

Orange County Public Schools

Ventura Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ventura Elementary

4400 WOODGATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32822

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

Demographics

Principal: Ana Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ventura Elementary

4400 WOODGATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32822

<https://venturaes.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	91%

School Grades History

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

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
Gonzalez, Ana	Principal	Oversee school-wide student safety and student achievement. Create a common school vision for excellence, and engage teachers, students, and community stakeholders towards the achievement of that vision.
Cardoso, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in the oversight of school-wide student safety and student achievement. With the principal, create a common school vision for excellence, and engage teachers, students, and community stakeholders towards the achievement of that vision.
Morrison, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Support the MTSS process throughout the school. Ensure students receive the individualized support needed to reach their individual and school-wide goals.
John, Lucillia	Instructional Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Griffin, Rosina	Teacher, K-12	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Seepersaud, Stacy	Reading Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Noll, Robert	School Counselor	Support the MTSS process throughout the school. Ensure students receive the individualized support needed to reach their individual and school-wide goals. Ensure the academic and social emotional success of students. Provide families with the supports and services needed to ensure student success at school and within the community.
Santiago Ramos, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Coggan, Susan	Staffing Specialist	Monitors the accommodations provided to ESE students and ensures their IEP plans are up to date and followed.
Figueroa, Rachel	Behavior Specialist	Supports the MTSS process and ensures the academic and social emotional success of students through classroom observation and support for behavior intervention.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Ana Gonzalez

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.*

6

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

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

590

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

16

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

16

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	40	88	94	105	86	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	20	48	32	56	30	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	9	39	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	57	54	48	35	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	253

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	10	29	30	0	0	0	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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/12/2022

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	38	107	105	82	108	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	17	35	39	28	47	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	1	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	1	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	

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	38	107	105	82	108	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	17	35	39	28	47	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	1	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	1	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	

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	43%	56%	56%				34%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						46%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						35%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	46%	50%				36%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						47%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						36%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	61%	59%				42%	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	28%	55%	-27%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

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	27%	62%	-35%	62%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	63%	-28%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	53%	-17%
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	3	61	64	14	64	77	8				
ELL	35	67	68	43	71	75	27				
BLK	34	61		50	69						
HSP	44	70	74	53	74	76	38				
WHT	50	82		50	64		45				
FRL	39	66	64	48	71	76	38				
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	10	42		12	28		13				
ELL	31	61	62	28	57	43	18				
BLK	38	29		18	31		25				
HSP	35	55	56	27	55	52	19				
WHT	61			59							
FRL	34	48	53	23	45	44	22				
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	6	33	36	16	38	27	30				
ELL	24	43	34	30	49	38	32				
BLK	40	61		30	39		50				
HSP	29	43	35	34	49	40	37				
WHT	52	56		48	39						
FRL	33	46	28	34	49	39	43				

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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	56
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	54
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	62
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	58
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	57
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?

Assessment data from 2022 show a 5 percent increase in ELA proficiency from the previous year (38% to 43%). This is still 9 percent below the district average (52%). In science, data shows an 11 percent increase from the previous year (26% to 37%). This is still 19 percent below the district average (56%). Learning gains in both ELA and Math were much higher than the district average by 14 - 28 percentage points. In comparison to the previous year, the learning gains increased by 15 - 25 percentage points. Math proficiency increased from the prior year by 24 percentage points (28% to 52%). Math proficiency is only 1 percentage point lower than the district average.

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

The greatest need for improvement will be in the reading proficiency and science proficiency categories. ELA proficiency is at 43%, 9 percent below the district average. Science proficiency is at 37%, 19 percent below the district average.

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 factors to this need for improvement were a lack of foundational knowledge and skills of prerequisite standards as well as continued need for actively monitoring students and planning for targeted instruction. The new actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement are the curriculum team will support teachers with reviewing assessments and sequence of instruction during common planning. Monitoring of student results on a weekly basis will also be the main focus of common planning to allow curriculum teams to make adjustments to instruction as needed to meet the student needs.

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

Current data shows the most improvement in math proficiency with an increase of 24 percentage points from the previous year (28% to 52%). Learning gains in math increased by 22 percentage points (51% to 73%) and learning gains for the lowest quartile in math increased by 25 percentage points (48% to 73%).

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were an intense focus on standards-based planning, instruction, monitoring, and reviewing assessments prior to instruction. Planning for instruction focused on ensuring that questions asked during the lesson were modeled after test item specifications and standards aligned.

