

Orange County Public Schools

Forsyth Woods Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

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

Forsyth Woods Elementary

6651 CURTIS ST, Orlando, FL 32807

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Maldonado

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%)
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

Forsyth Woods Elementary

6651 CURTIS ST, Orlando, FL 32807

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

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

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
Maldonado, Kelly	Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the principal are to ensure all areas of the school improvement plan are implemented with fidelity. In addition, the principal is responsible for ensuring the budget and funding resources are appropriately allocated to support the areas of focus and action plan items.
Clemente, Luriela	Assistant Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal include supporting the principal to ensure that all areas of the School Improvement Plan are implemented on a timely manner. In addition, the assistant principal ensures that the right progress monitoring tools are in place and functioning so teachers have the information needed to drive instruction and impact student achievement.
Zagarella, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The job duties and responsibilities of the Curriculum Resource Teacher include supporting teachers and classroom instruction by providing resources and information about the new B.E.S.T. Standards for Reading and Math, the guidance necessary to implement testing, and supporting the implementation of quality Math instruction.
Hartley, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	The job duties and responsibilities of the Instructional Coach is to support the SIP action plan by supporting the classroom teachers with new initiatives and strategies to improve student achievement. Mrs. Hartley provides a clear plan to mentor new teachers to support quality instruction and impact student achievement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/21/2019, Kelly Maldonado

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

473

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

6

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

6

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	32	60	76	65	79	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	14	30	39	28	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	11	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	5	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/8/2022

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	27	78	65	92	75	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	14	32	18	28	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	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	

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	27	78	65	92	75	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	14	32	18	28	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	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	

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	50%	56%	56%				48%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						58%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						59%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	46%	50%				53%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						52%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						52%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	61%	59%				60%	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	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	10	43	40	17	38	38	10				
ELL	39	62	48	45	61	36	29				
BLK	43			50							
HSP	50	68	52	51	67	45	50				
WHT	43	60		52	55						
FRL	51	69	53	50	66	41	53				
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	11	33		12	14	10					
ELL	26	27	43	24	29	9	11				
BLK	35			31							
HSP	35	29	35	32	23	13	25				
WHT	21			13							
FRL	33	34	41	29	21	12	18				
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	30	57	57	32	32	54	33				
ELL	39	60	60	48	49	59	58				
ASN	64			73							
BLK	52	61		52	63		40				
HSP	47	59	61	53	50	51	60				
WHT	44	50		44	30						
FRL	43	57	58	49	48	49	52				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	47
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	53
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	54
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?

The overall proficiency in the Spring 2022 FSA ELA improved from 36% (2021) to 50% (2022), an improvement of 14% more. Overall FSA Math proficiency improved +20% from 32% to 52%. ELA (+35%) and Math (+46%) learning gains show tremendous improvement. The proficiency of students performing below 25% show positive growth as well- +8% in ELA and +30% in Math. The SWD students underperformed this year in Reading in all grade levels- SWD proficiency in 3rd grade was 36%, in 4th grade was 37% and 11% in 5th grade. Third grade proficiency was 57% in Math while 4th and 5th was the same as in Reading.

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

Even though the overall proficiency was 2 points higher in Math than Reading, the area of focus will continue to be Math. We improved last year, but we were still 16% off of our goal of 66% proficiency. Fourth grade has an overall proficiency of 55% and Third grade has 54% proficiency. On the other hand, the Level 1 sit at 25% (4th grade) and 24% (3rd grade).

The SWD proficiency was virtually the same in all grade levels. Considering that only 5/14 SWD students

(3rd grade) were proficient in Reading, and 3/8 SWD students (4th grade) were proficient, we will focus on improving proficiency in 4th and 5th grades this year. SWD students (3rd grade) performed marginally better in Math (57% proficient), but proficiency for SWD in 4th grade was 37%.

When looking at the SBUA data and iReady diagnostics, it is evident that students are less than 50% fluent in the areas of measurement and data (49% proficient) and algebra and algebraic thinking (47% proficient). On the other hand in ELA, the iReady diagnostic shows that Vocabulary continues to be an area of need.

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

There are still challenges brought about by the virtual instruction during the 2020-21 school year when many of the students now starting Third grade chose to stay home all year; we are still working on skills that were not fully developed. In the content area of Math, students still struggle with basic math skills (number sense and fluency), which affects their performance in measurement and data and algebra. Math intervention last year tackled those areas and it shows in the overall improvements seen in the Spring FSA Math. The Second grade students coming up to Third grade performed at 67% below grade level (End of the Year diagnostic). Third grade is a grade level that will be in need of very specific and intensive interventions. In the area of ELA, vocabulary development continues to be an area of need that impacts reading comprehension.

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

Learning gains in ELA (+35%) and Math (+46%) were the data components that showed the most improvement on the Spring 2022 FSA administration. This improvement speaks well of the MTSS process and targeted intervention implemented last year.

