
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Azalea Park Elementary

1 CAROL AVE, Orlando, FL 32807

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

Demographics

Principal: Brad Rosa

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Azalea Park Elementary

1 CAROL AVE, Orlando, FL 32807

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

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Verano, Karen	Principal	Responsible for all school operations, decision making, and areas of instruction
Rosa, Brad	Assistant Principal	Responsible for supporting all school operations, decision making, and areas of instruction.
Rublaitus, Kimberly	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Coach, testing coordinator, 3rd support teacher, weekly coaching observations.
Pressly, Amber	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist, works with MTSS coach to serve and support struggling students.
Fangue, Ashlyn	Instructional Coach	Instructional focus, coaching cycles, PLC support, instructional leader.
Paul, Yvesmahri	School Counselor	Member of threat assessment team, supports student and family needs, health initiative, counsel students in groups and individually.
Cintron, Marybelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Compliance, MTSS Coach, coaching cycles, PLC support, instructional leader.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/6/2021, Brad Rosa

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

4

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

3

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	70	73	74	55	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	10	28	22	31	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	11	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/11/2022

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	24	61	69	65	74	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	5	26	21	14	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	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	24	61	69	65	74	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	5	26	21	14	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	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	54%	56%	56%				43%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						42%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						33%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	58%	46%	50%				56%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						53%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						41%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	61%	59%				43%	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	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	57%	-20%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	63%	-15%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
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	11	50	57	11	56	58	14				
ELL	44	70	52	51	77	70	44				
BLK	50			50	80						
HSP	54	71	57	58	73	64	49				
WHT	45	40		55	70		50				
FRL	52	66	48	56	74	62	47				
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	5	6	8	12	13	18	7				
ELL	44	42		43	28		26				
BLK	40			30							
HSP	49	39		51	38		42				
WHT	56			61							
FRL	48	39	9	50	40		41				
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	10	17	25	26	25	7				
ELL	32	40	26	44	51	43	45				
BLK	21			43							
HSP	44	46	32	56	57	45	48				
WHT	48	27		58	45						
FRL	41	40	29	54	56	48	41				

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	58
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	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	58
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	52
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	56
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?

Azalea Park experienced many positive trends from the 2021-2022 school year. Overall our school increased 26 percentage points. This growth brought our school from a school grade of D to a high B. Our increases were seen across every category and five out of the six subgroups. One specific positive trend across grade levels was our overall proficiency in both ELA (+11) and Math(+2). This placed our scores higher than pre-pandemic scores of 2019. Another positive trend our school had was our learning gains in the bottom percentile of students in both ELA and Math. Our lowest quartile ELA scores increased 45% points from 7% to 52%. Our Math lowest quartile scores increased 53% points from 14% to 67%.

Another positive trend is our ESSA categories. In the 2020-2021 school year we were below the state required 41% in 5 different categories (Black, Students With Disabilities (SWD) , ELL, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged(ED)). For the 2021-2022 school year we scored above the 41% in all categories but SWD. While our SWD category did not meet the required percentage, we did increase 21% (15 to 36).

Based off the actions we implemented last year our Multi-Tiered System of Support and careful scheduling allowed us to close the gap with our students. Our ESSA category for SWD went from 15% to 36%. With the growth that we experienced, a new action isn't needed. Instead we will continue the plan and further solidify our actions and expectations to continue the growth we experienced.

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

The 2021-2022 school based data shows that our greatest need for improvement is with our students with disabilities. They are performing behind all other subgroups in both ELA and Math proficiency. 11% of our students with disabilities performing at proficiency level. In mathematics, our students with disabilities scores showed that 18% met the requirement for proficiency. This is an area that we need to focus on in order to continue to close our achievement gap.

The students labeled as SWD have been placed in this program due to low proficiency in Reading/Math

or behavior. Azalea Park has two Emotional Behavior Disorder classrooms that support students from other schools. Of these students with intensive behavioral needs 1 out of 6 was proficient in reading, and 0 out of 5 in math. Although the team works to use techniques and smaller teacher student ratios to close these gaps, the learning gap over time is far from proficiency.

