Hungerford Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hungerford Elementary

230 RUFFEL STREET, Eatonville, FL 32751

https://hungerfordes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Letecia Foster

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2008

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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Hungerford Elementary

230 RUFFEL STREET, Eatonville, FL 32751

https://hungerfordes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

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

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

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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
Harris, Letecia	Principal	Develops, implements, and evaluates the programs within the school; provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures implementation of all core program; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; evaluates existing programs and practices; initiates continued improvement in curriculum and teaching methods; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities; observes teachers and provides immediate feedback to improve instruction.
Moore, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in all functions of school operation. Develops, implements and evaluates the programs within the school; provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures implementation of all core programs; evaluates existing programs and practices; initiates continued improvement in curriculum and teaching methods; observes teachers and provides immediate feedback to improve instruction. Coordinates school safety plans and activities
Jones, Sheila	Instructional Coach	On-site professional developer who teaches educators how to use proven instructional methods to provide quality instruction. Coaches meet with teachers individually during a planning period or after school to identify specific students' needs and to discuss possible research-validated interventions that might help the teacher address those needs. In order to make it as easy as possible for a teacher to successfully use a new instructional method, coaches alleviate the burden on teachers as much as possible by preparing all handouts, assessments, overheads, and other materials that the teacher needs. They also demonstrate how the new instructional methods or intervention should be taught. In some cases, they provide checklists, reflection forms, or other observation tools.
Moore-Gordon, Jawanna	Instructional Coach	On-site professional developer who teaches educators how to use proven instructional methods to provide quality instruction. Coaches meet with teachers individually during a planning period or after school to identify specific students' needs and to discuss possible research-validated interventions that might help the teacher address those needs. In order to make it as easy as possible for a teacher to successfully use a new

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional method, coaches alleviate the burden on teachers as much as possible by preparing all handouts, assessments, overheads, and other materials that the teacher needs. They also demonstrate how the new instructional methods or intervention should be taught. In some cases, they provide checklists, reflection forms, or other observation tools.
Dickerson, Courtney	Behavior Specialist	Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier III instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.Assists with behavior coaching for students and academic intervention planning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/12/2008, Letecia Foster

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
31

Total number of students enrolled at the school
220

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	17	38	48	40	38	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	20	8	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	10	14	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	4	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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	15	41	44	41	39	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
Attendance below 90 percent	3	8	11	5	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	11	9	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	15	41	44	41	39	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
Attendance below 90 percent	3	8	11	5	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	11	9	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	39%	56%	56%				41%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						54%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						68%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	46%	50%				47%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						34%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						32%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	61%	59%				28%	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	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

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	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	21%	63%	-42%	64%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	53%	-22%
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	11	42		28	55						
BLK	36	63	33	46	64	57	39				
HSP	53			47							
FRL	33	58	33	44	63	57	38				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8			8							

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
BLK	31	26	50	29	15	40	8				
FRL	28	20		26	14		6				

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	6	31		27	33						
BLK	39	55	68	47	35	31	27				
HSP	55			55							
FRL	38	56	74	46	32	33	29				

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	50
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	48
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	50
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	47
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?

Hungerford trended up in most tested subjects. All math categories and science showed significant improvement. 2 out 3 tested ELA areas showed growth.

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

The data components in greatest need of improvement based on 2022 state assessments are ELA learning gains among the bottom quartile and achievement of students with disabilities. Several of the students in these subcategories are the same 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?

Contributing factors to these data sets not showing growth like the other areas are lack of foundational skills leading this subset of students in multiple grade levels to struggle specifically with comprehension of fiction and nonfiction text. New actions to address this need will occur during T2 and T3 reading interventions (focus on foundational skills) and small group instruction during the ELA block (increase focus on comprehension skills).

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were learning gains in Math (+54%) and learning gains in ELA (+38%).

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

Contributing factors in improving our learning gains were all students returning to full time instruction here at school, increased focus on targeting deficiencies and addressing gaps from the pandemic years during interventions, common planning led weekly by instructional coaches, admin team leading data meetings with an increased focus on intervention planning and utilizing Tier 1 Interventionists to facilitate small groups and one-on-one interventions.

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

Continued focus on identifying gaps in foundational skills, differentiation during small group instruction and regularly scheduled frequent data chats with PLC teams to place students in appropriate intervention groups with data tracking on mastery specific foundational deficiencies (t2 and t3 students).

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.

PD opportunities to include best practices in planning for instruction with the new B.E.S.T. Startdards, increasing the capacity of Tier 1 Interventionists regarding data analysis and providing targeted instruction to intervention groups.

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

Continued supervision of data PLC's by the admin team, addition of a dedicated STEM Coach to the leadership team to assist with maintaining gain in Science (up 31% from previous year).

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Achievement among students with disabilities continues to be a weak data point for Hungerford. This is more evident in the ELA categories than the math categories. 10% of SWD made ELA achievement, while 32% of this same subgroup were proficient in math according to 2022 state assessments.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	32% of SWD will be proficient in ELA according to end of the year FAST testing (up 12% from previous year to math match achievement level with the same subgroup from 2022).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress monitoring of SWD subgroup will be determined by BOY and MOY progress monitoring state assessments (FAST) and i-Ready diagnostic testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Moore (ryan.moore@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Daily utilization of teaching in small, interactive groups using strategic, flexible grouping during regular ELA block and targeted instruction toward specific deficiencies identified by diagnostic testing during the beginning and middle of the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Various experts (Vaughn, Bos and Schumm, 2007; Marzano, et. al., 2001; Tomlinson and McTighe, 2006) identify delivering instruction in small, interactive groups as an effective, research-based strategy for teaching students with disabilities.Time for this small group instruction will be provided both during the daily 120 minute ELA back and during daily interventions.

