

Orange County Public Schools

Eccleston Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Eccleston Elementary

1500 AARON AVE, Orlando, FL 32811

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

Demographics

Principal: Angela Feliciano

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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 Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Eccleston Elementary

1500 AARON AVE, Orlando, FL 32811

<https://ecclestons.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 KG-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 | 96% |

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Feliciano, Angela | Principal | Mrs. Feliciano provides the vision for the school to ensure high academic achievement is attained for all students. She implements and evaluates programs within the school to ensure that the achievement gap is closing among subgroups. As an administrator, she performs classroom observations to manage and support alignment for student learning. Additionally, actionable feedback is provided to the teachers for improvement of instruction. She holds weekly Professional Learning Community meetings at each grade levels with the instructional team members and the support coaches to discuss standards-based instruction, Tier I and Tier II interventions along with enrichment lessons for students who are working above grade level. All discussions are focused toward increasing student achievement through fostering a growth mindset. Mrs. Feliciano coordinates the operation and management of all school functions, community relations, and school budget in compliance with district policies. She also participates in the School Advisory Council (SAC). |
| Harris, Willam | Assistant Principal | Mr. Harris is responsible for assisting the principal with carrying out the school's vision and mission. His role as an instructional leader includes the collection and analysis of data and supervisory support of all grade levels with an intense focus on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grades. He assists with facilitating common planning and data meetings. He conducts classroom observations and provides feedback and support to teachers on instructional practices and classroom interventions. Mr. Harris also coordinates the community engagement of the school through the Community Partnership School initiative. |
| Miskovsky, Melissa | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Miskovsky supports school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as an instructional coach, and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. Mrs. Miskovsky conducts curriculum materials inventory, assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices, and monitors the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. She oversees and monitors Tier One, assessments and student data. She facilitates Science Professional Learning Communities and coordinates the Science PMA diagnostic assessment schedules. |
| Wichhart, Lynda | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Wichhart will provide on-going professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers in ELA, Math and classroom management through the coaching cycle as it pertains to instruction in grades two through four. |
| Walker, Kimberly | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Walker will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers in ELA, Math and classroom |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | management through the coaching cycle as it pertains to instruction in grades K, 1st and 5th. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/25/2021, Angela Feliciano

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.*

1

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

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

367

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

8

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 | 20 | 62 | 59 | 63 | 60 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 25 | 28 | 22 | 20 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 94 | 82 | 78 | 80 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 419 |

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 | 7 | 24 | 38 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/29/2022

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 | 15 | 63 | 68 | 104 | 42 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 34 | 41 | 43 | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 21 | 29 | 32 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 15 | 63 | 68 | 104 | 42 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 34 | 41 | 43 | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 21 | 29 | 32 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 31% | 56% | 56% | | | | 32% | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | | | | | | 43% | 58% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | | | | | | 53% | 52% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 32% | 46% | 50% | | | | 39% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 70% | | | | | | 37% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | | | | | | 45% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 37% | 61% | 59% | | | | 36% | 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 | 31% | 55% | -24% | 58% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 57% | -25% | 58% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 33% | 54% | -21% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |

| 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 | 50% | 62% | -12% | 62% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 63% | -35% | 64% | -36% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -50% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 57% | -26% | 60% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -28% | | | | |

| 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 | 47 | 40 | 7 | 56 | | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 53 | 38 | 30 | 69 | 59 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 67 | | 38 | 67 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 52 | 38 | 32 | 69 | 56 | 41 | | | | |

| 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 | 4 | | | 5 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | | | 31 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 33 | 19 | 22 | 26 | 18 | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | 41 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 34 | 30 | 23 | 32 | 30 | 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 | 6 | 18 | 20 | 6 | 9 | 20 | | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 60 | | 33 | 67 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 43 | 55 | 39 | 36 | 43 | 34 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 53 | | 42 | 60 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 41 | 48 | 34 | 31 | 40 | 31 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 31 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 355 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| 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?

According to FSA, Eccleston is 9% below state average of 51% for ELA. Eccleston is 26% below state average of 57% in Math. However the school grade score rose from 29% (F) to a 46% (C). We were one of 18 schools out of 202 schools to increase two letter grades. Third grade math scores doubled from the previous year. Fourth grade students had a twenty-point percentage learning gain from 12 to 32 percent proficient in math. Fourth grade ELA increased proficiency by 17 percentage points. Fifth grade Math proficiency and learning gains each increased by 12%.

