

Orange County Public Schools

Pershing School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pershing School

1800 E PERSHING AVE, Orlando, FL 32806

<https://pershingk8.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Sanjay Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	69%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pershing School

1800 E PERSHING AVE, Orlando, FL 32806

<https://pershingk8.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)
Combination School KG-8	No	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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
Jeannides, Jorie	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Sanjay	Principal	
Vincent, Toni	Math Coach	
Paxson, Cayci	Other	
Horning, Melissa	Instructional Media	
Massie, Kate	Behavior Specialist	
Slattery, Deanna	Instructional Coach	
Schaefer, Amber	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
McClure, Kari	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Sanjay 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.*

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

81

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,104

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.

18

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	116	117	106	103	89	97	94	95	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	8	13	17	17	16	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	27	18	32	30	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	22	25	31	27	0	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	23	27	18	32	30	0	0	0	0	130

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	1	1	1	9	17	0	19	21	0	0	0	0	69

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Monday 7/18/2022

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	14	104	102	99	62	99	91	71	60	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	2	13	20	17	5	18	18	4	12	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	6	2	3	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	10	9	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	7	8	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	9	7	16	17	28	33	24	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	6	15	8	10	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	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	14	104	102	99	62	99	91	71	60	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	2	13	20	17	5	18	18	4	12	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	6	2	3	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	10	9	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	7	8	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	9	7	16	17	28	33	24	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	6	15	8	10	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	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	56%	57%	55%				53%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						55%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						39%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	56%	41%	42%				67%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	40%						66%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						48%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	55%	57%	54%				44%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	63%	59%					74%	78%

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	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	63%	5%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	24	40	29	24	33	28	19	67			
ELL	29	48	39	29	36	25	33	40			
ASN	58			83							
BLK	35	42	27	39	26	25	16				
HSP	44	50	36	43	34	23	47	68	63		
MUL	52	69		61	46						
WHT	66	57	54	65	45	42	65	81	77		
FRL	40	46	35	41	35	26	41	68	59		
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	30	41	38	28	27	7	23				
ELL	28	50	52	33	47	41	33				
ASN	69	67		77	42						
BLK	35	39		50	50		64				
HSP	45	55	46	48	49	37	42	62	67		
MUL	62			62							
WHT	66	63	55	70	50	41	56	69	67		
FRL	46	58	48	54	48	35	46	58	69		
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	26	46	46	34	50	64	8				
ELL	34	48		58	61		30				
ASN	58			75							
BLK	29	47		52	53						
HSP	48	47		63	51		36				
WHT	63	58	43	72	75	58	50				
FRL	46	46	36	60	63	56	50				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	45
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?

Across the grade levels from 3rd - 8th, the following subgroups are performing below the majority in all content areas: ESSA subgroups Students with Disabilities, ELL students and Black students.

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

Math achievement, learning gains and bottom 25% learning gains, ELA learning gains and ELA bottom 25% are the data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Pershing School struggled to secure an instructor throughout the school year. Once a teacher was identified, additional time was needed to address academic and behavior management concerns. Additionally, we onboarded other new Math instructors who lacked the experience, knowledge and pedagogy needed to address the myriad responsibilities of a classroom teacher. Learning new standards, addressing a class culture, learning professional responsibilities and experiencing the stresses of a first year teacher contributed to struggles within the classroom. Our school also experience resignations of Math instructors midway through the school year which compounded the effects of learning loss while students learning virtual during the previous school year.

With multiple teacher absences that had to be covered by support staff, support to teachers was not consistent.

Pershing School experienced similar concerns in Middle School ELA. Instructional staff members resigned midway through the school year and another was unable to complete the required duties due to a long term illness that required a leave of absence.

Actions that have been taken to address this need have been:

- * Math coaches for both elementary and middle school have been hired to support teachers
- * Math training has been provided for all Math teachers on the new B.E.S.T. standards
- * Hired additional middle school ESE support facilitation teacher to address the deficiencies with our SWD
- * Added additional sections of intensive math for middle school students who need additional support
- * Data discussions with teachers have been implemented to determine gaps and provide support

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

The social studies component had an increase of 12% of students scoring a level 3 and above.

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

There was an expansion of tutoring availability which moved beyond the traditional support of level 1 students.

Civics tutoring was provided to all students after school.

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

An interventionist will be hired to work with specific students for ELA and Math to close the gaps. We will hire additional staff members so that each of the middle school content area teachers are only teaching one grade level of material and one content area. Tutoring has been offered to students on a different day than other than activities so that students do not have to choose one or the other. We hired additional coaches to support both the middle school and the elementary school teachers. We will hire a Dean to reduce discipline concerns

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.

Teachers will be provided professional development in building relationships with students, the new B.E.S.T. standards, PBIS, new curriculum, data analysis and verbal de-escalation techniques.

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

Weekly PLC meetings will be supported by administration and coaches. Professional development based on teacher needs throughout the school 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.

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA state assessment data results, the ESSA subgroup, Students with disabilities scored a 39% which is below the 41% Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the ESSA subgroups will increase to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through quarterly data meetings. It will also be monitored through classroom observations to ensure that differentiated instruction is taking place. In addition, this will be monitored through the implementation of FBS and MTSS. Data meetings will focus on the number of students achieving proficiency on unit tests, progress monitoring checks and other locally administered exams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Differentiated Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Targeted Instruction
Project Based Learning

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

These strategies have been proven to address the needs of various subgroups of students. Research data shows students perform better when learning modalities are taken into consideration when instructed. In order to achieve our intended goal, students will need to achieve proficiency on this year's Progress Monitoring 3 exam.

