Conway Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Conway Elementary

4100 LAKE MARGARET DR, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Judy Bransford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

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: C (49%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (46%)
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

Conway Elementary

4100 LAKE MARGARET DR, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayes.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	82%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

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
Bransford, Judy	Principal	Mrs. Bransford will provide a common vision and direction for the school through rigorous academic goals for all students and staff. The Principal will meet weekly with the leadership team to ensure school resources are maximized to achieve school improvement goals and to discuss the needs of the school, as well as the action plan to support instruction and assessment of all students. The Principal will oversee Tier I core instruction as well as Tier II and Tier III intervention and progress monitoring plans for all students. In addition, weekly data meetings are held to review student performance and support the MTSS process.The Principal will foster positive relationships with students and stakeholders to promote a positive climate and safe environment.
Peedin, Tawny	Instructional Coach	Ms. Peedin will provide guidance with the K-12 ELA plan and support data collection and implementation for Tier I, II and III. She will assist in data analysis and provide professional development to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning. She support teachers to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. She will also work directly with the lowest 25% during interventions.
Sanabria, Nicole	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist will provides guidance with data collection and analysis to ensure ESE students are successful. She supports the implementation of Tier I, II and III intervention plans. She works directly with our ESE resource team to to ensure student IEP goals are monitored, adjusted and met.
Knight, Cynthia	School Counselor	Ms. Knight will provide support to students and staff concerning mental health awareness through healthy emotional and social development strategies and implementation of the SEL initiatives. She will monitor the early warning signs of all students and assist with monthly threat assessment meetings to discuss students at risk and their progress.
Pappas, George	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist works directly with the ASD units and ensures the academic and social emotional success of students.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hafele, Danielle	Instructional Media	Ms. Hafele will monitor and provide support for digital tools in Tier I instruction. Ms. Hafele will support the school in digital resources that support standard based instruction.
Hernandez, Janeris	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to provide a common vision and direction for the school through rigorous academic goals for all students and staff. Some of her responsibilities will be: *to assist with weekly leadership team meetings to ensure school resources are maximized to achieve school improvement goals. *to oversee Tier I core instruction as well as Tier II and Tier III intervention and progress monitoring plans for all students. *to discuss the needs of the school and plan action to support instruction and assessment of all students. *to monitor student performance and support the MTSS process. provide intense support to our instructional staff in their first three years of teaching or new to our school.
Roman, Ashley	Math Coach	Ms. Roman will provide guidance with the K-12 Math plan and support data collection and implementation for Tier I, II and III. She will assist in data analysis and provide professional development to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning. She support teachers to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. She will also work directly with the lowest 25% during interventions.
Paolozzi, Tamara	Instructional Coach	Ms. Paolozzi will ensure that the school based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity and addressing goals and targets in the SIP plan. She will provide guidance as well as monitoring effective instructional strategies through professional developments, classroom walkthroughs, and interventions. Ms. Paolozzi will communicate with families regarding school based MTSS plans as well as support the implementation of Tier I, II and III best instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/13/2021, Judy Bransford

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

471

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

7

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

7

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	70	76	76	75	64	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	437
Attendance below 90 percent	12	28	32	26	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	0	1	5	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	22	81	70	73	62	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	8	29	21	28	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	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	0	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	22	81	70	73	62	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	8	29	21	28	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	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	0	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	44%	56%	56%				59%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						57%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						58%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	46%	50%				63%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	51%						65%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						50%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	61%	59%				63%	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	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	63%	8%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
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	15	38	50	18	49	48	17				
ELL	33	51	69	45	61	50	23				
BLK	31	43		29	33		32				
HSP	41	52	63	46	57	59	32				
WHT	67	58		67	50		76				
FRL	40	51	56	43	43	42	25				

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	12	39		12	50		20				
ELL	21	34		26	48	73	23				
BLK	59			28	40		60				
HSP	33	38	50	36	55	73	33				
WHT	42			63							
FRL	38	46	50	34	49	70	36				

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	24	50	54	26	59	46	23				
ELL	44	64	70	53	73	63	73				
ASN	60			70							
BLK	42	40		49	43		40				
HSP	57	54	59	59	66	53	60				
WHT	72	69		78	71		78				
FRL	56	55	55	62	62	52	55				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	64
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?

ELA is the lowest performance component for grades 3-5 based on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessments scores, with fourth grade being the lowest scores schoolwide. Grades 3-5 in ELA had 45% of the students show proficiency on the FSA scores.

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

Based on the most recent FSA data for the 2022 school year, our area's greatest need for improvement is in ELA with only 45% proficiency for grades 3-5.

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

The contributing factor to this years performance was attendance below 90% and Tier I instruction. Tier I instruction shifting back to small groups that included re-teaching of standards using data to drive grouping is the action that will help address deficits in Tier I instruction.

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

Based on the Florida Standards Assessments 2022 scores, the data component that showed the greatest improvement is in math with a 47% proficiency for grades 3-5.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement in math was the implementation of rigorous small group activities with an emphasis on manipulatives and a strategic reteach plan. Also, using strategies such as bringing math to daily experiences and targeting skill based gaps for intervention.

