

Orange County Public Schools

Shenandoah Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Shenandoah Elementary

4827 S CONWAY RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

Demographics

Principal: Des IR Ee Hitchmon Houghton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	N/A

* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Shenandoah Elementary

4827 S CONWAY RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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
Houghton, Desiree	Principal	<p>The principal, Desiree Houghton, functions as the instructional leader for the staff and stakeholders. In this role, she ensures standards-based instruction, implements school and district initiatives, facilitates teacher and student growth, monitors the effectiveness of instructions and interventions, and supports her leadership team to certify all aspects of the school are operating as efficient and effectively as possible. Desiree Houghton ensures that her leadership team is analyzing data to identify student needs. Through her leadership and supervision, the team implements common planning with fidelity and effectiveness. Furthermore, she provides opportunities for differentiated professional learning opportunities via grade level Professional Learning Communities. The principal collaborates with her instructional leaders to implement the Positive Behavior Support committee to promote a safe, collaborative school environment.</p>
Saslov, Joy	Instructional Coach	<p>The Instructional Coach (Joy Saslov) facilitates and guides teachers in data analysis and planning effective, research-based instruction via Professional Learning Community meetings. She also conducts lesson modeling, promotes teacher growth through the coaching cycle, and collaborates with staff to develop instructional and behavioral plans that certify children have a rigorous and safe learning environment. All members of the leadership team collaborate daily to analyze data and identify trends in classrooms. Joy facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) which are held one time a week to assist teachers with strategic planning, integrating Marzano strategies, and developing/implementing formative assessments based on the state standards. The team highlights and celebrates successes and studies data to identify areas of concern. Together, the team develops an action plan to address weaknesses. Through shared leadership, the team builds teacher capacity and increases student achievement.</p>
Gromlich, Ilona	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>The curriculum resource teacher (Ilona Gromlich), facilitates and guides teachers in data analysis and planning effective, research-based instruction via Professional Learning Community meetings. She also conducts lesson modeling, promotes teacher growth through the coaching cycle, and collaborates with staff to develop instructional and behavioral plans that certify children have a rigorous and safe learning environment. All members of the leadership team collaborate daily to analyze data and identify trends in classrooms. Ilona facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) which are held one time a week to assist teachers with strategic planning, integrating Marzano strategies, and developing/implementing formative assessments based on the state standards. The team highlights and celebrates successes and studies data to identify areas of concern. Together, the team develops an action plan to address weaknesses. Through shared leadership, the team builds teacher capacity and increases student achievement.</p>
Asbury, Alison	Staffing Specialist	<p>The Staffing Specialist (Alison Asbury) collaborates with instructional staff, interventionists, paraprofessionals, the MTSS coach, the Guidance</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Counselor, families, outside service providers, and the School Psychologist for shared decision making through the MTSS framework and ESE meetings to ensure that the instructional environment and expectations are met for all students. Additionally, Allison Asbury works in partnership with her team to ensure that data is utilized and monitored frequently to ensure student growth and drive instructional decision making. The staffing specialist acts as the liaison and communicator with families and staff to ensure each child is receiving the services he/she needs in the most appropriate setting.</p>
<p>Brummitt, Shacara</p>	<p>School Counselor</p>	<p>Ms. Brummitt supports teachers and students in building capacity in social emotional learning. She provides professional development and support to our stakeholders to assist the school with obtaining its' SEL goals. Furthermore, the SEL competencies have proven to have a great impact on student learning. A positive school culture and learning environment will increase student success. Ms. Brummitt provides support for student behavior and behavioral interventions.</p>
<p>Roberts, Michelle</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Ms. Davis, serves as our MTSS coach. She provides resources to the staff regarding MTSS. Ms. Davis guides diagnostic assessments and collects and analyzes data in order to implement tiered interventions to meet the individual student's needs. As a member of the leadership team, she facilitates meetings with teachers, parents and stakeholders to build an understanding of the MTSS process. She monitors the implementation of interventions by participating in data meetings, conducting walkthroughs of the intervention block, and providing on-going professional development to staff on MTSS.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, Des IR Ee Hitchmon Houghton