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 through Professional Learning Communities (PLC's)
Creating schedules for coaching support
Differentiated professional development opportunities outside of planning for teachers
Targeted feedback to teachers in using the evidence based strategies
Monitoring application of state standards in K-8 classrooms

Person Responsible Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Math achievement scores dropped from 61% to 56%, learning gains decreased from 49% to 40%, and learning gains for the bottom 25% decreased from 39% to 30%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase math achievement from 56% to 60%, increase math learning gains from 40% to 50% and increase learning gains for bottom 25% from 30% to 40%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through CRM assessment data and data meetings. It will also be monitored through PM testing utilizing FAST and subsequent data meetings. In addition, this area of focus will be monitored utilizing classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toni Vincent (toni.vincent@ocps.net)

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

Differentiated Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Targeted Instruction
Project Based Learning
Spiraled Reviews
Remediation Interventions
Enrichment opportunities
Use of manipulatives

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These strategies have been proven to address the needs of various subgroups of students. Research data shows students perform better when learning modalities are taken into consideration when instructed. Differentiated instruction through small group has been proven to assist in meeting the needs of students.

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.

Math coaches to attend FCS training

Person Responsible

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible

Jorie Jeannides (50357@ocps.net)

Data meetings middle school

Person Responsible

Toni Vincent (toni.vincent@ocps.net)

Data meeting elementary school

Person Responsible

Kari McClure (kari.mcclure@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA learning gains decreased from 56% to 54% and ELA bottom 25% learning gains decreased from 48% to 42%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA learning gains to increase from 54% to 60% and learning gains for the bottom 25% to increase from 42% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through CRM assessment data and data meetings. It will also be monitored through PM testing utilizing FAST and subsequent data meetings. In addition, this area of focus will be monitored utilizing classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

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

Differentiated Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Targeted Instruction
Project Based Learning
Spiraled Reviews
Remediation Interventions
Enrichment opportunities
Use of manipulatives
Frontload Vocabulary
Cooperative learning and collaborative structures

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These strategies have been proven to address the needs of various subgroups of students. Research data shows students perform better when learning modalities are taken into consideration when instructed. Differentiated instruction through small group has been proven to assist in meeting the needs of students.

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.

Data meetings

Person Responsible

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

Classroom Walkthroughs

Person Responsible

Jorie Jeannides (jorie.jeannides@ocps.net)

Common structure for PLCs

Person Responsible

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

Common Structures and protocols

Person Responsible

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA state assessment data results, the ESSA subgroup, English Language Learners scored a 39% which is below the 41% Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal this school year is to increase proficiency to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through quarterly data meetings. It will also be monitored through classroom observations to ensure that differentiated instruction is taking place. ELL students receive reading intervention support through Intensive Reading classes in grades 6-8 and during the FBS block in K-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Frontloading Vocabulary
Use of Visuals and Manipulatives
Differentiated Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Targeted Instruction
Project Based Learning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These strategies have been proven to address the needs of various subgroups of students. Research data shows students perform better when learning modalities are taken into consideration when instructed. In order to achieve our intended goal, students will need to achieve proficiency on this year's Progress Monitoring 3 exam.

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 through Professional Learning Communities (PLC's)
Creating schedules for coaching support
Differentiated professional development opportunities outside of planning for teachers
Targeted feedback to teachers in using the evidence based strategies
Monitoring application of state standards in K-8 classrooms
Itinerant Social Worker will create small groups for social emotional learning

Person Responsible

Toni Vincent (toni.vincent@ocps.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA state assessment data results, the ESSA subgroup, Black/African-American scored a 39% which is below the 41% Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for this ESSA subgroup is 41%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through quarterly data meetings. It will also be monitored through classroom observations to ensure that differentiated instruction is taking place. Black students identified as not meeting proficiency receive support through differentiated instruction, intensive reading and intensive Math classes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Frontloading Vocabulary
Use of Visuals and Manipulatives
Differentiated Instruction
Small Group Instruction
Targeted Instruction
Project Based Learning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These strategies have been proven to address the needs of various subgroups of students. Research data shows students perform better when learning modalities are taken into consideration when instructed. In order to achieve our intended goal, students will need to achieve proficiency on this year's Progress Monitoring 3 exam.

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 through Professional Learning Communities (PLC's)
Creating schedules for coaching support
Differentiated professional development opportunities outside of planning for teachers
Targeted feedback to teachers in using the evidence based strategies
Monitoring application of state standards in K-8 classrooms

Person Responsible

Jorie Jeannides (jorie.jeannides@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.

We will bridge the gap between the middle school and the elementary school to become one school. We will recognize all faculty and staff throughout the year. We will increase community involvement by collaborating with local high schools. We will celebrate monthly birthday celebrations for the staff and increase student celebrations and recognitions as well. We will be visible in the school.

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

Sanjay Brown - Principal: Oversee the implementation of the plan; be visible for staff, students, and families at events, in school and in the community.
 Jorie Jeannides - Assistant Principal: Collaborate with different organization to organize and plan events; be visible for staff, students, and families at events, in school and in the community.
 Jennifer Slauter - coordinate volunteers for events; coordinates Teach-In
 Tina Gonzalez - coordinate events with school, PTSO, community and Foundation