Zellwood Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

https://zellwoodes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Carol Grimando

Start Date for this Principal: 5/19/2021

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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 (51%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%)
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

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

https://zellwoodes.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	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Grimando, Caroll	Principal	Budget Management, Personnel Hiring, Staff Evaluations, Discipline, Parental Concerns, Data Analysis, Public Relations, Staff Management, Mentoring, Coaching, Facilities Management
Ward, Cecelia	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Support Staff Scheduling, Staff Evaluations, Discipline, Parental Concerns, Coverage for Absences, Title IX, Threat Assessment Team, Summer School Coordinator, Skycap, MAO Liaison, etc.
Cordero, Evelisse	School Counselor	Mental Health Designee, Threat Assessment Team Coordinator, SEDNET Contact, Homeless and Foster Care Contact, Individual and Group Counseling, Child Safety Matters Facilitator, Student Awards/Incentive Coordinator, Counseling Events, etc.
Dickmyer, Jennifer	Staffing Specialist	Exceptional Student Education Coordinator, Individual Education Plan Compliance and Implementation, Section 504 Designee, State Restraint Reporting, Risk Management Contact, Individual Health Care Plans, Exceptional Student Education Data Entry/Accuracy
Dozier, Jamie	Instructional Coach	Professional Development, PLC Support, Deliberate Practice Support, Instructional Rounds, Teacher Induction, Parent Training, Orton-Gillingham Coordinator, Technology Problem Solving, Coaching/Model Lessons, Skyward and Canvas Support, Textbook Coordinator
Reyes, Vicvelyn	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Master Calendar, School Event Manager, Curriculum Coordinator, Good Cause Promotion, Teach In Coordinator, Sky Cap, Testing Coordinator, Data Analysis
Carmenate, Wanda	Teacher, K-12	Interventionist Team Lead, Model/coach lessons, Orton Gillingham Implementation, Data Collection and Analysis
Tennis-Slotsve, Melody	Behavior Specialist	Social Skills Instruction - Groups/Individual, Mentoring Program Coordinator, Crisis Prevention Intervention Lead
Barnard, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Multi-Tiered System of Support Coach/Coordinator, Implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 for Academics/Behaviors, Intervention Resources, Partner in Education Coordinator, Data Analysis, House System Coordinator, OCPS Gives Coordinator, Truancy Monitoring

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 5/19/2021, Carol Grimando

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

444

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.

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	30	77	68	91	52	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	5	26	20	27	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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	12	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/19/2022

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	31	82	112	98	102	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	14	23	35	22	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	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	

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	31	82	112	98	102	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	14	23	35	22	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	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	

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	40%	56%	56%				51%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						58%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						63%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	46%	50%				52%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						42%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						20%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	61%	59%				57%	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	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	63%	-13%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
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	39	47	27	58	71	12				
ELL	23	52	42	35	52	56	26				
BLK	34	63	60	36	67	65	27				
HSP	35	58	45	39	56	59	38				
WHT	56	58		58	68		50				
FRL	28	57	46	34	59	58	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	35	31	20	29	25	12				
ELL	23	36	25	29	41		22				
BLK	40	35		30	33		29				
HSP	35	39	25	33	40	33	30				
WHT	55	44		58	54		63				
FRL	26	34	40	28	34	29	26				

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	19	52	52	23	33	17	15				
ELL	40	57	65	46	38	14	48				
BLK	32	47	50	32	40	17	38				
HSP	47	60	67	51	40	17	51				
WHT	67	57	60	65	45		78				
FRL	41	55	65	45	40	19	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	51
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	42
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

After analyzing the 2022 FSA state assessment results from last year and this year, we see that overall, our students in the upper grade levels continue to perform below proficiency in ELA and Math. However, 3rd and 4th grade improved proficiency by 4% in ELA . In Math, 3rd grade improved proficiency by 25% and 4th grade improved by 6%. A noticeable downward trend was reflected in 5th grade showing that the proficiency decreased in ELA and Math by 10% and 16% respectively.