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

407

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

10

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

8

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	15	64	60	67	71	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	367
Attendance below 90 percent	5	29	14	14	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	0	0	8	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Saturday 8/6/2022

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	9	70	77	99	79	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	9	21	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	9	70	77	99	79	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	9	21	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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 0 3 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3

Students retained two or more times 0 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	58%	56%	56%				63%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						54%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						45%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	46%	50%				67%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						57%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						33%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	61%	59%				55%	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	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	57%	13%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	53%	2%
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	27	47	56	41	67	67	45				
ELL	41	60	56	59	71	81	35				
BLK	38	57		38	43						
HSP	48	56	48	56	69	67	40				
WHT	75	73		83	76		83				
FRL	44	56	43	51	66	64	43				

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	31	45		45	30	18	35				
ELL	44	65		40	39	20	38				
BLK	35			43							
HSP	52	60	64	46	42	14	47				
WHT	76	80		79	80		83				
FRL	43	52	77	42	32	24	34				

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	34	36	44	45	28	20	22				
ELL	43	49	52	59	54	35	50				
BLK	45	45		48	45		53				
HSP	54	54	53	62	53	29	51				
WHT	79	57		77	66	50	62				
FRL	52	52	51	58	49	29	51				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	44
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	55
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	78
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	53
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?

Despite an overall improvement in learning gains, students in our lowest 25 percent, across grade levels and subgroups, continue to underperform in ELA.

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

The data component, based on the 2021 FSA results, showed the lowest performance was learning gains in our bottom 25%. This includes our SWD. The lowest quartile earned 43% and our ELA lowest 25th percentile obtained 63%. Although we increased in the lowest quartile percentage of students making learning gains in Math, we decreased in the lowest 25% making learning gains in ELA and overall ELA performance.

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

Time spent in a teacher-led small group to provide differentiated instruction to meet the specific needs of students in our lowest 25% was limited. An increase in time spent in teacher-led small group instruction in both ELA and Math is needed to meet the specific needs of each student and close gaps in achievement. Furthermore, there needs to be an improvement in identifying student gaps and providing research-based, targeted interventions. Our MTSS coach and Instructional coach will assist teachers in completing diagnostics, analyzing data, and providing research-based interventions.

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

Our greatest area of improvement was in Math. Overall math proficiency increased 7 points from 57 to 64. The percentage of students making learning gains in math increased 20 points going from 49 to 69 percent. Students in our lowest quartile showed the most improvement with an increase of 41 points.

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

The instructional coach collaborated with teachers during common planning to increase standards-based instruction. Additionally, the team focused on identifying, implementing, and monitoring specific instructional strategies aimed at student engagement. The team also worked to incorporate the gradual release model and improved instructional scaffolds.

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

The leadership team members and paraprofessionals will be utilized to support classroom instruction by working with small groups daily. This will allow for a greater number of students to meet in a targeted small group. Groups will be fluid based on data and allow teachers to target the specific needs of all students. Additionally, the leadership team (coaches and administration) will provide professional development in high-yield instructional strategies and interventions for small group.

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.

This year, a key area of focus will be professional development focused on the BEST standards and implementing new technology. Teachers in grade 3-5 will need to process the components of the standards. Coaches and teachers will collaborate to appreciate the depth and extent of the new standards to improve learning gains in ELA and Math.

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

Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs to collaborate, analyze data to identify grade-level trends, and ensure implementation of the BEST standards. The leadership team will collaborate with teachers and provide ongoing feedback through the coaching cycle to improve instructional practices. Additionally, teachers will conduct peer observation to identify high-yield strategies and promote shared leadership.

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.**

Student achievement will increase by continuing to focus on our students with disabilities. Based on the 2021-2022 FSA, 42% of our students with disabilities showed proficiency in ELA.

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

In 2022-2023, the scores for students with disabilities will increase by at least 3% for ELA.

