William S Maxey Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

William S Maxey Elementary

602 E STORY ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://maxeyes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Sean Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%)
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

William S Maxey Elementary

602 E STORY ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://maxeyes.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	89%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	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 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
Davis-Wilson, Carletta	Principal	Principal, Carletta Davis-Wilson: The principal leads the school and ensures all faculty and staff are working towards the school's mission and vision. She conducts all formal observations to make sure all instructional employees are implementing the Marzano Instructional Framework. She utilizes data-based decision-making to ensure the students are provided a meaningful education. The principal is responsible for ensuring students are provided standards-based and differentiated instruction, as well as intervention services. She facilitates data meetings and school leadership team meetings to discuss student academic progress. The principal regularly communicates with stakeholders regarding the school and students' academic progress.
Young, Tara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Tara Young: The resource teacher is responsible for timely inventory and delivery of instructional resources to teachers. The CRT schedules, organizes, and maintains the testing calendar to ensure assessments are completed. She is the designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state assessments. She is responsible for collecting and analyzing data as well as generating data reports bimonthly to identify trends in instruction. The CRT schedules all professional development trainings, supports classroom instruction, and conducts peer observations.
Louis, Irarissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Demetries McPherson and Instructional Coach, Irarissa Louis: The instructional coaches ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. They facilitate weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coaches assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at-risk." In addition, they assist in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. They routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. Instructional coaches model lessons and support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction. Coaches are also an integral part of developing common assessments.
McPherson, Demetries	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Demetries McPherson and Instructional Coach, Irarissa Louis: The instructional coaches ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. They facilitate weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coaches assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at-risk." In addition, they assist in the development and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		implementation of progress monitoring. They routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. Instructional coaches model lessons and support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction. Coaches are also an integral part of developing common assessments.
Horne, Christine	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL Compliance Specialist, Christine Horne: As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Horne coordinates assessments for English Language Learners, oversees placements and supports in the general education classroom. She is responsible for monitoring and tracking ELL student performance in order to identify trends in instruction. She provides professional development trainings in accountable areas.
Urquhart, Michelle	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist, Dr. Michelle Urquhart: As a Behavior Specialist, Dr. Urquhart facilitates the MTSS Behavior Team. The Behavior Team establishes schoolwide procedures designed to meet district and State objectives. This includes creating a safe, inclusive learning environment for all students; especially those with special needs as well as general education students needing behavior intervention support. Dr. Urquhart is responsible for monitoring and tracking behavioral data for ESSA subgroups in order to determine school needs. Additionally, as the school's designated Title I Contact, Dr. Urquhart works directly with the Parent Engagement Liaison to implement the objectives outlined in the Parent and Family Engagement Plan.
Saulsby, Maria	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Maria Saulsby: The guidance counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. As a member of the Child Study Team, Mrs. Saulsby provide intervention to families and students identified as needing intervention for truancy. She is the liaison for families needing academic, behavioral, and/or mental support services. She assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children considered "at-risk." The guidance counselor facilitates IEP meetings and is a member of the MTSS team. The guidance counselor is responsible for modeling and monitoring implementation of health lessons grades K-5.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Sean Brown

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

455

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

2

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

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	39	74	60	83	64	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	380
Attendance below 90 percent	5	22	8	16	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	2	0	2	2	11	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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 7/19/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	21	60	71	78	52	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
Attendance below 90 percent	4	12	9	15	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	5	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	1	1	6	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	1	0	3	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	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	21	60	71	78	52	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
Attendance below 90 percent	4	12	9	15	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	5	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	1	1	6	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	1	0	3	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	

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	57%	56%	56%				66%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						64%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						59%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	71%	46%	50%				77%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						70%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						59%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	61%	59%				57%	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	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

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	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	63%	18%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

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	12	35		38	47		46				
ELL	39	59	54	73	76		38				
BLK	60	63	50	64	67	60	37				
HSP	48	65	57	73	72		50				
WHT	62			85							
FRL	55	62	53	70	69	56	51				

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	33			43							
ELL	46	60		63	53		38				
BLK	56	65		53	35		45				
HSP	50	59		63	47		44				
WHT	64			82							
FRL	56	68		58	46		46				

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	68	38		53	38						
ELL	53	61	54	63	61	45	31				
BLK	65	62		85	71		63				
HSP	62	65	60	67	66	50	47				
FRL	63	66	69	73	67	63	59				

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	59
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	57
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	57
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	60
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	74
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	60
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?