Despite this, all our subgroups showed a significant improvement. Based on the Percent Point Index by Subgroup, the white students' subgroup went from 55% to 58%. Our black students' subgroup improved from 33% to 50%, and the Hispanic student subgroup went from 34% to 48%. Students with disabilities showed improvement going from 23% to 41%. Free and Reduced Lunch improved from 31% to 45%, and ELL students went from 29% to 42%.

The successes of our subgroups were a result of learning gain improvements in both Reading and Math for all students, as well as those in the bottom quartile. In ELA, the percentage of students making learning gains increased 18% and those in the bottom quartile increased by 9%. In Math, the percentage of students making learning gains increased 17% and those in the bottom quartile increased their learning gains by 18%.

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

Progress monitoring data and 2022 state assessments show that Tier 1 instruction needs to be improved in ELA and Math for all grade levels. Our iReady progress monitoring for the end of the year shows that 47% of students are one or more grade levels below in reading and 49% in math. This need is more prominent in 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade levels for Math and ELA. This same trend is reflected in the 2022 state assessment showing a need for improvement in ELA and Math for the students in the upper grade levels. FSA data shows that 59% of students scored below the proficiency level in Reading and 52% below the proficiency level in Math.

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

Students at Zellwood are behind academically due to several factors, the greatest of which is likely several years of Pandemic-interrupted instruction. Many students were learning virtually, and most of those were not in environments conducive to learning. Additionally, as a result of these circumstances which were beyond our control, students were promoted to the next grade level in the last two years without having the proficiency necessary to be successful. Attendance was affected by the pandemic, as many students had to be quarantined multiple times throughout the school year, which resulted in gaps in their learning.

Zellwood administration is seeing that the intense focus on Early Reading has made a huge difference with our population, resulting in fewer students in the primary grades needing intervention support. We will continue to ensure all staff is trained in Orton-Gillingham and that these strategies are applied for all tier 1 students. We will also strategically use the six Tier 1 interventionists to fill in gaps for students in the upper grades and ensure that intervention is targeted to specific areas of student weakness.

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

Progress Monitoring and 2022 state assessments show that the students in all our subgroups have improved significantly. Based on the Percent Point Index by Subgroup, the white students' subgroup went from 55% to 58%. Our black students' subgroup improved from 33% to 50%, and the Hispanic student subgroup went from 34% to 48%. In the same way, students with disabilities showed improvement going from 23% to 41%. Free and Reduced Lunch improved from 31% to 45%, and ELL students went from 29% to 42%. As mentioned previously, learning gains were impressive, but student proficiency continues to be low.

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

This year, we implemented many strategic moves to improve ELA and Math proficiency in all grade levels. Most notably, Orton Gillingham structures were utilized across grade levels during our ELA block. We used the Orton Gillingham assessments and DIBELS for progress monitoring to identify learning gaps and to inform instruction. We had six Tier 1 interventionists that provided targeted instruction and used the Orton Gillingham structures to target learning gaps. In addition, we organized the Math block to include dedicated Math intervention. To help teachers also improve their teaching strategies, our coaching team provided actionable feedback and modeled lessons. Finally, we had an attendance team that monitored the attendance of each grade level, followed up with parents and students that showed an attendance issue, and conducted Attendance Child Study Team meetings to find solutions to the student attendance issues.
Our six Tier 1 interventionists will continue to provide targeted instructions using the Orton Gillingham structures to close the learning gaps in Reading. We will also continue to monitor students' attendance weekly during the PLC meetings.

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

Tier 1 support will need to be restructured to allow for consistent reading foundational and vocabulary skills to be covered in all classes with all students. These lessons are necessary to close foundational gaps that still exist with intermediate grade students. The Tier 1 interventionists will co-teach with the ELA teachers so that all students will receive the same Orton Gillingham approach to maintain consistency of the Orton Gillingham lessons. For Math, we will implement the use of manipulatives across the grade levels and create strategic Math interventions.

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.