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

Eccleston's greatest need of improvement is in Math. We are currently at 26% proficiency and our state average is 57%. We need to focus on increasing the achievement of our ELL and ESE populations.

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

According to the i-Ready 2021-22 beginning-of-year Reading Diagnostic, 18% of students in grades 3-5 were on or above grade level in Reading. i-Ready Reading Diagnostic data also indicates 53% of students in grades 3-5 are performing 2 or more years below grade level. This indicates a significant learning gap in 53% of our students in grades 3-5. Additionally, Eccleston continues to struggle with high tardy and absence rates school-wide. Eccleston also had a difficult time fully staffing the school, including leadership instructional coach positions. To address this need, Eccleston will need to fully staff our school and continue to provide professional development on scaffolds and supports, specifically with ESE and ELL students.

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

Overall, learning gains showed the most improvement. Eccleston showed a 5% increase in ELA Learning

Gains. In fourth grade their was a 17% increase in learning gains. Eccleston showed a 20% increase in Math Learning Gains. In both third and fifth grades, their was a 12-point gain. A 5% gain was achieved in fourth grade.

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

In the 2021-22 school year, Eccleston implemented a walk-to intervention model in both reading and math. In reading, students were ability-grouped, and their deficiency was targeted using the SIPPS research-based program in a small group setting for 60 minutes, 5 days per week. In math, students were ability-grouped, and specific standards/skills were targeted daily for 30 minutes during math intervention time. Certified co-teachers we used to support additional small group and individualized instruction for both reading and math. Instructional staff collected data for the MTSS process and to progress monitor student growth. Adjustments were made based on data.

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

In order to accelerate learning, an intense focus on targeted student achievement will happen throughout the school year through the walk-to intervention models in reading and math.

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.

The following professional development will be provided in order to accelerate learning:

Student-Centered Processing

Monitoring Techniques

ESE/ESOL strategies

Foundations of Reading

Gradual Release Model of Instruction

SEL

MTSS

Research-based reading and math intervention programs

Kagan Strategies

Small group instruction

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

Eccleston will use the acceleration model of instruction during after-school learning opportunities and small group instruction.

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.

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 69% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention, which will support an increase in ELA proficiency by 5% in the 3-5 grade population and by 1.5% in English Language Learner population and our ESE population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2023 ELA FAST will show an increase in achievement for students in grades 3-5 of at least 5 percentage points from 31% to 36% as measured by the third assessment of the year. Since 8.3% of the the school population is ESE and 8.7 % are English Language Learners our goal is that these subgroups will increase by 1.5% in the area of proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment
SIPPS Mastery Assessments
Classroom Walkthroughs
District Standards-based Unit Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in intermediate grades to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The strategy above was selected because there is strong evidence to support the fact that teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers. In addition our ESSA sub group data reflects the need to increase proficiency in all areas and most importantly or ESE subgroup.

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.

72% of the school population is African American in addition 8.7% with limited English proficiency, 8.3% of students have learning disabilities and all who are performing below grade level. The school will implement instructional frameworks for all tiers of instruction to ensure teachers are meeting the needs of all learners and aligning instruction to the depth of the standards.

Person Responsible

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Students will be diagnosed for interventions and progress monitored throughout the year to ensure interventions are strategic and meet the needs of all students. ESSR sub group data will be monitored to ensure students within each group are academically growing and moving toward proficiency.

Person Responsible

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Standard-based unit assessments will be administered after each unit of instruction to progress monitor student proficiency of the standards. Teachers will strategically remediate and reteach based on data.

Person Responsible Lynda Wichhart (lynda.wichhart@ocps.net)

Customized professional development will be provided to teachers throughout the school year to build their capacity and understanding of the new B.E.S.T standards.

Person Responsible Kimberly Walker (kimberly.walker@ocps.net)

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

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

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 74% of students scored below a level 3 in math. We will target math foundational skills in math intervention, which will support an increase in math proficiency by 5%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2023 Math FAST will show an increase in achievement for students in grades 3-5 of at least 5% percentage points from 32% to 37% as measured by the third assessment of the year.

Monitoring:

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

Symphony Math
Classroom Walkthroughs
District Standards-based Unit Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teach students in our lowest 25% to count, compare and understand place value. Additionally we will focus on a strong understanding of mathematical operations and problem solving.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Mathematics provides an effective way of building mental discipline and encourages logical reasoning and mental rigor. In addition, mathematical knowledge plays a crucial role in understanding the contents of other school subjects such as science, social studies, and even music and art.