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

A focus on small group differentiated instruction that target students' learning process and specific needs, as well as a rigorous strategic reteach plan for both ELA and Math that will occur and be part of the instructional focus calendars and lesson plans.

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 and staff members will benefit from different PD trainings about small group differentiated instruction, how to understand and apply the data trends in your daily lessons and how to maximize the resources based on students' specific needs.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement in this school year, teachers will provide differentiated small group instruction for ELA and Math to target each student's needs based on their Tiers. In addition, stakeholders will promote social and emotional learning for a positive impact on a wide range of outcomes, including academic performance, healthy relationships and mental wellness.

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.	At Conway Elementary, students with disabilities have consistently performed lower than their non-disabled peers. Based on the 2019 FSA data, only 24% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA and 26% were proficient in Math. The overall federal index for students with disabilities at Conway Elementary was 34 federal percent of the points index which is below the federal requirement of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	For the 22-23 school year, we will increase proficiency by 5% or more for students with disabilities in ELA and Math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student data from FAST, Standards Based Unit Assessments, classroom assignments, and frequent formative assessments will be used for monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Conway Elementary teachers will provide standards based instruction and intensive reading instruction. Teachers will match the intensity of instruction to the skill deficit and needs of each student. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers will group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They will frequently monitor student progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students who are not proficient in reading or math require differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs. Intensive instruction at the needed level, in addition, to the regular standards based instruction will help close the achievement gap for all students, especially the students with disabilities.
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 learning opportunities focused on effective implementation strategies of the small group intervention in reading and math. Teachers will be provided resources for differentiating instruction based on specific student needs.

Person Responsible   Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	We will provide instructional staff with professional development for Tier I and Tier II reading instruction that focuses on standards-aligned instructional practices based on the B.E.S.T standards. Teachers will focus on monitoring student growth to increase student achievement and to close the learning gaps, as well as ensure all students are exposed to rigorous instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	- Increase proficiency by 6% in ELA and Math - Increase proficiency in the lowest 25% in ELA and Math by 3%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	-Implement monitoring instructional walks that focus on standards-aligned instruction in Math and ELA. -Detailed IFCs -Interventionists to support lowest 25% in ELA and provide Tier III intensive interventions
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Data meetings will occur bi-weekly to desegregate common assessments data and drive instructional shifts that focus on acceleration. The instructional coach will work with teachers and interventionists to group students by acceleration that is needed to master grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Data meetings are critical to inform and to make adjustments that meet the needs of all students. Acceleration will be used if the standards are not mastered in order to ensure students continue to be exposed to standards-aligned instruction.

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.

The leadership team, instructional coaches and intervention teachers will provide K-5 grade level support to small groups and monitor students weekly using data from assigned path lessons. In addition, the leadership team will participate in the planning process and data meetings to ensure data conversations driven and best practice are utilize.

Person Responsible	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@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

On the most recent i-Ready Diagnostics results (EOY), data indicated that 32% of students scored below level for English Language Arts.

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

On the most recent Florida Standard Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 53% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts. The following percentages for ELA achievement are: Third Grade-48%, Fourth Grade-41%, Fifth Grade-45%.

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 2023 EOY i-Ready ELA Diagnostic will show an increase of 25% for each grade level (K-2) in comparison with the BOY i-Ready Diagnostic for ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The 2023 ELA FSA will show an increase for the following grade level(s):
Third Grade - seven percentage points from 48% to 55%
Fourth Grade - nine percentage points from 41% to 50%
Fifth Grade - ten percentage points from 45% to 55%

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.

Monitoring will occur by using the outcomes of:
i-Ready Diagnostic Tests
i-Ready Growth Monitoring
F.A.S.T.
Standards-Based Unit Assessments
District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments
SIPPS Mastery Assessments
Haggerty Assessments
Early Bird Assessments

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

Bransford, Judy, judy.bransford@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to the letters. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence. Each student will read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and
comprehension. For students of greater need, small group instruction can occur where
students can decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
I-ready diagnostics, bi-weekly reports, and mini-benchmark tests will help clarify which
students will need further support to attain proficiency on each ELA standard.

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?

Having a growing population of ESE and ELL students at the school, specific literacy strategies will need to be a part of everyday instruction in ELA classes. Methodical vocabulary, comprehension skills, and reading stamina will continue to be implemented. To expand writing success, the use of textual evidence along with comprehension and interpretation to support the writing process will ensure that writing will be more directly infused into ELA instruction all year long.

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
1. MTSS team will meet with leaders and teachers to review student progress. 2. Reading coach will meet with teachers to construct a delivery plan for each standard/target, will model and update any changes to delivery models based on student data talks and student samples, and participate directly in co-teaching in each of the ELA classrooms. 3. ELA Interventionists will be assigned to assist with lesson progress and intervention within classrooms. (September, monthly review of schedules) 4. PLC/Data Room will provide a fluid visual for reference of the site-wide monitoring process, yearlong. 6. BPIE Indicators, as well as strategies to serve SWD, will be shared during the planning process. 7. Walkthroughs to support the teaching and learning process as well as improve the learning environment. 8. Engagement strategies will be included as a focus in PLCs.	Bransford, Judy, judy.bransford@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, school leaders and staff members will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, our school uses the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support
student success.

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

School leaders, a core team of teachers and stakeholders, will attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.