All teachers will be trained in Orton Gillingham structures to become Early Literacy experts. Teachers will participate in Professional Development for vocabulary, Kagan strategies, the new BEST Standards, and effective lesson planning.

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

The school will continue to maintain a partnership with the Reed Foundation and work collaboratively with the Directors of Implementation to expand and increase the teachers' Orton-Gillingham expertise in content and structure implementation in the classroom. Skilled coaches and support staff, with proven track records, have been hired to support professional development, model lessons, support lesson planning, enhance student engagement and increase teacher capacity. Skilled interventionists will support Tier 1 instruction school-wide and also target the most fragile students in each grade level to close learning gaps for these students through small group, targeted remediation and acceleration.

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

:

#1. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Zellwood Elementary has undergone a lot of changes over the past year. A new principal was named in the Summer of 2021 and the Leadership Team has undergone many changes as a result. There is a need to now build capacity among the PLC teams and develop leaders within the teacher ranks.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We would like to identify teacher leaders who will help guide PLC's, model lessons for other teachers, "share the load" with monitoring of outcomes and build their capacity for later growth into leadership positions within the school and district. We will increase the number of teachers scoring "innovating" on their Domain 4 elements related to leadership.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor this area of focus by observing interactions of PLC's, scheduling peer observations of lessons, monitoring the student achievement outcomes and the processes related to MTSS and Truancy management. We will also monitor staff survey data at the mid-year, as well as Domain 4 mid-year data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers with shared collective efficacy will help increase their instructional effectiveness and improve student achievement. A sense of pride and a shared vision, combined with comprehensive training in best practices, will motivate and develop the instructional staff, building their individual capacity while also positively impacting school-wide academic achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers must feel empowered to problem solve and collaborate. They must have "buy-in" for school initiatives in order to fully implement them with fidelity. As evidenced by recent Panorama survey data and additional school survey data, the staff appreciates the strong leadership present in the school and embraces the changes in effect. The time is right to cultivate additional school leaders and empower them to lead their peers.

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.

Identify Teacher Leaders within PLC's to lead the work of PLC's and lead the work of the three Caminos (Pathways). Train these teacher leaders in Leadership best practices that will elicit buy-in and cooperation from peers.

Person Responsible   Jamie Dozier (jaime.dozier@ocps.net)

All teachers will be recruited to join a Caminos Committee that will be selected by them based on interest and expertise. They will be asked to take active roles in the Camino initiatives that are supporting each of the three pathways within the Innovation Plan.

Person Responsible   Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

Leadership Team will identify teacher leaders who have consistently demonstrated the instructional best practices in their classrooms. These teachers will model lessons for peers and these observations will be led and debriefed by the instructional coach.

Person Responsible   Jamie Dozier (jaime.dozier@ocps.net)

Zellwood Elementary was selected to be an Orton-Gillingham Model School through the Reed Foundation. Teachers and Administrators from all over Orange County will be visiting throughout the year to observe ZES teachers implementing OG lessons with their students. By teaching others and modeling OG practices, teachers will be solidifying their expertise in these Foundational Reading best practices and more of them will expand their training to Associates' Level competency.

Person Responsible   Jamie Dozier (jaime.dozier@ocps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Self-Management, Social Awareness and School Climate

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on student Panorama survey data, Zellwood students rated themselves critically and are in the lower percentiles (below 40%) in Self-Management, Social Awareness and School Climate. Additionally, staff members rated the students lower than previous years in school climate. Teachers scored them lower in school enthusiasm, support of peers and collaborative skills.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	As a result of our school improvement efforts in these Life Skills areas, we hope to see a significant improvement in student attitudes related to self-management, social awareness and school climate. We also expect to see a positive correlation to teacher observations of students in related climate questions.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations, analysis of truancy data, analysis of referral data and staff and student surveys.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students who feel connected to school and feel positive about their school experience are less likely to be chronically absent and have a greater likelihood of academic success. Students who can regulate their behavior and manage their responses spend less time out of the classroom for discipline-related issues. Students must be taught how to interact appropriately with others and how to resolve conflict peacefully. They must be aware of the power of their personal choices and reactions to situations. Social skills groups, Life Skills lessons and differentiated behavioral supports will allow for growth in this area of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific	Students have socially regressed as a result of a life-changing pandemic that left them isolated at home, without the socialization and collaboration provided in the school environment. When they were able to attend face-to-face, students were asked to be "socially distant" from peers and from their teacher. This further contributed to social stagnation and stunted the life skills development of our students.