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

In order to accelerate learning, Ventura will need to ensure that Tier I instruction is clear, focused, and purposeful. Teachers will be expected to come prepared to planning sessions with reviewed resources and curriculum content for discussion and modeling. Emphasis will be placed on standards-based instruction, authentic student engagement, and consistent monitoring of student learning outcomes. The focus will shift from remediation to acceleration. Tier I interventionists will be utilized to support acceleration during core instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will include classroom management, small group instruction, data analysis, and small focus groups for beginning teachers. Professional development on resources available for small group instruction and centers for math and for reading will be key to ensuring differentiation and acceleration is present in classrooms.

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, consistent monitoring and feedback will be provided to teachers as well as students. We will incorporate celebrations of growth throughout the year that will help to motivate teachers and students. We will continue to measure the effectiveness of all plans implemented and make adjustments to instruction and to plans as needed.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In grades K-2, 45% of students were not on track to score a Level 3 or above according to the iReady EOY Diagnostic results.
 In Kindergarten, 15% of students were not proficient on the District's iReady EOY diagnostic.
 In first grade, 60% of students were not proficient on the District's iReady EOY diagnostic.
 In second grade, 56% of students were not proficient on the District's iReady EOY diagnostic.
 On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment, data indicated that 57% of students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).
 In third grade, 63% of students were not proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment.
 In fourth grade, 48% of students were not proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment.
 In fifth grade, 61% of students were not proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ventura will increase reading proficiency in grades K-2 to 70% by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
 Ventura will increase reading proficiency in grades 3 -5 to 55% by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Monitoring will occur utilizing standards based assessments provided during instruction as well as through the outcomes of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. iReady assessments will also be utilized as a monitoring tool throughout the year to ensure reading proficiency goals are being met.
 After analysis of these data points, instruction will be adjusted to include and revise re-teaching and re-assessment opportunities. Tracking of these reteaching and reassessment opportunities will occur throughout weekly common planning meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalez2@ocps.net)

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

Strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction will be utilized to support this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The rationale for selecting these strategies is an effort to strengthen instructional practice through the use of differentiated instruction. This will result in improved instructional effectiveness and increased student achievement.

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.

1. Ongoing professional development will be provided during weekly common planning to assure Tier One standards-based instruction is implemented with fidelity. Person Responsible: Stacy Seepersaud - Reading Coach
2. Data meetings will be held monthly with ELA teachers to review student progress and plan instruction based on identified trends. Person Responsible: Stacy Seepersaud / Lisa Morrison
3. Targeted intervention groups will be implemented based on student progress monitoring data to address student needs. Person Responsible: Lisa Morrison
4. Modeling of evidence-based strategies via peer observation and coaching will be completed to build capacity for teachers with less than two years of experience teaching reading. Person Responsible: Lucillia John

Person Responsible

Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalez2@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

On the most recent FSA Science assessment, data indicated that 37% of our fifth grade students are proficient in Science. This was a 11 percent increase in proficiency from the prior year (26%) but still 19 percentage points lower than the district average (56%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

FSA Science proficiency will reach 50% by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Growth in science proficiency will be monitored through the use of the district based Science Progress Monitoring Assessments and through weekly monitoring of Study Island usage and standards based unit assessments. Reteaching opportunities of science concepts will be included through daily activities within each science lesson.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalez2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction will be utilized to support this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy an effort to strengthen instructional practice through the use of differentiated instruction and focus on science content teaching to include vocabulary instruction. This will result in improved instructional effectiveness and increased student achievement.

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.

1. Ongoing professional development will be provided during weekly common planning to assure standards-based instruction is implemented with fidelity. Person Responsible: Rosina Griffin
2. Data meetings will be held monthly with science teachers to review student progress and plan instruction based on identified trends. Person Responsible: Rosina Griffin
3. Differentiated instruction utilizing scientific texts will be provided to students during ELA small group instruction time weekly. Person Responsible: Stacy Seepersaud / Rosina Griffin

Person Responsible

Michelle Cardoso (michelle.cardoso@ocps.net)

#3. 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.

Students with disabilities have scored low in proficiency for the past two years. This year's proficiency percentage for students with disabilities was at 32%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ventura will increase proficiency of our students with disabilities to 41% by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur utilizing standards based assessments provided during instruction as well as through the outcomes of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. iReady assessments will also be utilized as a monitoring tool throughout the year to ensure reading proficiency goals are being met. After analysis of these data points, instruction will be adjusted to include and revise re-teaching and re-assessment opportunities. Tracking of these reteaching and reassessment opportunities will occur throughout weekly common planning meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalez2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework for learning will be utilized in planning and implementing instruction to optimize learning for students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

UDL guidelines offer a set of concrete suggestions that can be applied to any discipline or domain to ensure that all learners can access and participate in meaningful, challenging learning opportunities.

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.

