievement Office acceleration model at each grade level
- D. Monitor acceleration groups

**Person Responsible**                      Sallie Long (sallie.long@ocps.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus****Description****and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, proficiency performance in math showed a 1-point loss from the previous year. There was a 19-point gain on learning gains in math and 25-point growth in the math learning gains for the lowest 25%.

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

Our goal is to increase math proficiency by 3% on the FSA spring assessments. The 2023 FSA will move math proficiency to 60%.

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

Progress monitoring assessments - 3x  
Summative assessments after each unit of instruction

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

Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

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

Interventionist support through small group instruction for the lowest 25% will be implemented. MAO Acceleration will be implemented specifically for the area of math during small group math intervention time as well as after school. This model fills in foundational gaps "just in time" and frontloads key vocabulary and concepts for students. Math has traditionally been an area of strength, however, as a result of lost instructional time due to COVID-19, math is now our area of greatest need. Acceleration has proven to be an effective and efficient means of supporting student growth when implemented with fidelity.

**Rationale for****Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

Math has traditionally been an area of strength, however, as a result of lost instructional time due to COVID-19, math is now our area of greatest need. The implementation of this interventionist support was proven to be successful in the 2021-2022 school year resulting in an increase in learning gains in math. Acceleration has proven to be an

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

effective and efficient means of supporting student growth when implemented with fidelity. We are partnering with the MAO Office to implement Math Acceleration at grades 3-5 and are monitoring through specialized professional development for teachers, assessments, review of instructional materials, attendance, and classroom walkthroughs

#### **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.

- A. Increase implementation of standards-based small groups: implementation/monitor through strategic walk-throughs
- B. Increased support for planning small group instruction through Coach-led PLC's
- C. Increase implementation of standards-based centers: increased support for planning & implementation/ monitor through strategic walk- throughs
- D. Implementation of the Acceleration Model during WIN block grades 1-5
- E. Implementation of after school tutoring using the Acceleration Model for students in grades 2-5
- F. Implement targeted interventionist support for lowest 25%

**Person Responsible** Hope Proudfoot (hope.proudfoot@ocps.net)

- A. Implement hybrid model of support facilitation and direct instruction for ESE students
- B. Monitor ESE students

**Person Responsible** Sallie Long (sallie.long@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**

N/A

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

N/A

**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)**

N/A

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

N/A

**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.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

N/A

**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?

N/A

**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**

N/A



## 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 support of the OCPS Strategic Plan 2025, our school will focus on Social and Emotional Learning for the 2022-2023 school year. "Through distributive leadership, our charge as leaders is to equip our teachers with the necessary skills, attitudes, and behaviors to create a positive climate and culture for social and emotional learning. In support of the OCPS 2025 Strategic Plan, we will implement the Caring School Community program school-wide. Additional SEL support provided to all students will lead to creating a safe learning environment for students in which they will be free to take greater risks in the classroom knowing that they have supportive structures in place. Students will be better equipped to effectively and ethically deal with daily tasks and challenges that occur at school. Implementation of this SEL support will create a nurturing environment, respectful and supportive relations, and shared norms and values for students to be able to increase proficiency and learning gains in all content areas.

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

Rebecca McDaid - oversee the implementation of the SEL program

Christina Naughton - coordinator of the SEL program

Classroom Teachers - implementing the Caring School Community program daily within the classrooms