Orange County Public Schools

Dillard Street Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dillard Street Elementary

311 N DILLARD ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://dillardstreetes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Smid

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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

Dillard Street Elementary

311 N DILLARD ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://dillardstreetes.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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

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
Smid, Tiffany	Principal	Instructional Leader
Austing, Andrea	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Coordinates all assessments Coaches and supports teacher instruction Ensures ELL compliance
Landrock, Heather	Instructional Coach	Coaches teachers with instruction Supports new teachers
Smith, Felicia	Assistant Principal	Evaluates Teachers Manages inventory Coordinates student behavior interventions
Clark, Christina	Other	Monitors students who need tier 2 and tier 3 interventions Coordinates intervention groups Supports families, teachers and staffing specialist with the MTSS process
Rawls, Rebecca	Staffing Specialist	Coordinates compliance with IEPs and 504 plans Supports teachers and families with creation and implementation of the IEP

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/13/2022, Tiffany Smid

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

0

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

520

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

15

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

13

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	77	80	84	87	69	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	16	16	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	9	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	7	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 8/16/2022

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	52	90	77	72	62	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	437
Attendance below 90 percent	6	15	24	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	3	12	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
	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	

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	2	7	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	52	90	77	72	62	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	437
Attendance below 90 percent	6	15	24	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	3	12	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
	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	

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	2	7	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	47%	56%	56%				52%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						53%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						54%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	48%	46%	50%				53%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						45%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						26%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	61%	59%				46%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	53%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	23	43	44	33	54	17	19				
ELL	28	52	53	32	57	47	25				
BLK	36	52	71	32	42	36	18				
HSP	38	55	53	47	60	50	28				
WHT	69	73		65	68		67				
FRL	38	53	62	39	47	29	31				

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	13	21		23	29	36	18				
ELL	31	41		34	53		27				
BLK	35	21		31	21						
HSP	39	42		46	52		38				
WHT	58	25		58	29		59				
FRL	34	33	33	41	33	47	35				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	11	32	41	9	23	27					
ELL	28	56	54	35	35	30	27				
BLK	50	46		49	26		31				
HSP	40	52	57	44	44	36	33				
WHT	64	56	64	65	53		70				
FRL	43	50	49	45	40	25	40				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	43
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	41
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	48
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	68
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	44
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?

Proficiency in both ELA and Mathematics showed an increase of 2%. In addition, learning gains for both ELA and Math showed significant gains including a 26% increase in ELA and a 17% increase in math. Also, our lowest quartile of students showed a 26% increase in ELA learning gains. Our Black Students and Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroups showed significant gains in proficiency and learning gains in both ELA and Math. Our English Language Learners subgroup showed growth in math and math learning gains.

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

Math learning gains for the lowest quartile had a drop of 11% from last year to 39%. Science dropped 4% from last year to 37%. Those two areas show the greatest need for improvement. In addition, ELA proficiency and learning gains both dropped with our ELL subgroup of 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?

In mathematics, the tier 3 intervention supports for our lowest quartile of students requires additional time for instruction and the implementation of research-based resources and strategies. In addition, teachers need support with implementing scaffolds for whole group core instruction in mathematics to support these students. With our science instruction, teachers need support with implementing comprehensive, lab-based instruction that is aligned to the standards and allows students to develop a deep understanding of the content. In addition, students need opportunities to develop an understanding of scientific vocabulary and make real-world connections with the content.

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

According to state assessments, learning gains in ELA for all students and our lowest quartile showed the greatest improvement of 26% for each area. In addition, math learning gains for all students showed great improvement at a 17% increase. This data was consistent with our progress monitoring of i-Ready data throughout the year.

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

The school implemented comprehensive systems for tier 2 intervention instruction in ELA and math. Student data was monitored closely throughout the year. Students were placed in small groups to address instruction needs and groups remained fluid as students made growth. Tier 3 instruction for ELA was also systematic, using researched-based resources and strategies throughout the school year. School-wide shifts emphasized all students receive on-grade level instruction during the entire 90-minute reading block each day.

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

Structures from the previous school year need to continue. Increased opportunities for students who are close to proficiency need to receive math and ELA acceleration lessons embedded in the school day every week.

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 opportunities to accelerate learning would include:
scaffolding strategies for core whole group instruction in ELA and Math
implementation of acceleration lessons for bubble students
lab-based science instruction

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

Staff will continue to track student data with regularly scheduled team reviews to shift intervention instruction based on student needs. Periodic opportunities for teacher teams to vertically align instruction ensuring there are no gaps. Continue a professional development series for teachers on scaffolding supports and engagement during instruction. Maintain opportunities for bubble students to receive acceleration strategies in ELA and Mathematics. Increase opportunities for tier 3 mathematics students to receive intervention support. Build opportunities for lab-based science instruction during the school day as well as on Saturdays.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	According to statewide science assessment data, our students scored 37 percent proficient. This is a decrease from the previous year which was 41 percent and 19 percentage points below the district average. According to ESSA reporting our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup scored at 33 percent proficiency which does not meet the required 41 percent federal index score.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our school goal is at 50 percent proficiency in science on the statewide assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administrators and coaches will collaboratively support teachers with the planning process of standards-based, inquiry science lessons and monitor the implementation of lessons in frequent walk-through observations. Data collected from unit assessments will be reviewed with teachers to collaboratively plan and reteach lessons. Standards-based unit assessment data will be reviewed by administrators, coaches, and teachers to plan and deliver reteach lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Smid (tiffany.smid@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will plan rigorous, inquiry-based science lessons based on the NGSSS standards and deliver the daily lessons according to our scope and sequence. Coaches and administrators will collaboratively plan lessons with teachers to ensure resources are aligned to the standards and ensure that students have opportunities to engage in hands-on inquiry-based activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	According to research, science instruction requires hands-on learning opportunities that involve the active participation of students experiencing scientific concepts.