In ELA, as a school, students need extra support in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension of informational & complex text. Students have shown improvement in the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics. There is a need for increased opportunities for students to practice fluent reading throughout the school day to build stamina and fluency.
In Math, as a school, students need extra support in the areas of numbers & operations and fact fluency. Based on the data from the 2022 FSA, the SWD subgroup had the lowest achievement in both ELA and Math.

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

Based on the data from the 2021 - 2022 FSA, the data components that showed the greatest need for improvement was overall ELA proficiency, the lowest 25% for ELA and Science. Subgroups that performed significantly below all other subgroups were SWD at 12% and ELL at 39%. Progress monitoring comparison data from the i-Ready ELA assessment showed that SWD scored 17% proficient on the BOY and 53% proficient on the EOY. Additionally, the ELL subgroup scored 6% proficient on the i-Ready ELA BOY and 23% proficient on the i-Ready EOY assessment.

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 include:
*There has been limited opportunities for fluency practice & automaticity
*A need to shift instructional focus
*ELL students are still acquiring English language skills and working towards proficiency
*Students lack of ability to read and interpret complex informational science content
*Over scaffolding during support facilitation

New actions that are needed to address this area of improvement include:
*Intensive intervention support provided through the MTSS process for SWD
*Professional development to support effective teaching strategies for ELL and SWD students

*Increase frequency of data tracking and monitoring for ELL and SWD who are not showing adequate progress

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

The 2021-2022 FSA data component that showed the most improvement was overall Math achievement and learning gains. In 2021, overall achievement was 61% compared to 71% in 2022. Math learning gains improved by 27% points (45% to 72%) and math learning gains of the lowest 25% increased 21% points (36% to 27%).

According to the i-Ready diagnostic assessment, the BOY data showed only 27% of students on mastery level. The EOY data showed 62% of students on mastery level in math; which is a gain of 35%.

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

In order to improve mathematics instruction, teachers participated in professional development focused on effective math pedagogy. During common planning, the Backwards Design Model was used to ensure purposeful lesson planning aligned to rigor of the standards. Additionally, students received increased practice opportunities to master content as well as learning tasks to accelerate and apply math skills with independence.

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

In addition to the strategies that have proven to be successful, we will closely monitor and discuss student data to identify and address specific deficits. During data meetings, teachers will develop an action plan to address the needs for the identified student performance levels. Deficits will be addressed during small group instruction and push in/ out support. A new structure for data monitoring will be implemented to allow closer monitoring of students in each subgroup. The ESE teacher and Tier I Interventionist will support students in the classroom providing strategies to help students take ownership of their learning and apply learned strategies independently.

Additionally, each intermediate student will have and use a data journal to ensure that they are taking accountability for their learning and are aware of their progress. All classes K-5 will have a fluid data display to increase accountability, set goals, and accelerate learning. Engagement strategies will be implemented and utilized during daily instruction to support students' discourse and understanding of content.

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.

Professional development (PD) opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders will focus on:
*The new Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking
*Strategies to support and engage students will learning need including ELL and SWD
*Analyzing and disaggregating data to plan for student learning across all content areas
*Writing in response to reading

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

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement, students will receive additional push-in support by an interventionist to accelerate learning. Pull-out intervention groups will take place weekly and will be

provided by Reading Endorsed staff. Additionally, during PLCs, teams will purposely plan for reading and math small groups, ensuring that resources match the needs of the students. Students will have increased opportunities to engage in hands on application of science process skills and close reading of science informational text. Lastly, we will continue to provide project based enrichment opportunities for students that have mastered grade level standards