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

Some contributing factors that cause this need for improvement in our students with disabilities are about half of our students with disabilities are also deficient in the acquisition of the English language. With the lack of language acquisition and a diagnosed learning disability, our students are beginning behind their peers and needing support. Another factor for our students with disabilities are about 82% (45/55) are Economically Disadvantaged.

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

The data components that showed the most progress based off progress monitoring and the 2022 state assessments was our learning gains in the bottom quartile for both ELA and Math. Our bottom quartile in ELA showed a 45% gain, while our bottom quartile in math showed a 53% percentile increase.

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

Contributing factors to our improvement in the areas above are due to the implementation of our data tracking system and a focus on our intervention blocks. During the 2021-2022 school year we emphasized the importance of tracking student data. We created a data warehouse which we routinely used to have conversations about our students and make adjustments based on the data we saw. Additionally, we purposefully used our data to identify student needs and worked on our intervention blocks. In ELA, we implemented walk to reading, this program identified specific reading skills that students were lacking and targeted them to close the reading deficiency gap. In math, our focus was on the new intervention block. Utilizing the state defined time to target deficiencies in math instruction and fill academic gaps in students allowed us to increase basic math skills and allow students to apply them towards more complex mathematical standards.

The additional support of six extra ESSER funded positions have been extremely helpful towards the academic progress of our students. These positions were utilized to support classroom instruction and provide targeted instruction and smaller groups to impact students acquisition of foundational skills.

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

The strategies needed to accelerate learning is going to be supporting our teachers with the specific instructional practices that promote student learning. The instructional focus this year is going to be on processing and monitoring. We believe that these two instructional strategies will create a classroom environment centered around student learning, resulting in greater overall proficiency.

An increased focus on student's social emotional learning through our newly implemented Caring Schools Community program will allow our teachers to better impact students needs that directly impact student performance. The implementation of this program will cause a reduction in behaviors resulting in more time spent in class. Additionally, the continued implementation of small group instruction with a focus on strong progress monitoring, and scheduling SWD outside of the FBS block will be implemented to accelerate learning.

Additionally, strategies for our school to focus on will be teacher monitoring and foundational reading

skills. We have provided our teachers with trainings in Orton Gillingham/multisensory for foundational reading skills, implementation of Early Bird Diagnostic for early detection of possible dyslexia and actions to take to support.

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.

As we enter the 2022-2023 school year our focus will be directly connected to students achievement. Our professional development will be ongoing throughout the entire school year focused on the following areas:

- Social Emotional Learning and Leadership
- Continued MTSS Implementation
- Data Driven Decisions for Students
- Professional Learning Communities
- Coaching Cycles based on walkthrough data
- Implementation of Azalea Behavioral Approach
- Caring Schools Community
- B.E.S.T standards grades K-5 (ELA and Math)
- Orton Gillingham training to support foundational reading skills
- Early Bird Diagnostic - Early detection for dyslexia
- Multisensory approach to reading
- Professional Development on student processing and teacher monitoring

These trainings will continue to be modeled and embedded in our daily routines that impact students and support teachers.

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

As we ensure sustainability of improvement for next year and beyond, our school will continue implementing the SIPPS curriculum during our FBS block, and having a school wide Oral Reading fluency tracking for clear and direct data for MTSS, and a focus to include parents in the decision making progress.

Azalea Park also continued to receive funding to have six ESSER grant funded positions, these added resource positions are utilized to provide additional instruction and to meet individual needs.

We will also continue implementing an individual student data tracking tool in order to diagnose difficulties in both academics and behavior.

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.

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, an area of focus for 2022-2023 will be ELA proficiency. Although ELA proficiency increased, with the addition of new ELA standards for the 2022-2023 school year, an instructional focus needs to be directed on ELA achievement, Teaching new benchmarks with a new progress monitoring system and new curriculum will be a challenge.

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

As the Florida Department of Education has released a new assessment for students (F.A.S.T.), we would like to see 58% of our students above the proficiency level in grades 3-5 on the ELA portion of the assessment.