1. Professional development on the planning and implementation of differentiated instruction and UDL principles will be provided for all staff. Person Responsible: Susan Coggan
2. Exceptional Student Education teachers will meet weekly with content area coaches and classroom teachers to plan accommodation strategies/lessons for students identified with academic achievement gaps. Person Responsible: Susan Coggan
3. Intensive intervention for students with disabilities will be implemented with consistency according to Individualized Education Plans and grade level expectations in all subject areas. Person Responsible: Susan Coggan

Person Responsible

Michelle Cardoso (michelle.cardoso@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

In grades K-2, 45% of students were not on track to score a Level 3 or above according to the iReady EOY Diagnostic results.

1. In Kindergarten, 15% of students were not proficient on the District's iReady EOY diagnostic.
2. In first grade, 60% of students were not proficient on the District's iReady EOY diagnostic.
3. In second grade, 56% of students were not proficient on the District's iReady EOY diagnostic.

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade: Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

Students in grades K - 2 will participate in literacy activities to prepare students to read words and comprehend text.

Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Students in grades K - 2 will participate in literacy activities that allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

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

The proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows according to the "RAISE Schools Identification 2022-2023" document:

1. In 3rd grade, 63% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
2. In 4th grade, 48% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
3. In 5th grade, 61% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

For Grade 3:

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:

* Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

Literacy activities in grade 3 will focus on preparing students to read words and comprehend text.

* Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Literacy activities in grade 3 will focus on allowing students to begin spelling and decoding words.

For Grades 4-5:

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9:

* Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

Literacy activities in grades 4-5 will involve students in thinking analytically and follow increasingly intricate series of events.

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)

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 70% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

By the end of the year, at least 85% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

By the end of the year, at least 60% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

By the end of the year, at least 70% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, at least 55% of tested students in grades 3-5 will achieve a proficient score on the state assessment.

By the end of the year, at least 55% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

By the end of the year, at least 55% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

- 3) By the end of the year, at least 60% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

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.

The Area of Focus supporting RAISE will be monitored using beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through FAST as well as i-Ready. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data from the Standards-based Unit Assessments and data gained from documented MTSS interventions provided to readers at the Tier II and Tier III levels through such programs as iReady, SIPPS, and Heggerty. Biweekly data meetings will occur with teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made for student learning as well as formative checks to verify that students make gains in content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gonzalez, Ana, ana.gonzalez2@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The school will use evidence-based programs such as i-Ready, SIPPS, and Heggerty for instruction and monitoring. The school will align with the District's expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted professional development, and differentiated instruction for students who are identified as needing Tier II and Tier III support. The school will use the District approved streamlined walkthrough tool weekly to monitor instruction and identify trends.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with iReady, Heggerty, and SIPPS meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA subgroups:

-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
-Heggerty (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)
-SIPPS (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, write and recognize words. Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills to read complex multisyllabic words.)
-iReady (Recommendation 4: Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, write and recognize words.)
These evidence-based practices aid in predicting student proficiency and identifying student needs.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will attend PLCs twice per week to go over details of upcoming lessons, plan text-based and benchmark-based questions, and plan for student responses.	
- Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made.	
- Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content.	Cardoso, Michelle, michelle.cardoso@ocps.net
- Assessment - Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and make adjustments to future lessons. EOY and FSA data are being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the groups as changes are being made in the data.	
- Professional Learning - Training in SIPPS, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. standards will be available.	
MTSS process will be solidified as students are properly placed in fluid Tiers based on their needs.	
- Literacy Leadership - The Leadership Team will monitor Functional Basic Skills (FBS) and small group instruction by utilizing classroom walkthroughs.	
- Literacy Coaching - Lessons for small group instruction will be addressed during the PLC process.	Morrison, Lisa, lisa.morrison@ocps.net
- Assessment - Assessment information gathered from FBS and small group instruction will be utilized to make adjustments to the student groups.	
- Professional Learning - Training in the programs for SIPPS and Heggerty will be available to all employees, including support staff (paras, tutors).	

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.

Ventura provides yearly surveys to stakeholders, including staff, students, and parents. The surveys include opportunities for stakeholders to provide input, which is analyzed and considered as efforts are made to improve culture and environment. There will be a focus on creating an environment at Ventura

Elementary where every student feels safe to try their best and is celebrated as they make progress toward goals. Staff and students will take pride in themselves, their school, and their community. Extracurricular activities will include opportunities for students to join Running Club, Drama Club, Dance Club, Chess Club, Art Club, Safety Patrols, Student Senate, A Gift for Music Strings Ensemble collaboration, and Accelerated Reader initiatives. Teacher and Classified of the Month will be celebrated and student celebration activities will be added.

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

The administrative team will set the tone for promoting a positive culture and safe learning environment at the school. Teachers will create a welcoming learning environment for the class family in the classroom. Support Staff will promote positive choices across the campus. Families and the community will encourage students and staff with the continued positive support off-campus.