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.	Learning gains for the Lowest 25% in Math showed a performance of 57%. Progress monitoring Data from the 2021-22 school year indicated a need as 25% of the Lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 displayed proficiency level on the End of Year i-Ready Diagnostic. Focusing on increasing the learning gains of the Lowest 25% ,with the implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards, will lead to an increase in learning gains, overall math proficiency and help reduce the achievement gap within the population of students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With the full implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards schoolwide, our goal is to improve learning gains for the Lowest 25% in math on the statewide assessment from 57% to 65%. Additionally, on i-Ready, the goal is to increase overall math proficiency for the Lowest 25% population from 25% to 30% on the end of year assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by classroom teachers and administrative team. Teachers will closely monitor the identified subgroup for work product on standards aligned tasks and assessments. During weekly grade level PLCs, student data on formative and summative assessments will be analyzed for class and grade level trends. Actionable feedback and instructional adjustments will be made pending data outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Scaffolding strategies will be used during small group instruction. Clarity and specificity of the B.E.S.T. standards will be utilized to meet the needs of the focus group. Student data will be monitored and tracked for progress towards proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	This strategy was selected to bridge the achievement gap and ensure high expectations by meeting students at their individual level while providing scaffolds and support as needed.

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.

Teachers will participate in continuous trainings through grade level, content area and schoolwide professional development on the components of the B.E.S.T. standards for mathematics. In addition, teachers will be trained on how to utilize resources to plan for and deliver standards-aligned mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible   Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

Content area coaches will facilitate weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards-based instruction is evident. Purposeful planning will be implemented for the lowest 25% of students.

Person Responsible   Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

During weekly common planning, teams will purposefully plan for and embed scaffolding strategies into whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible   Demetries McPherson (demetries.mcpherson@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Learning gains for the Lowest 25% in ELA showed the lowest performance being 50%. Progress Monitoring Data from the 2021-22 school year also indicated need as 29% of the Lowest 25% of students grades 3-5 displayed proficiency on the EOY iReady Diagnostic. According to the Federal Index, the SWD subgroup fell below the 41% threshold. Focusing on improving ELA performance of the Lowest 25%, which includes students with disabilities, overall ELA proficiency would improve as well as a reduction in the achievement gap within this population of students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With the full implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards schoolwide, our goal is to improve ELA performance of the Lowest 25% from 50% to 55%. Additionally, on i-Ready, the goal is to increase overall ELA proficiency for the Lowest 25% population from 29% to 34% by the end of year assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	In order to monitor this area of focus, classroom walkthroughs will be conducted during whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will receive actionable feedback on areas where improvement is needed. During weekly grade level PLCs, student data on formative and summative assessments will be analyzed for class and grade level trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carletta Davis-Wilson (carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Differentiated strategies will be utilized during small group and intervention. Individualized learning plans will support the facilitation of instruction at the students' ability level with progression towards grade level expectations. Classroom teachers will monitor and track student progress towards proficiency. The data will guide academic decisions for each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	The rationale for selecting this evidence based strategy is defined by the increase in academic performance that will be achieved when instruction is individualized based on student performance and data.

resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

During grade level PLCs and instructional planning days, standards based instruction for the Lowest 25% of students will be thoughtfully planned and discussed.

Person Responsible	Irarissa Louis (irarissa.louis@ocps.net)

Data for this subgroup will be frequently analyzed to assist in making academic decisions for each student.

Person Responsible	Irarissa Louis (irarissa.louis@ocps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

After analyzing end of year data from the final i-Ready ELA Diagnostic assessment, 65% of Kindergarten students, 75% of first grade students, and 46% of second grade students scored mid or above grade level. This placement projects the number of students highly likely to score proficient on statewide assessments. Considering the projected fell below 50% for second grade as well as the number of identified students with disabilities in this grade level, additional support and intervention is needed to ensure adequate progress in this grade level.

The instructional practices that will be utilized are differentiated small group instruction with a focus on systematic phonics instruction to teach students to decode words and analyze word parts. Students will read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

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

Learning gains for the Lowest 25% in ELA showed the lowest performance being 50%. Progress Monitoring Data from the 2021-22 school year also indicated need as 29% of the Lowest 25% of students grades 3-5 displayed proficiency on the EOY i-Ready Diagnostic. According to the Federal Index, the SWD subgroup fell below the 41% threshold. Focusing on improving ELA performance of the Lowest 25%, which includes students with disabilities, overall ELA proficiency would improve as well as a reduction in the achievement gap within this population of students.