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

By using the iReady diagnostic we will compare the beginning of the year diagnostic to the middle of the year diagnostic. Additionally, we will monitor our students through common assessments, and discuss their progress during school-based data meetings. Our end determination of achievement will be based on the state F.A.S.T. assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)

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

- 1.) Increase our systematic approach to providing differentiated instruction through the ELA block.
- 2.) Accelerate student performance.
- 3.) Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports in foundational reading skills.
- 4.) Build our culture of collaboration between professional (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success.

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

Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success. Teachers select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students' performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness, and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Some supports are planned prior to lessons, and some are provided responsively during instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

The leadership team will collaborate with teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff weekly to impact students' learning toward measurable outcomes. The leadership team will collaborate with individual teachers and PLC teams using a variety of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning. The continued use of our ESSER positions for push-in support will increase our overall effort to support students academic needs.

Person Responsible Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)

The leadership team will continue to work with individual teachers who need support. Through the coaching cycle we will increase teacher capacity in small group differentiated instruction to impact student learning, and ensure we are meeting the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Ashlyn Fanguie (ashlyn.fanguie@ocps.net)

Further embed our MTSS program that focuses on student needs.

Person Responsible Marybelle Cintron (marybelle.cintron@ocps.net)

Through the implementation of our schoolwide program (Caring School Community), we plan on directly impacting the culture of our school where our students have a greater sense of belonging. Creating a school community where students understand the importance of learning, and the relationships they build will directly impact their learning.

Person Responsible Yvesmahri Paul (yvesmahri.paul@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.

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, an area of focus for 2022-2023 will be Math proficiency. Although Math proficiency increased, with the addition of new Math standards for the 2022-2023 school year, an instructional focus needs to be directed on Math achievement. Teaching new benchmarks with a new progress monitoring system and new curriculum will be a challenge.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As the Florida Department of Education has released a new assessment for students (F.A.S.T.), we would like to see 60% of our students above the proficiency level in grades 3-5 on the math assessment.

Monitoring:

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

By using the iReady diagnostic we will compare the beginning of the year diagnostic to the middle of the year diagnostic. Additionally, we will monitor our students through common assessments, and discuss their progress during school based data meetings. Our end determination of achievement will be based on the state F.A.S.T. assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Verano (karen.verano@ocps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

The evidence based strategy will be learning the new benchmarks and developing lessons that support students. We will continue with additional individualized support with Math FBS. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of this learning through data analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rationale for selecting learning about the new benchmarks as a needed strategy is to ensure our teachers fully teach the benchmarks. To include concrete instruction with differentiation, we need to ensure student learning is not impacted.

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 ongoing professional development, and lesson alignment through professional learning communities.

Person Responsible

Ashlyn Fangue (ashlyn.fangue@ocps.net)

Use multiple progress monitoring assessments to include classroom observation to develop ongoing needs.

Person Responsible

Marybelle Cintron (marybelle.cintron@ocps.net)

Implement math intervention focused around student need, and track progress of students with both formal and informal monitoring tools.

Person Responsible Ashlyn Fangué (ashlyn.fangué@ocps.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In our grades K-2, our instructional practice related to ELA will be our students learning on basic phonics and building their overall reading fluency.

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

In our grades 3-5, and based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, an Instructional Practice relating to ELA for 2022-2023 will be overall reading proficiency. Although our ELA proficiency increased, with the addition of new ELA standards for the 2022-2023 school year, an instructional focus needs to be directed on ELA achievement, Teaching new benchmarks with a new progress monitoring system and new curriculum will be a challenge.

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)

For grades K and 1 we will have iReady progression in phonics as our measurable outcome. We would like to see our first graders test out of phonics by the EOY iReady diagnostic. For our 2nd grade students we will measure their fluency using DIBELS reading passages. The goal is for 70% of our students to be reading at least 70-110 words per minute.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

As the Florida Department of Education has released a new assessment for students (F.A.S.T.), we would like to see 58% of our students above the proficiency level in grades 3-5 on the ELA portion of the 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.