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.

Coaches, administrators, and teachers collaboratively plan science lessons to ensure weekly opportunities for students to engage in hands-on learning activities aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible Heather Landrock (heather.landrock@ocps.net)

Coaches, administrators, and teachers will review progress monitoring data to plan and reteach lessons for students who are not meeting expectations. Students who are below level in our SWD subgroup, will receive specific intensive science instruction with appropriate scaffolds of support.

Person Responsible Andrea Austing (31319@ocps.net)

Students who need extra support will be invited to a thirty-minute morning science lab, two days a week using an online science program.

Person Responsible Tiffany Smid (tiffany.smid@ocps.net)

Each quarter, all fifth-grade students will be invited to an interactive Saturday Science Lab to engage in hands-on learning opportunities for experiencing scientific concepts.

Person Responsible Tiffany Smid (tiffany.smid@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

According to the end-of-year i-Ready screening, 54 percent of our current second-grade students and 51 percent of third-grade students scored below the proficiency level in English Language Arts (ELA). In addition, according to ESSA reporting our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup scored at 33 percent proficiency which does not meet the required 41 percent federal index score. To help students increase their proficiency, structured instruction will be collaboratively planned, implemented, and monitored, using research-based resources. Daily, all students receive core tier 1 reading instruction for an uninterrupted 90 minutes block, with frequent checks for understanding. Teachers will implement differentiated small group centers and teacher-led small groups. In addition, students in our SWD subgroup will receive differentiated instruction, using scaffolds of supports provided by an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher.

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

According to statewide, standardized results, 51 percent of our current fourth-grade students scored below the proficiency level in English Language Arts (ELA). In addition, according to ESSA reporting our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup scored at 33 percent proficiency which does not meet the required 41 percent federal index score. To help students increase their proficiency, structured instruction will be collaboratively planned, implemented, and monitored, using research-based resources. Daily, all students receive core tier 1 reading instruction for an uninterrupted 90 minutes block, with frequent checks for understanding. Teachers will implement differentiated small group centers and teacher-led small groups. In addition, students in our SWD subgroup will receive differentiated instruction, using scaffolds of supports provided by an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher.

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)

The expected outcome for proficiency on the statewide assessment is 54 percent for students in grades kindergarten through second grade. An additional expected outcome is for students in our SWD subgroup will score at least 41 percent proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The expected outcome for proficiency on the statewide assessment is 54 percent for students in third-fifth grades. An additional expected outcome is for students in our SWD subgroup will score at least 41 percent proficiency.

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.

Several layers of progress monitoring will occur on an ongoing basis. Teachers will monitor whole group instruction, with progress checks throughout the week, and adjust small group activities accordingly. Intervention teachers will monitor bubble students and deliver acceleration lessons on a weekly basis. Grade-level teams, with the support of instructional coaches, will monitor data from unit standards-based unit assessments every three weeks to plan the implementation of reteaching lessons.

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

Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@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?

Teachers will use differentiated learning tasks during centers and teacher-led small group instruction.

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?

This strategy was selected because differentiated instruction allows teachers to maximize the growth of all students by meeting them where they are regardless of their abilities, strengths, and weaknesses.

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
Content area coaches will facilitate bi-weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards-based instruction with embedded opportunities for scaffolding and support is evident. Differentiated centers will be purposely planned to meet the needs of the focus subgroups.	Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@ocps.net
Teams will review standards-based unit assessment data to plan and re-teach lessons.	Landrock, Heather, heather.landrock@ocps.net
Coaches and administration will conduct frequent walk-throughs to provide coaching support and guidance to the teachers through job-embedded professional development opportunities.	Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@ocps.net
Students who are below level in our SWD subgroup, will receive specific, directed, individualized intensive instruction provided in small group and in additional time with an ESE resource teacher.	Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@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.

Dillard Street Elementary utilizes the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) – to promote school safety and good behavior, with a focus on prevention not punishment. The students are taught positive behavior strategies and expectations for different situations and may receive rewards for exhibiting appropriate behavior in the classrooms, cafeteria, and other common areas. With these practices in place, students are better equipped to be successful academically and we should see a decline in inappropriate behaviors. The House System is also used to promote a safe and positive learning environment. The students and staff members are placed in Houses at the beginning of the year. This allows everyone to connect regardless of their class, grade level, or position who may not normally have a chance to interact with each other. This cultivates friendships and creates a family-like culture mixed with friendly competition at the school.

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

PBIS Team Members – consists of the following: Administrators, Guidance Counselor, Behavior Specialist, MTSS Coach, Media Interventionist and teachers. It may also include students, parents and other stakeholders.

The PBIS team sets the framework and the teachers executes the teaching of the strategies and enforce expectations to promote a safe and learning environment that will affect student outcomes every day.

All Stakeholders will strengthen the school dynamics necessary to collectively support a positive school culture and promote a safe learning environment.