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

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure teachers are implementing targeted small group instruction and differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students. Ms. Houghton and her leadership team will monitor the data.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@ocps.net)

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

The MTSS Instructional Support Resource Teacher will conduct data reviews with teachers, host MTSS meetings, and monitor MTSS graphs with increased focus on our SWD. Progress monitoring comes from a variety of sources individualized for each student. The data is graphed to promote easy analysis and instruction is adjusted as needed to match the student's learning needs. Furthermore, walkthroughs will occur daily to monitor differentiated instruction. Data will also be analyzed by the administration and teachers to target the specific needs of each student through PLCs.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific
strategy.
Describe the**

By focusing on the specific needs of our students, overall student achievement will improve, thus also improving achievement outcomes for our students with disabilities. For the success of all students, instruction needs to be differentiated to target specific needs. Also, by focusing on the MTSS process, we will target all learners and their individual needs. Students' achievement gaps will be identified and targeted which will guarantee they are participating in quality instruction.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

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

In August, the MTSS Resource Teacher will provide an MTSS overview to ensure understanding, clarify expectations for our Tier 3 students which include our students with disabilities, and to review expectations for the year to instructional staff.

Person Responsible Michelle Roberts (michelle.roberts@ocps.net)

Provide ongoing MTSS professional development based on the needs of students and staff.

Person Responsible Michelle Roberts (michelle.roberts@ocps.net)

Plan for and develop MTSS professional development and in response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities, discuss specific strategies for targeting the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Michelle Roberts (michelle.roberts@ocps.net)

MTSS graphs are generated (monthly) from progress monitoring. This data is then graphed and instruction is adjusted, instructional intervention groups are adjusted as needed to meet each student's ongoing learning needs.

Person Responsible Michelle Roberts (michelle.roberts@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.

Student achievement will improve when we focus on ELA proficiency. In the 2021-2022 school year, 57% of students were proficient in ELA.

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

In 2022-2023, overall ELA proficiency will increase by at least 3% to reach 60% proficient.

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

Together, the leadership team and teachers will collaborate through PLC to monitor student data. The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs daily and provide feedback and coaching to ensure instruction is aligned to the depth of the new standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@ocps.net)

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

All teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) weekly and plan lessons collaboratively with coach support to build their understanding of the BEST standards. In these PLC groups, teachers will analyze the standard, explore vertical and horizontal alignment and develop formative assessments to track student progress. Additionally, they will continue to plan using strategies, specifically focusing on close reading, student engagement, and differentiated instruction. Teachers will plan for more rigorous reading blocks. Together, they will be able to use strategies learned through the Professional Learning Community, such as pulling complex texts and text dependent question stems, to ensure students are proficient in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the

PLCs will build capacity amongst the teachers and staff. The teachers will review the BEST standards, analyze and identify trends in the data, and consider the impact of the instructional strategies that were selected. Additionally, teachers can collaborate to determine potential adaptations for future instruction.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

The leadership team will collaborate with teachers to determine needed planning adjustments based on potential academic gaps.

Person Responsible Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

The leadership team will provide professional development to teachers on the BEST standards, reading strategies such as close reading and pulling aligning complex texts with grade level expectations, as well as using interactive technology to increase engagement.

Person Responsible Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

The ESE team will provide professional development in response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities. The team will discuss how to find varying levels of complex texts to target the needs of all students.

Person Responsible Alison Asbury (alison.asbury@ocps.net)

The instructional coach and members of the leadership team will model ELA lessons with a focus on BEST standards implementation and using high-yield instructional strategies in classrooms.

Person Responsible Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

Teachers will complete peer observations to observe close reading strategies and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

The Instructional coach and leadership team will provide updates on common planning progress at leadership team meetings and provide ongoing, differentiated support to teachers.

Person Responsible Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@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.

Shenandoah will utilize a distributive leadership model and facilitate social and emotional learning by implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally embedding SEL instructional strategies, and focusing on school supports for families. The SEL site team will analyze panorama data to identify the school's areas that need improvement and provide professional development and support. We utilize the House program to promote student and staff recognition and create a sense of belonging.

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

Teachers, faculty, staff and families will continue to increase community involvement in school wide events and decisions. Our core SEL team will collaborate with the school team to implement professional development to support students and families on their community needs. The SEL team will unitize staff to bridge the community and school and build a positive school culture. Our School Advisor Committee will continue to meet to increase community involvement and determine next steps.