The instructional practices that will be utilized are students will read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension and strengthening students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

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)

Our goal is to improve the percentage of students projected to score a level 3 or above in the identified group of second graders. The goal is to increase from 46% to 50% on the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is to increase the number of 3rd - 5th grade students scoring proficient from 57% to 60% as measured on the statewide third progress monitoring F.A.S.T. ELA assessment.

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.

By implementing a continual improvement process, progress monitoring data will be analyzed and disaggregated on a routine basis. District and school-based assessment periods are predetermined to ensure frequency of data collection and monitoring. The testing coordinator ensures 95% or more of students are included in all assessment windows. Once data is completed, school teams analyze and disaggregate data, measure outcomes, and make instructional adjustments to meet or exceed impact end of year goals.

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators.

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.

Davis-Wilson, Carletta, carletta.davis-wilson@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?

Maxey Elementary implements a structured reading plan that is aligned to the district's K-12 Reading Plan. This plan encompasses all five essential elements of reading starting with prekindergarten through grade five. Evidence-based programs are used to support the teaching of these essential elements including:

*Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters (Heggerty Phonological and Phonemic Awarenes)

*Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS)

*Provide students with opportunities to practice making sense of stretch text (i.e., challenging text) that will expose them to complex ideas and information (State adopted curriculum- Wonders)

A non-negotiable 90 minute reading block is built into the daily master schedule in addition to 120 minutes of intervention and/or enrichment. Common planning is utilized to ensure intentional planning for reading instruction and the use of practices.

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?

The rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs are:

-The use of the foundational daily slides teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words

-Heggerty helps students develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters

-SIPPS teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. It 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
Teachers will participate in continuous trainings through grade level, content area and schoolwide professional development on the components of the B.E.S.T. standards for English Language Arts. In addition, teachers will be trained on how to utilize resources to plan for and to deliver systematic instruction in reading. Maxey will develop professional learning plans based on the needs of their schools. These plans include specific supports for teachers based on progress monitoring data.	Louis, Irarissa, irarissa.louis@ocps.net
Maxey Elementary embraces distributive leadership. Our Literacy Leadership Team is made of reading endorsed classroom teachers, reading specialists, and site-based instructional leaders. Monthly team meetings are conducted where data are analyzed, action steps implemented, and monitored for progress towards established goals. The Literacy Leadership Team is responsible for developing a multi-year MTSS schoolwide implementation plan to address academic deficiencies. Monthly Literacy Leadership team meetings, where data is analyzed and action steps are implemented and monitored.	Davis-Wilson, Carletta, carletta.davis-wilson@ocps.net
Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support etc. to fit area(s) of need. The literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Louis, Irarissa, irarissa.louis@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Through a distributive leadership model, a core team of teachers, principal, and a mental health designee collaborate throughout the year to analyze survey data, select strategies to address areas of need, and monitor implementation of strategies in order to build a positive school culture and environment. Our spring 2022 Panorama data indicates a need to increase students' self-management and social-awareness skills while at school. Strategies to improve these targeted areas include class morning meetings, goal-setting, and practicing teamwork with collaborative problem solving techniques.

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

As we build momentum towards enhancing student learning, Maxey Elementary School will continue to develop positive relationships with parents, families, and the community by creating a warm, nurturing, and safe environment that meets the needs of all students. We will achieve this welcoming experience by ensuring that all members of the Maxey family understand their role and responsibility in the school-home partnership. Additionally, it is imperative that all stakeholders are able to contribute to the development and implementation of school improvement strategies, therefore ensuring that our goals are inclusive, equitable, and of benefit to our students. To foster school-home collaboration and engagement, Maxey Elementary encourages stakeholders to engage in volunteer and partner opportunities. Information is provided in multiple languages in order to sufficiently inform stakeholders, match needs and interests, and involve partners that share a common value.

School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation of services and to gather feedback to help determine next steps towards improving school culture and environment.