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

In order to improve student achievement we discussed SBUA data during PLCs and identified standards that needed reteaching. The discussion included the identification of distractors on the assessments and how to teach or reteach the standard. Instructional coaches observed and identified teachers in need of additional support to improve their instructional delivery. Co-teaching was an intervention used frequently to help instructional delivery. Our healthy and expansive Tutoring program (grades 2-5) provided pre-teaching of standards, additional support and practice to students in the lowest 25%.

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

Our school will continue using the Symphony Math computer program that focuses on providing additional practice on basic math skills. Instructional Coaches and Interventionists will support the Math intervention time to provide support and structure and thus improve students' math achievement. Our Coaches will continue to be available to demonstrate effective strategies and coach our teachers. The MTSS Coordinator will strengthen the Math and ELA Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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

All teachers will be either learning the Reading and/or Math B.E.S.T Benchmarks this year; professional development will be provided during pre-planning and support will be provided during the PLC weekly meetings as well. New teachers to our school will need professional development so they can understand how to use the Symphony Math and iReady programs to support their instruction and

intervention programs. Professional development opportunities will be provided to teachers to improve understanding of Math concepts and effective strategies. Training on the new monitoring and end-of-the-year assessments will also be needed.

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

Training and support on the implementation of the new B.E.S.T Benchmarks to teachers will be provided, as well as, specific training to administer and analyze new assessment data. These trainings will be critical to continuing our improvement in the area of Reading and Math.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

One subgroup where we underperformed is the SWD student group. In order to improve our overall proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25%, we need to target this group during classroom instruction, small group, and intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our SWD student achievement from 28% to 48% in Reading and from 35% to 55% in Math.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor by tracking SBUA, Symphony Math, and quarterly assessments to determine academic needs and adjust classroom instruction, small groups, and intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Academic performance will be monitored using mainly SBUA data to make intervention quick and responsive to the academic needs of the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Monitoring academic performance will allow the teachers to pinpoint areas of need and determine whether the SWD students are progressing or not. By providing professional development on the best practices to help SWD students, the teachers will gain confidence in accommodating the needs of the SWD students in their daily instruction in the classroom.

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.

Discuss SWD academic performance during PLCs and possible student tasks to accommodate the SWD students during classroom instruction, small groups, and interventions.

Person Responsible

Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

The ESE department will provide additional training to teachers on the best instructional delivery practices that benefit SWD students and ways to incorporate the IEP goals in their lesson planning.

Person Responsible

Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

Implement SEL lessons in the classroom to improve student self-esteem and confidence in their own ability to succeed.

Person Responsible Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

B.E.S.T Math Benchmarks are new to all of the teachers. The teachers will need professional development to support and ensure the successful implementation of the benchmarks in Reading and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

All teachers (100%) will demonstrate knowledge and application of the new B.E.S.T. Benchmarks in Reading and Math by the end of the school year by exit slips after professional development and discussions during PLCs.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by exit slips after professional development sessions and by discussion and participation during PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Summer professional development was offered to the teachers, but our coaches will also provide additional professional development at the beginning of the year to ensure that the teachers focus on the benchmarks' important details. Mini-pds will also be offered during the school year as well. During PLCs coaches and admin will support the teachers on the benchmarks discussions to further clarify misconceptions or confusions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The new B.E.S.T. Benchmarks are implemented in their totality this year. Teachers in K-2 have knowledge of the benchmarks in Reading, but will be implementing the Math benchmarks for the first time with the rest of the grade levels this year. In order to internalize the new benchmarks, teachers will have to be introduced to them and discuss

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

them at length in context. Giving the teachers the opportunity to be exposed to the benchmarks during professional development and PLCs will allow them to learn by using the benchmarks. Instructional coaches will also be available to provide coaching to teachers that could be having difficulties with the benchmark implementation.

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.

Prepare pre-planning PD format and delivery to ensure successful delivery of B.E.S.T. Benchmarks overview.

Person Responsible Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

Prepare mini-PDs during the school year to address additional information and clarifications as needed.

Person Responsible Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

Support PLCs discussions of the benchmarks to ensure successful implementation of the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks across every grade-level.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide coaching to teachers when observations show that the teacher is struggling with implementation.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hartley (kimberly.hartley@ocps.net)

#3. 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.

Math continues to be the content area of lowest academic proficiency. Even though we made positive gains, we need to continue improving the students math literacy and proficiency. Students often times feel they are not good in math and do not see the real world application of what they are learning. We as teachers need to make a better effort to engage our students and make Math more attainable.

Most of our teachers might not feel comfortable with Math concepts nor know how to best reach the students so they learn to love and be challenged by Math. We want to promote persistence when tackling Math problems so students are not discouraged when they make mistakes. Mistakes should be learning tools.

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

We will improve Math proficiency from 52% to 66% (+14%) and learning gains from 66% to 76% (10%).

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

We will monitor progress using a data monitoring tool to track SBUA, district assessments, and state assessments. We will monitor the students progress on Symphony Math to follow their progress or lack of it through the program stages. We will also use classroom observations of student tasks to gauge implementation of best practices during Math instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

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

Professional development for teachers in the area of benchmark student task alignment and Mathematical Mindsets.