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 T2 and T3 students in need of foundational skills support delivered in small group and one-on-one-settings

Person Responsible	Ryan Moore (ryan.moore@ocps.net)

MTSS procedures including parent communication, data analysis implemented to group students for specific target instruction.

Person Responsible	Ryan Moore (ryan.moore@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Schoolwide effort to implement new B.E.S.T. standards in order for students to be successful in ELA achievement (ELA achievement showed only 9% growth while other data area showed much more significant growth).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA achievement should improve to 47% of students (up 7% from 2022). Goal is measurable using FAST and i-Ready diagnostic assessments to monitor progress through the year. Goal is achievable given that 47% of Hungerford students taking state assessments in 2022 were proficient in math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will be done using FAST and i-Ready diagnostic testing at the beginning and middle of the year, adjustments to grouping and lesson plans will be made according to student progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jawanna Moore-Gordon (jawanna.moore-gordon@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to the letters to address foundation skill gaps, which will lead to proficiency.This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	This selected instructional practice(s) has/have a strong level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional development to occur during preplanning regarding implementing B.E.S.T. standards and related strategies.

Person Responsible	Letecia Harris (letecia.foster@ocps.net)

Strengthen the common planning process.Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions Include foundational planning in K-2.

Person Responsible	Letecia Harris (letecia.foster@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible	Letecia Harris (letecia.foster@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

Progress monitoring data from i-Ready EOY 2022 indicates that 92% (36/39) of kindergarten students, 44% (24/55) of Grade 1 students and 50% (26/51) of Grade 2 students are on target to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. No data is available for rising 2023 kindergarteners at this time. Grade 1 was the only level not on track for 50% proficiency. Our area of focus will continue to be addressing foundational skills using the SIPPS Beginning and Extension Level programs in ELA interventions in the K-2 classrooms. SIPPS program accelerates progress so that students are able to efficiently close the gap and engage in grade-level reading.

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

2022 State assessment data indicates that 39% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA. Grade 3 was 35% (14/40), Grade 4 was 50% (20/40) and Garde 5 was 28% (10/36). Our area of focus will continue to be addressing foundational skills using the SIPPS Extension and Challenge Level programs in ELA interventions in the 3-5 classrooms. SIPPS program at the Extension and Challenge levels focus on building mastery in the spelling-pattern phase and addresses the most complex, polysyllabic/ morphemic phase.

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 progress monitoring data, only 2023's Grade 2 class is not on track to meet 50% proficiency (data not available for rising 2023 KG class). Measurable outcome for Grade 2 in 2023 will be to increase from 44% proficient to 54% (10%year-to-year improvement).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on progress monitoring and statewide ELA assessment data, only 2023's Grade 4 class is not on track to meet 50% proficiency. Measurable outcome for Grade 4 in 2023 will be to increase from 35% to 50% (15% year-to-year improvement)

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.

School's are of focus will be monitored during monthly grade level data PLCs. Data sources for monitoring will include i-Ready diagnostic testing, FAST BOY and MOY assessments and classroom assessments Summative assemnts (i-Ready EOY and FAST EOY) will be considered for end of year outcome..

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

Moore, Ryan, ryan.moore@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. §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?

SIPPS Beginning, Extension and Challenge Level programs will be utilized in our Grade 2 and Grade 4 ELA interventions. SIPPS program has a Moderate ESSA rating (average effect size = 0.25), Foundation skills taught within the program align to Florida B.E.S.T. standards and the OCPS Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan.

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?

IPPS is a foundational skills reading curriculum designed to help both new and struggling readers in grades K–12. The program's systematic scope and sequence provides a structured-literacy approach to instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling-sounds, and sight words. It is based on the premise that beginning literacy is best taught through two distinct strands: one focusing on language comprehension and the other on word recognition. When used as Tier 2 and Tier 3, SIPPS accelerates progress so that students are able to close the gap and engage in grade-level reading. The program is multi-level, addressing students' word recognition needs at their instructional levels.

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
Continued professional development among classroom teachers and interventionists to utilize the SIPPS program. This is Hungerford's second year using this intervention program with most instructional staff members already fully trained. Leadership team (admin and coaches) will ensure all instructional staff already trained receive continuing support and new staff receive the initial training.	Harris, Letecia, letecia.foster@ocps.net
Ensure that grade level teams utilize data to identify and place students needing support in appropriate SIPPS levels, monitor their progress utilizing already in-place MTSS framework. Capacity for data analysis will be increased by administrators leading grade level team in data meetings, reviewing assessments (BOY assessments, SIPPS placement assessments and other classroom data sources).	Moore, Ryan, ryan.moore@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

Stakeholders in the Hungerford community include students, families, staff, local establishments and business in the Eatonville and Maitland communities. Hungerford staff play an essential role in promoting a positive culture in day-to-day school operations and continue to implement SEL strategies in daily lessons. Hungerford staff will engage families to participate in Title I community outreach activates on a monthly basis as well as daily engagement with specific families and community members in need of support through our Parent Engagement Liaison. Local establishments support a positive culture and enlivement here at Hungerford by continuing their relationships as our Partners in Education and taking an active role in supporting school operations (examples include local churches providing meting space and breakfast for teachers during planning, national publishing company providing college scholarships for Hungerford graduates).