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 school will implement instructional frameworks for all tiers of instruction to ensure teachers are meeting the needs of all learners and aligning instruction to the depth of the standards.

Person Responsible

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Standard-based unit assessments will be administered after each unit of instruction to progress monitor student proficiency of the standards. Teachers will strategically remediate and reteach based on data.

Person Responsible

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Customized professional development will be provided to teachers throughout the school year to build their capacity and understanding of the new B.E.S.T standards.

Person Responsible

Melissa Miskovsky (melissa.miskovsky@ocps.net)

The school will implement instructional frameworks for all tiers of instruction to ensure teachers are meeting the needs of all learners and aligning instruction to the depth of the standards.

Person Responsible

Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Standard-based unit assessments will be administered after each unit of instruction to progress monitor student proficiency of the standards. Teachers will strategically remediate and reteach based on data.

Person Responsible Angela Feliciano (angela.feliciano@ocps.net)

Customized professional development will be provided to teachers throughout the school year to build their capacity and understanding of the new B.E.S.T standards.

Person Responsible Melissa Miskovsky (melissa.miskovsky@ocps.net)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one
identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for 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.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for 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.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

The instructional practice for ELA include 60 minutes of reading intervention using SIPPS, Reading Plus and Haggerty. During the ELA block teachers use the CRM and Wonders curriculum to teach current grade level B.E.S.T standards. In addition, teachers differentiate instruction in reading during small group with the support of Tier1 teachers who push in and pull out based on current data.

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

The instructional practice for ELA include 60 minutes of reading intervention using SIPPS, Reading Plus and Haggerty. During the ELA block teachers use the CRM and Wonders curriculum to teach current grade level B.E.S.T standards. In addition, teachers differentiate instruction in reading during small group with the support of Tier1 teachers who push in and pull out based on current data.

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 goal is that the students gain at least one year's worth of growth as measured on the i-Ready EOY reading diagnostic.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is that the students gain at least one year's worth of growth as measured on the i-Ready EOY reading diagnostic.

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 i-Ready, SIPPS, and FAST assessment data will be used as ongoing monitoring of student progress to ensure students are making adequate gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Feliciano, Angela, angela.feliciano@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?

1. Deliberate, research-informed efforts to foster literacy motivation and engagement within and across lessons.
2. Small group and individual instruction, using a variety of grouping strategies, most often with flexible groups formed and instruction targeted to children's observed and assessed needs in specific aspects of literacy development.
3. Activities that build phonological awareness.
4. Explicit instruction in letter-sound relationships.
5. Intentional and ambitious efforts to build vocabulary and content knowledge.
6. Abundant reading material and reading opportunities in the classroom.
7. Collaboration with families in promoting literacy.
8. Intentional, research-informed instruction using increasingly complex texts and tasks that build comprehension, knowledge, and strategic reading activity.
9. Activities that build reading fluency and stamina with increasingly complex text.
10. Discussion of the ideas in texts and how to construct text meaning across texts and disciplines.
11. Standards aligned writing instruction.
12. Intentional and ambitious efforts to build vocabulary and content knowledge.

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 are evidence based practices that have proven positive and measurable results in students growth in reading.

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 |
|--|---|
| Progress monitoring assessments will be given multiple times throughout the year. | Miskovsky, Melissa, melissa.miskovsky@ocps.net |
| Literacy Coaching: Weekly Grade Level PLCs Monthly Data Meetings Weekly Classroom Walkthroughs and Coaching | Walker, Kimberly, kimberly.walker@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.

The school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of discipline data with a School-wide Plan for Expectations. We will keep parents informed of student responsibility via dojo, newsletters, and phone/all calls. The importance of teaching and re-teaching the expectations will remain ongoing throughout the school year, with character education, classroom and campus individualized lessons, small group social skills training, quarterly review of the Code of Student. Conduct and social emotional reminders and tips on morning announcements.

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

The following stakeholders will assist in promoting a positive culture and environment of the school:

1. Faculty and staff will set and clearly define behavior expectations, and also explicitly teach and model those expectations.
2. Families will support and reinforce the Code of Conduct and Behavior expectations laid out for their child. Families can communicate with staff via Dojo, e-mail, or phone to keep students on the right

path.

3. Students will follow schoolwide expectations and the Code of Conduct consistently.