Union Park Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Union Park Elementary

1600 N DEAN RD, Orlando, FL 32825

https://unionparkes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Ashlynn Ram IR Ez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2019

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 (55%) 2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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	TSI
* 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

Union Park Elementary

1600 N DEAN RD, Orlando, FL 32825

https://unionparkes.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	85%

School Grades History

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

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
Ramirez, Ashlynn	Principal	Digital Administrator, School-Based Budget, Supervise Progress Monitoring (All Content), Evaluates Secretary, Registrar, All Lead Team Members, Grades 3-5, Parent Engagement/ Involvement, Accountability Corrections, Staff Morale, Student Morale, Teacher Retention, Professional Learning Communities, Oversees Schoolwide Data Tracker, Monitors Schoolwide Communication, Community Connection, Oversees PLC/PD
Vales, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Digital Administrator , School-Based Budget, Supervise Progress Monitoring (All Content), Evaluates Classified, ESE, Grades K-2, and Specials Parent Engagement/Involvement, Accountability Corrections. Staff Morale, Student Morale,Teacher Retention, Professional Learning Communities, Supports Schoolwide Data Tracker, Good Cause Lead, Monitors Schoolwide Communication, Community Connection, Oversees PLC/PD
Malanga, Connie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	CRT - UPE Tracker, Digital Roll Out, FAST State Testing (Plan/Schedule), WIDA Testing Lead, Social Media/Website Support, Community Liaison, New Teachers Lead, Progress Monitoring Lead, ELL Support, Good Cause Support, ESOL Compliance, Progress Reports Grade Tracker, Inservice Points
Nguyen, Le	Instructional Coach	Math/Science Coach - MAO Lead, Saturday School, Digital Implementation, Bottom Quartile Data Analysis for Math & Science, Feeder Middle School Connections, Report Card/ Progress Reports Grade Tracker, Attendance Interventionist, Spring Break Camp Lead, PLC Schedules, After School Tutoring, Math Bootcamps (Pre-FAST), PLC Facilitator: Math & Science, Master Calendar, Social Media/Website Lead
Ayala, Lauren	Reading Coach	Resources for Students, Data Analysis for ELA, PD Schedules, Read to Succeed, Deliberate Practice, Teacher Retention, Staff Morale Mentoring for Students, Student Clubs, Reading Bootcamp (Pre-FAST), Writing Bootcamp (Pre-FAST), Grade 3 Portfolio Support, Report Card/ Progress Reports Grade Tracker, PLC Facilitator: ELA
	School Counselor	Title 1, Positive Behavior, Social Skill Groups, Restorative Justice Circles, Threat Assessments, Mental Health Support, MVP, Safety Patrol Support, Zones of Regulation, Title IX Coordinator
McGovern, Kimberly	Other	Provide specific instruction to the identified lowest 30% quartile students in all grade levels, MTSS Lead, Parent Meetings for MTSS

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shank, Melanie	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist - Compliance, MTSS Support, 504, IEP's, Parent Meetings, ESE Testing Liaison (FSAA, Accommodations), ESOL Support, Behavior MTSS Support
Gonzalez - Rodriguez, Sonia	Instructional Media	Media Specialist - Digital Lead, Student Morale, Textbook Inventory, Textbook Manager, Digital Inventory, News Crew, Community Outreach, Book Club, Book Fair, HOUSE System Lead
Cole, Megan	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Support Teacher- Title 1, Positive Behavior, Social Skill Groups, Restorative Justice Circles, Zones of Regulation, MTSS Behavior Lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/11/2019, Ashlynn Ram IR Ez

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

497

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

2

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	66	85	83	76	80	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	18	28	26	9	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	10	14	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/28/2022

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	83	91	69	79	84	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
Attendance below 90 percent	25	17	22	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	41	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	15	18	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	2	2	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	91	69	79	84	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
Attendance below 90 percent	25	17	22	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	41	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	15	18	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	2	2	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	56%	56%				51%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						54%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						28%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	46%	50%				48%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%						42%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						22%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	61%	59%				27%	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	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	26%	57%	-31%	60%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	53%	-25%
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	19	35	29	20	45	47					
ELL	37	44	32	47	77	62	34				
BLK	33	52		47	77		73				
HSP	45	54	36	50	78	59	38				
WHT	52	68		55	79						
FRL	34	49	46	42	72	58	46				

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		15		7	30						
ELL	27	40	40	29	59		16				
BLK	28			24							
HSP	41	47	40	36	57	46	41				
WHT	53			59			80				
FRL	31	37	33	31	45	33	44				
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	9	21	21	12	14	15					
ELL	39	50	32	37	37	25	23				
BLK	57	63		51	50		8				
HSP	48	53	29	44	41	23	30				
WHT	57	48		54	35		36				
FRL	43	49	28	40	38	18	25				

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	56
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	53
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	64
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	51
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 trends across 5th grade ELA indicate an inconsistency in growth over the years with a 2% point decrease from 44% proficiency on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 42% proficiency on the 2021-2022 FSA statewide assessment. (A 2% point decrease). 3rd grade math showed the greatest increase after a steady decline with 43% proficiency on the 2021-22 FSA statewide assessment from 30% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test (A 13% point increase). Overall, the trends for ELA and Math have been inconsistent across Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25%.