By using the iReady diagnostic we will compare the beginning of the year diagnostic to the middle of the year diagnostic. Additionally, we will monitor our students through common assessments, and discuss their progress during school-based data meetings. Our end determination of achievement will be based on the state F.A.S.T. assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fangue, Ashlyn, ashlyn.fangue@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?

As a focus on our goals, we will be implementing the following evidence-based practice strategies:

- Increase our systematic approach to providing differentiated instruction through the ELA block.
- Accelerate student performance.
- Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports in foundational reading skills.
- Build our culture of collaboration between professional (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success.

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?

Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success. Teachers select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students’ performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness, and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Some supports are planned prior to lessons, and some are provided responsively during instruction.

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
<p>The leadership team will collaborate with teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff weekly to impact students’ learning toward measurable outcomes. The leadership team will collaborate with individual teachers and PLC teams using a variety of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning. The continued use of our ESSER positions for push-in support will increase our overall effort to support students academic needs.</p>	<p>Rosa, Brad, brad.rosa@ocps.net</p>
<p>Continued implementation of our MTSS program that identifies students and places them in an intervention to support the deficit of skills.</p>	<p>Cintron, Marybelle, marybelle.cintron@ocps.net</p>
<p>Implementation of Early Bird Reading program that is an early indicator of dyslexia.</p>	<p>Fangue, Ashlyn, ashlyn.fangue@ocps.net</p>
<p>Staff development for 11 teachers on Orton Gillingham training. This training will support our teachers and students in phonemic awareness and phonics instruction to build the foundation for reading in emerging readers.</p>	<p>Verano, Karen, karen.verano@ocps.net</p>

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.

Azalea Park Elementary school continues to build a positive school culture and environment through a variety of ways. Administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, custodians, cafeteria staff, front office staff, extended day staff, and families will work together to create a positive school culture.

Azalea Park Elementary staff will engage in ongoing professional development, Caring Schools, focused on social and emotional learning that will strengthen how teams of teachers and staff work together and collaborate to build academic expertise for all students. The Caring Schools uses the CASEL Core Competencies as the foundation and common language to support a positive school culture. This social and emotional learning will connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student learning and success. Additionally, our school will implement a quarterly review of expectations, positive office referral program, and the implementation of our schoolwide P.R.I.D.E. motto to set clear school expectations. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

Meanwhile, it is critical that school leadership, teachers and staff model an openness to develop, and persist with a growth-mindset, communicate clearly, listen well, and seek and offer help when needed. This will lead us to reach the school's vision, mission and goals.

Clearly, the aspects of social-emotional learning are reflective of our core values: every student can learn and succeed with the support and engagement of families and the community.

- 1.) Providing families with timely and accurate information about the well-being, behavior and academic performance of their child is essential to higher student achievement and continued behavioral success.
- 2.) Involving parents and community members in the decision-making process about the use of funds, planned activities, and services is essential to positively impact the personal growth and academic success of the children we serve.
- 3.) Parent meetings, SAC meetings and a variety of workshops will be scheduled to support parents with social and emotional learning strategies and provide academic resources to develop and sustain a positive learning environment at home.
- 4.) Building the capacity of all school staff with various professional development activities will be provided

to educate teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, administrators and other school staff to be fully equipped to support parents and families, and efficiently meet the needs of at-risk children in our school community.

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

Leadership Team - The leadership team's role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school is to monitor and support teachers with the skills needed to develop a classroom that promotes an environment that is conducive to positivity and learning.

Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) - The PEL's responsibilities are to encourage a positive parent/family involvement in all school activities. This supports our philosophy that involvement is essential to all student academic achievement and behavioral successes.

Guidance Counselor - The Guidance Counselor's role is to ensure students emotional needs are being met. Their guidance through difficult situations both personal and emotional are discussed and guided in the best way to support them in order to be successful academically.

Teachers - The teachers role is to imbue the SEL Competencies in all aspects of the day. These competencies will promote a school and classroom that allows students to feel safe, and grow academically every day.

Parents - The parents' role is to attend meetings organized by the PEL in order to be informed and support their students to grow to their maximum potential both socially and academically. Through the message from the school and the parents support Azalea Park can continue to grow and create a pathway to success for our students.