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.

An ESSER-funded Behavior Specialist position has been added to support ESE students in need of behavioral interventions. She will work closely with teachers and students to implement social skills groups, provide supports with classroom interventions and support the MTSS process for students who struggle with compliance and self-management.

Person Responsible   Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

Life Skills lessons that specifically target areas of student weakness (social awareness, problem solving, emotional regulation, etc..)

Person Responsible   Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

Student Life Skills leadership opportunities will be provided, helping to cultivate a supportive climate by the utilization of role models within classes to help set a tone of collegiality, cooperation and community. Additionally, Character Awards will be used as motivational tools so students are recognized and celebrated for their citizenship.

Person Responsible   Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on both the Panorama School Climate Survey and FSA scores, student engagement has been identified as an area of focus. The Panorama Survey asked teachers, "How enthusiastic are the students about being at school?" Only 45% responded favorably, which is down 17% from Spring 2021. When asked, "How supportive are students in their interactions with each other?" only 45% of teachers responded favorably, which is down 24% from last year. Panorama Survey data also indicates that only 55% of students were able to disagree with others without starting an argument, which is down 2% from Spring 2021. In addition, only 52% of students responded favorably to the question, "How often do you compliment others' accomplishments?" This is down 4% from Spring 2021. Interacting with other students is a critical component in helping students process content. It is imperative that we focus on teaching students how to interact positively in order to impact student engagement, and ultimately standards mastery. While our FSA data shows improvement in students making learning gains in both ELA and Math, our percentage of students scoring at a proficient level continues to remain low; 40% in ELA and 43% in Math. In order to increase the number of proficient students, we must increase their engagement with each other and the content.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our Panorama School Climate Survey data will increase to 70% in the areas of student enthusiasm and supportive student interactions. Our students will increase their ability to disagree with others without starting an argument from 55% to 70%. They will increase their frequency of complimenting others' accomplishments from 52% to 70%. Our students will increase proficiency in ELA from 40% to 50% on the Florida Statewide Assessment. Our students will increase proficiency in Math from 43% to 53% on the Florida Statewide Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the effectiveness of student engagement through coaching observations, informal and formal observations, and targeted walkthroughs. Quarterly surveys will be given to teachers and students to monitor the quality of student interactions. Progress monitoring for ELA and Math will be done through common unit assessments, as well as diagnostic assessments throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Professional development on cooperative learning structures and student engagement will occur throughout the year. Leadership Team members will coordinate data analysis with grade level PLCs, Tier 1 interventionists, and members of the school coaching team. Information from the data analysis will be used to provide feedback to teachers and drive instructional practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	This strategy was selected as there is an evident need for improvement in the area of student engagement and student interaction. Ultimately, improving these areas will positively impact 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.

Select staff members to attend the Kagan Summer Academy to become experts on cooperative learning structures. Provide an opportunity for them to collaborate and plan differentiated professional development by grade level. Present this professional development during pre-planning, as well as in PLC's throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

Utilize the Instructional Coach to model cooperative learning structures in classrooms and conduct coaching cycles with teachers who need support in increasing student engagement.

Person Responsible	Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

Create a library of engagement resources, including videos of cooperative learning structures, sentence stems for students to amicably disagree and show appreciation for one another, materials for selecting students and prompting discussion and processing, etc.

