Camelot Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Camelot Elementary

14501 WATERFORD CHASE PKWY, Orlando, FL 32828

https://camelotes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Gordon

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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

Camelot Elementary

14501 WATERFORD CHASE PKWY, Orlando, FL 32828

https://camelotes.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	No	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

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
Gordon, Melissa	Principal	Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, differentiated and rigorous instruction, monitors iObservation, partners master teachers with teachers in need of improvement, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity. The Principal runs data meetings, participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision making and monitors teachers' data spreadsheets as well as appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of instruction.
Tait, Stacy	ELL Compliance Specialist	Meets with students in the lowest 30% during MTSS to provide additional support. Monitors teachers' data spreadsheets, supervises that the appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of instruction, monitors teachers regarding data interpretation, participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision-making, provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS, trains teachers in graphing procedures and how to problem solve, monitor the size of each group that is participating in MTSS and organizes Tier 3 meetings to ensure completion of all paperwork. Reviews ELL data to ensure the students are being provided rigorous and differentiated instruction, and ensures all paperwork is in compliance with the District and the State. Monitors the fidelity and implementation of the curriculum within the classroom to ensure accommodations and modifications for ELL students, follow roles and duties for the instructional coach.
Brinzo, Kristen	Instructional Media	Provides literary support in our media center by supplying and helping student choose the correct lexile level book. Ensures our textbook, library book and technology inventory is in compliance. Supports writing intervention and acceleration opportunities through small group.
Castillo, Justina	Dean	Provides support for behavioral MTSS decision making processes, helps to organize and assist in proper documentation and compliance, monitors discipline and implements BIPs as well as facilitates reward systems, expedites PLC meetings, reviews ELL data to ensure the students are being provided rigorous and differentiated instruction, and ensures all paperwork is in compliance with the District and the State. Monitors the fidelity and implementation of the curriculum within the classroom to ensure accommodations and modifications for ELL students, follow roles and duties for the instructional coach.
Dugan, Carrie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides teachers with appropriate and grade level specific data and monitors appropriate use of intervention materials. Testing coordinator for all school-wide test events. Meets once a week as a Leadership PLC focusing on effective teaching strategies, coaching opportunities, and both schoolwide and individual student data.
Parris, Erica	Instructional Coach	Provides support to teachers in progress monitoring of each classroom and student data. Meets once a week as a Leadership PLC focusing on

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		effective teaching strategies, coaching opportunities, and both schoolwide and individual student data. Works with the teachers in the classroom and provides coaching and leads common planning in the areas of their expertise. Meet with the lowest 30% of students in math to provide additional academic support. Monitors teachers' data spreadsheets, supervises that the appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of instruction occurs, monitors teachers regarding data interpretation, participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision making. Provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS.
Poffenberger, Rebecca	Staffing Specialist	Provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS, helps to organize and assist in Tier 3 paperwork and compliance, monitors the implementation of IEPs and 504 plans, and collaborates with teachers to ensure SWD are receiving differentiated rigorous instruction.
Mills, Elease	Assistant Principal	Helps to run data meetings and monitors teachers' data spreadsheets, supervises that the appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of instruction, supervises teachers regarding data interpretation, participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision-making, provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS, trains teachers in graphing procedures and how to problem solve, monitor the size of each group that is participating in MTSS and monitors Tier 3 meetings to ensure completion of all paperwork.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/22/2020, Melissa Gordon

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Total number of students enrolled at the school
607

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
12

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/12/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	31	68	83	87	100	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	15	17	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	31	68	83	87	100	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	15	17	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	58%	56%	56%				70%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						62%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						43%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	46%	50%				79%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						79%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						60%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	61%	59%				69%	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	72%	55%	17%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	82%	62%	20%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	63%	12%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	26	22	14	19	5	20				
ELL	43	58	44	46	48	13	45				
ASN	85	64		85	67						
BLK	53	64		53	45		27				
HSP	49	61	55	53	52	29	50				
WHT	69	60	38	68	66		52				
FRL	49	61	43	47	47	25	40				

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	21	10		21	10						
ELL	51	68	50	47	31	10	42				
ASN	94			67							
BLK	54	62		49	31		31				
HSP	54	47	20	50	22		46				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	64	56		66	44		39				
FRL	52	49	35	46	22	11	31				
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	29	33	37	42	66	55	25				
ELL	59	57	41	70	77	63	63				
ASN	86	75		91	94						
BLK	59	51		70	74	40	75				
HSP	64	57	50	75	77	69	60				
WHT	78	69	36	83	79	54	71				
FRL	63	59	44	75	77	59	68				

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	52
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	45
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	51
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	59
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	47
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?

In review of the 2022 data there was an increase in six of the seven components when comparing to the 2021 SY data. Only ELA proficiency showed a decrease which was one point less than in the 2021 school year. When comparing grade level data, Fifth Grade data was the lowest in all categories in comparison to Third and Fourth.

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

The lowest 25% Math Learning Gains subgroup was the lowest performing at 27%, however, this was a 13 point increase from the prior year of 14% making Learning Gains using 2021 FSA data.

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

Fifth Grade had a high percentage of SWD student, more than one fourth of the grade falling in this category. There was also a class that did not have a consistent teacher for four months of the school year. Students returning to campus after being LaunchEd struggled with behavioral problems which then cut into instructional time.
The actions being taken to address this area of improvement is tightly coupled systems. Prepared schedules for services and progress monitoring through common assessments each cluster of standards taught will allow us to make instructional decisions on students needs and what supports are needed.

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

Based on the 2022 state assessments, all ESSA subgroups met the minimum proficiency required and six of the seven components showed improvement. The component with the most improvement was Math Learning Gains which improved by 25% when comparing to the 2021 SY data.