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

In order to engage the students during Math instruction, teachers will have to implement student tasks that are relevant and support the content (benchmark) thus supporting the instructional core thus impacting student achievement. The professional development will be extended during PLCs giving the teachers the opportunity to discuss the tasks and implementation. We will continue the use of the Symphony Math program that focuses on basic math skills, providing the students with additional practice opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional development for teachers on Mathematical Mindsets.

Person Responsible Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

Implementing growth mindset strategies in the classroom where teachers should encourage students to be self-confident in their ability to learn math.

Person Responsible Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Our school improved overall proficiency last year from 36% to 50% (+14%) and learning gains in ELA from 32% to 67% (+35%). Nonetheless, the improvement was only 1% in overall proficiency and 9% in learning gains when compared to the FSA scores on 2019 (the last scores pre-pandemic levels). We have performed higher in ELA when compared to Math, but there is still room to improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to improve at least 10% in overall proficiency (60%) and learning gains (77%) by focusing in instructional delivery and vocabulary development.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student improvement with our progress monitoring tool. We will be monitoring SBUA, district and state assessments to inform instructional adjustments in small group instruction and intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

During PLCs, teachers will discuss classroom, district, and state assessments to ensure that small group instruction and intervention is responsive to student needs. This will be even more critical as we become familiarized with the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

As teachers become comfortable with the B.E.S.T Benchmarks, the collaboration during PLCs will help them determine the best student tasks and interventions as they analyze student academic performance on district and state assessments.

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.

Progress monitoring tool PD at the beginning of the year to familiarize teachers with the tool we will be using this year.

Person Responsible

Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

Support during PLCs discussing the benchmarks and appropriate student tasks to deliver instruction.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Hartley (kimberly.hartley@ocps.net)

Progress monitoring tool PD at the beginning of the year to familiarize teachers with the tool we will be using this year.

Person Responsible Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

Support during PLCs discussing the benchmarks and appropriate student tasks to deliver instruction.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hartley (kimberly.hartley@ocps.net)

Progress monitoring tool PD at the beginning of the year to familiarize teachers with the tool we will be using this year.

Person Responsible Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

Support during PLCs discussing the benchmarks and appropriate student tasks to deliver instruction.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hartley (kimberly.hartley@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

When analyzing the EOY iReady diagnostic and progress monitoring, First grade proficiency is only 41%, the lowest performance area is Vocabulary (42%) followed by High Frequency Words with 47% and Comprehension Literature with 47% proficiency. Second grade's overall proficiency is 32% with Vocabulary (28%) being the lowest area followed by Phonics (35%) and comprehension (Informational- 38% and Literature- 39%).

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

The 2022 FSA Spring administration shows that Third grade has 44% proficiency. When looking at the EOY iReady diagnostic, Third grade performed lower in the area of Vocabulary (54%) and Informational Comprehension (54%). Fifth grade has a 45% proficiency based on the 2022 FSA. In iReady, 34% of the

students are proficient. The area of Vocabulary is 29%, Comprehension in Literature and Informational Text is 37% each--it's important to remember that the Fifth grade cohort will no longer be with us.

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)

Vocabulary has been consistently the area of need based on the EOY iReady diagnostics and classroom assessments. The new students in Kindergarten will have to be assessed at the beginning of the school year to determine the area(s) of need. The Second graders in the lowest 30% as determined by the BOY assessments (former First graders) will be progress monitored with iReady and classroom assessments. We expect at least 51% of the K-2 students to be proficient as measured by state assessments by the end of the school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Third and Fifth grade have below 50% proficiency. As with grade K-2, Vocabulary was the area of need based on EOY iReady diagnostic, which in turn also affected reading comprehension in the areas of Literature and Informational Text. We expect the Third to Fifth grade students to be at least 55% proficient in the EOY state 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.

All students will be monitored by PM benchmarks and CRMs using a common progress monitoring tool. Any benchmark where the students score less than 70% will be re-taught and assessed to ensure proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Clemente, Luriela, luriela.clemente@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?

Teachers will pre-teach vocabulary, use plenty of visuals as applicable and use the vocabulary activities provided in the CRM and curriculum resources. Vocabulary will be used in context and background knowledge established to ensure the students understand the content at hand.

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?

Pre-teaching the vocabulary that might not be familiar to the students before hand will help build a framework of reference that the students will be able to use to better understand the topic at hand. With the support of vocabulary activities and tapping into the students' background knowledge will further develop content knowledge that will in turn improve students' overall reading comprehension.

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
Literacy Coaching: During PLCs, coaches will work with teachers to identify instructional practices addressing vocabulary that will benefit their academic instruction. The discussion about implementation of these practices will be encouraged to ensure a successful implementation.	Hartley, Kimberly, kimberly.hartley@ocps.net
Professional Learning: Professional Development Trainings will be offered throughout the year to develop the teachers' instructional skills.	Zagarella, Jennifer, jennifer.zagarella@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.

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. Taking care of the socio-emotional well being of our students by actively fostering positive relationships between teacher mentors and students. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support student success.

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, 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 district programs such as the Parent Academy.
Schools utilize staff such as the Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge the community and school culture.