Person Responsible	Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

#4. 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.**	Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, 40% of our students scored proficient with 59% making learning gains. Of our students in the lowest 25%, 50% made learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our students will increase proficiency in ELA from 40% to 50% on the Florida Statewide Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Diagnostic data from BOY to MOY to EOY will be used as a progress monitoring tool. Additionally, Unit Summatives will be used for monitoring acquisition of the standards. Orton-Gillingham assessments will be used to monitor phonics acquisition in K-3 and morphology/vocabulary acquisition in grades 4 & 5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Leadership Team members will coordinate data analysis with grade level PLC's, Tier 1 interventionists, and members of the school coaching team. Information from the data analysis will be used to provide actionable feedback and drive instructional practice, including reteaching and reassessment efforts and targeted intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	This strategy was selected as there is an evident need for improvement of Tier 1 standards-based instruction as well as increasing teacher capacity in order to effectively respond to data and make informed instructional decisions that will positively impact 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.

Provide professional development for the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, with support from the State Regional Literacy department and district ELA team, in order to have students reach academic proficiency in ELA.

Person Responsible	Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

The Instructional Coach will help support teachers through modeling lessons/strategies/skills, reviewing data and providing feedback to teachers to improve upon the skills and strategies necessary to drive small group instruction. The coaching cycle will be used with fidelity to identify areas of focus, analyze and collect data, provide actionable feedback and time for reflection. Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized and data analysis will help monitor the effectiveness of the instructional practice.

Person Responsible	Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

We will serve as an Orton-Gillingham Model School with 100% of instructional staff members receiving comprehensive training in how to teach foundational reading skills using the Orton-Gillingham multisensory approach. As a model school, teachers will receive materials, training and coaching from the

REED Charitable Foundation's Directors of Implementation in order to strengthen teaching practices and student outcomes. Tier I interventionists will provide whole-group mini-lessons in grades 2-5 for consistent phonics and morphology content.

Person Responsible   Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the Math FSA, only 43% our our students scored at a proficient level, with 61% making learning gains.Of the students in the bottom 25%, 63% made learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our students will increase proficiency in Math from 43% to 53% on the Florida Statewide Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Diagnostic assessment data from the BOY, MOY and EOY will be utilized to progress monitor math performance. Unit summative assessments will also be used to measure progress toward acquisition of grade level standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Leadership Team members will coordinate data analysis with grade level PLC's, Tier 1 interventionists, and members of the school coaching team. Information from the data analysis will be used to provide actionable feedback and drive instructional practice, including reteaching and reassessment efforts and targeted intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	This strategy was selected as there is an evident need for improvement of Tier 1 standards-based instruction. There is also a need to increase teacher capacity in order to effectively respond to data and make informed instructional decisions that will positively impact student achievement. With the addition of mandatory Math intervention into the master schedule, there will be a need to ensure this is happening daily, with fidelity and that teachers are intentionally planning for this time. We must also ensure that all Math teachers are effectively making use of manipulatives to ensure Math concepts are comprehensible and students can successfully problem solve.

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 addition of a Tier I Math Interventionist and the creation of a B.E.S.T. Math Problem Solvers Team will allow for a "train the trainer" model of professional development. Through PLC's and school-wide PD, teachers will be trained on the components of the B.E.S.T. Standards, how to utilize the B1G-M instructional resource to plan for and deliver standards-aligned mathematics instruction, and best

practices for the utilization of the newly adopted textbook and manipulatives to support daily mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible   Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

The Instructional Coach will conduct coaching cycles, as well as model and co-teach math lessons to introduce teachers to effective instructional strategies to implement during their math block. The coach will assist the teachers with data analysis in order to make instructional adjustments and plan for differentiated Math interventions.

Person Responsible   Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

To increase proficiency in mathematical fact fluency and accuracy in computation, we will implement school-wide weekly Math Challenges. These challenges will be differentiated by grade level and determined by areas of need based on data. In grades 3-5, students will be challenged to learn their multiplication and division facts during lunch.

Person Responsible   Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@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

Based on the 2022 iReady EOY data, 62% of our students scored at a proficient level, which leaves 38% of students in grades K-2 performing below level.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, 40% of our students scored at a proficient level, which leaves 60% of students in grades 3-5 scoring below Level 3.