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

One contributing factor to this improvement was the addition of the Math Intervention block in the daily schedule. Another factor was that every classroom K-5 has a tutor push in support 30 minutes daily to focus on the students that were not proficient and provide additional support for those students.

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

Teachers will identify students that would benefit from the use of acceleration strategies based on the BOY Diagnostic in reading and math. Specifically, an acceleration approach to math is used in the intervention block to allow students to be exposed to the standards prior to the actual standard being taught therefore increasing the time the students see the topic/content. Camelot will continue to pilot a supplemental Math, Symphony Math, that will provide the students with the opportunity to target and practice skills that were or will be pre-taught.

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.

Specific professional development on data analysis including sub group data will be presented to our staff at various times during the 2022-23 school year. In addition professional development about the MTSS process and identification process for students that are Tier 3 will take place.

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

An increased resource team at Camelot will also be added for the 2022-23 school year. These additional positions will support our enrichment program as well as intervention teachers for grades K-2 and also 3-5. An MTSS Coordinator will support the Tier 3 students (reading and/or math) to ensure students receive interventions needed to achieve.

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: 1. In review of the discipline data and types of referrals issued, a focus on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports would help to incorporate a proactive approach to discipline. 2. Increasing the school community will help to decrease behaviors and absences.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Data collected from the Early Warning Systems will be reduced as a result of supporting Social Emotional Learning. Out-of-school suspension indicator will be reduced to less than one student in each grade level by incorporating self-awareness and relationships among peers and adults.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitoring with our administrative team weekly trends in skyward discipline and attendance of both students and staff. Based on School Climate surveys on students, parents and staff. We will see a decrease of 10 percent of those that missed ten or more days.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Justina Castillo (justina.castillo@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide PBIS system, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.
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 achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

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.

Implement a school-wide PBIS system. This will include ensuring that all staff receives training on the PBIS system from the school based PBIS team.

Person Responsible   Justina Castillo (justina.castillo@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.	Math proficiency has dropped since the 2019 school year from 79 percent proficiency to 60% in the 2022 school year. While growth was demonstrated from the 2021 school year in which proficiency was 55% it is still not comparable to pre-pandemic times. Our goal is to increase proficiency to 80% to bring our proficiency in line with pre-pandemic trends.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The school plans to achieve an increase in proficiency from 60% to 80% (an increase of 20%) as measured by the Florida State Assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	A progress-monitoring tool will be used by all classroom teachers to track iReady and Symphony Math diagnostics and checkpoints. PLCs will have scheduled data meetings to discuss progress or lack of progress and adjustments to instructional strategies after the conclusion of each CRM.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elease Mills (elease.mills@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use iReady math profile data and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small group intervention and acceleration to support the math standards. This data will be combined with the Symphony Math Benchmark assessments to finetune instruction and target skills. Intervention blocks will be used to provide additional instruction for those students that score in the bottom 30%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale behind utilizing iReady profile and instructional grouping reports is to allow the teachers to create fluid groups of intervention based on actual student data and needs. Symphony will be used as an additional data point to use to monitor and adjust instruction fluidly.

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.

Administration and members of the leadership team will monitor data and small intervention group data to make adjustments to instruction and grouping as needed.

Person Responsible	Stacy Tait (stacy.tait@ocps.net)

Teachers will administer the three Symphony Math Benchmark assessments required for the implementation of the program.

Person Responsible   Elease Mills (elease.mills@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	On the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 42% of our students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The school will increase proficiency by 17 percent on the Florida State Assessment for the 2023 School Year to demonstrate a proficiency of 75% for grades 3-5.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	A progress-monitoring tool is used by all classroom teachers to track iReady and CRM summative assessments at the conclusion of each CRM. PLCs will have scheduled data meetings to discuss progress or lack of progress and adjustments to instructional strategies after the conclusion of each CRM.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elease Mills (elease.mills@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use iReady reading profile data and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small group intervention and acceleration to support the reading standards. This data will be combined with the CRM summative assessments to further identify the specific standards and target skills the students need to improve. Students K-5 will be grouped in intervention groups during the FBS block to meet the students remediation and enrichment needs daily using iReady data and FSA data for grouping.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale behind utilizing iReady profile and instructional grouping reports is to allow the teachers to create fluid groups of intervention based on actual student data and needs. Data meetings are conducted after the conclusion of each CRM and intervention groups are adjusted as needed based on the assessment results.

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.

Administration and members of the leadership team will monitor data and small intervention group data to make adjustments to instruction and grouping as needed.

Person Responsible   Stacy Tait (stacy.tait@ocps.net)

Teachers will use iReady reading profile and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small intervention groups.

Person Responsible   Elease Mills (elease.mills@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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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.

N/A

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

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

School Leadership Team collaborates frequently 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. In addition our school will strengthen our implementation during year two of Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies (PBIS) for the 2022-23 school year. Camelot has created a schoolwide PBIS policy as well as classroom PBIS strategies. This will be supported with the House system which has all students sorted into houses for the 2022-23 school year to support these PBIS practices.

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

Administration- All of leadership team will be integral in the implementation process of the PBIS processes. They will be responsible for promotion of the new system, ordering of the materials and shirts needed and ensuring the follow through occurs schoolwide.

PBIS Committee Members-these individuals are representative of the entire staff with grade level teachers, classified employees and the leadership team who are creating the schoolwide focus statement and goals for our PBIS Implementation. They will lead schoolwide trainings and create materials for school use.

Guidance Counselor- She will meet with individual students, lead classroom social skills lessons and character trait lessons as well as small groups. She will also be responsible for leading the anti-bullying campaign for our school. Additionally the guidance counselor will serve as our Partner's in Ed Coordinator to foster positive relationships among our school and community.