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)

Our K-2 students will increase proficiency in ELA from 62% to 72% on the Florida Statewide Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our 3-5 students will increase proficiency in ELA from 40% to 50% on the Florida Statewide Assessment.

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.

Diagnostic data from BOY to MOY to EOY will be used as a progress monitoring tool. Additionally, Unit Summatives will be used for monitoring acquisition of the standards. Orton-Gillingham assessments will be used to monitor phonics acquisition in K-3 and morphology/vocabulary acquisition in grades 4 & 5.

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

Grimando, Caroll, caroll.grimando@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?

Leadership Team members will coordinate data analysis with grade level PLC's, Tier 1 interventionists, and members of the school coaching team. Information from the data analysis will be used to provide actionable

feedback and drive instructional practice, including reteaching and reassessment efforts and targeted intervention.

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?

These strategies were selected as there is an evident need for improvement of Tier 1 standards-based instruction as well as increasing teacher capacity in order to effectively respond to data and make informed instructional decisions that will positively impact student achievement.

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
Provide professional development for the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, with support from the State Regional Literacy department and district ELA team, in order to have students reach academic proficiency in ELA.	Dozier, Jamie, jaime.dozier@ocps.net
The Instructional Coach will help support teachers through modeling lessons/strategies/skills, reviewing data and providing feedback to teachers to improve upon the skills and strategies necessary to drive small group instruction. The coaching cycle will be used with fidelity to identify areas of focus, analyze and collect data, provide actionable feedback and time for reflection. Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized and data analysis will help monitor the effectiveness of the instructional practice.	Dozier, Jamie, jaime.dozier@ocps.net
Serve as an Orton-Gillingham Model School with 100% of instructional staff members receiving comprehensive training in how to teach foundational reading skills using the Orton-Gillingham multisensory approach. As a model school, teachers will receive materials, training and coaching from the REED Charitable Foundation's Directors of Implementation in order to strengthen teaching practices and student outcomes. Tier I interventionists will provide whole-group mini-lessons in grades 2-5 for consistent phonics and morphology content.	Grimando, Caroll, caroll.grimando@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.

Zellwood addresses building a positive school environment by engaging all stakeholders, building pride in our school, and promoting a culture of compassion, caring and respect. We believe that a students' social and emotional growth are as important as their academic growth. Life Skills lessons are part of our work each week and "teachable moments" within each day are utilized to help students learn to engage respectfully with others, resolve conflict and understand varying perspectives. We believe teaching, promoting and rewarding positive character traits helps instill in children a sense of citizenship and community and that is necessary to cultivate positive, contributing members of society. Staff members working collaboratively, displaying positive attitudes and respect toward others serve as models for students each day. Our goal is to create a warm and welcoming community that feels like "family" for each student, parent and staff member.

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

Our most important stakeholders are our students. They are our "why". Their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment is to put forth their best effort each day and treat all members of the community with respect. We also expect them to support others and contribute to our community by being inclusive, compassionate and kind.

Parents are an important stakeholder because they will serve as educational partners and their influence and support is critical to student success. Actively partnering with teachers, holding students accountable, showing support for the school through actions and words creates an expectation for their children and holds them to high standards.

Staff members are critical stakeholders as they set the tone within the building for the students and parents. From the administration, to the teachers, to the paraprofessionals, to the office staff, to the custodial and cafeteria team, every staff member plays a crucial role in cultivating an environment of respect, teamwork, collegiality and understanding. Staff must ensure that families feel welcome and valued, and this comes from communicating with families in their native language, keeping them informed each week about school events, inviting them to family-friendly activities, engaging them in supporting their child's academic efforts and making them feel welcome and valued each time they step on campus.

Finally, our community members are stakeholders. The small community of Zellwood and the neighborhoods surrounding ZES are supportive and take pride in the school. The churches and businesses that support our school will continue to thrive if our students and families thrive. They play a role by helping us to serve those in need of help, providing resources and support when called upon.

All stakeholders work together to create ZES, a source of pride within the Zellwood Community.