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

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement was ELA Proficiency from 42% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 42% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test, indicating no improvement. Our ELA overall proficiency was the lowest across 3rd - 5th grade compared to Math on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test.

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

A contributing factor was an inconsistent transfer of best practices for differentiation and small group instruction amongst grade levels and inadequate monitoring of student progress.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains from 55% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 76% on the 2021-2022 FSA statewide assessment. (a 21% point increase).

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

The continued actions of implementing fluid small group and data driven instruction. Instructional coaches and other members of lead team, along with the teachers, met together weekly to look at data and make adjustments to instruction. Also, using common vocabulary across grade levels in the math classroom. A new action was intentional small group support for our lowest 25% with leadership push-in support in grades 3-5.

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

-Frontloading of academic vocabulary
-Activate/build background knowledge
-Close Reading Strategies
-Collaborative group structures and learning
-Targeted engagement supports
-Scaffolding ELA and Math Standards
-Continued collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success
-Improved targeted support for ELLs
-Continue current system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes
-Continue implementation of flexible and fluid grouping. Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports
-Increase our systematic use of explicit instruction when learning new materials, anticipate common misconceptions, highlight essential content, and remove distracting information
-Model and scaffold steps or processes needed to understand content and concepts, apply skills and complete tasks successfully and independently

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.

Continuous Improvement Model PD
Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures
Close Reading PD
B.E.S.T. Standards PD for both ELA and Math
Culturally Responsive Teaching PD
High Yield Strategies for ESE/ELL

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

Targeted optional professional development over the summer prior to the school year starting. As well as a follow up of these same opportunities during pre-planning. School Year PD Master calendar posted for all staff members. This will be a live document to be updated as new needs are identified through the CIM.

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.	The ELA Proficiency indicated no movement from 42% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 42% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test. Specifically, 3rd Grade ELA overall proficiency indicated a decrease from 49% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 36% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test. (A 13% point decrease) These areas have been identified as critical needs. We will incorporate small group instruction to target deficit standards to support all students making progress towards proficiency, with a focus on our ESSA subgroups (ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged). By focusing on small group instruction, we will ensure that we are adequately monitoring teacher performance with meaningful feedback as well as monitoring student performance throughout the academic school year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 42% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 42% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test, the school plans to increase ELA Proficiency to 54% on the ELA state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor through formative assessments and common assessment data, as well as using the progress monitoring tools suggested by the district and the quarterly PMA assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashlynn Ramirez (ashlynn.ramirez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	In order to continue to adequately monitor and analyze data, we will utilize our item analysis sheet to determine the greatest deficits based upon standards, have data-driven discussions within PLCs, analyze instructional practices specific to small group instruction by providing coaching cycles for identified teachers with consistent monitoring and feedback, and other necessary adjustments that improve outcomes. Teachers will be provided opportunities during PLCs to adjust their instruction to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features, and enhance instructional decision making. Coaches will work with teachers to incorporate standards aligned small group instruction, including vocabulary and hands-on instruction, to meet the needs of the students and prepare them to answer and

analyze questions. Additionally, teachers will continue to be provided with resources to support the identified ESSA subgroups (ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged).

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 this strategy is to have teachers engage in the continuous improvement model. When teachers are intentional and analyze their instructional practices they will present instruction based on proven instructional practices to improve student proficiency. Teachers will use data from common assessments to drive small group instruction of the standards that were at a deficit. The coaches and teachers will also use the data analysis to determine instruction for intervention and tutoring programs. This will ensure that instruction is being implemented based upon the data from assessments. This allows for teachers to provide the necessary support needed to lessen the deficits of particular standards.

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.

1: Planning: PLCs meet bi weekly to analyze the data and share/explain best practices for small group instruction through common planning and the support of coaches.
2. Monitoring: Observe small group instruction weekly based upon the data analysis of deficit standards.
3. Provide teacher feedback: Meaningful and actionable feedback on a bi-weekly basis
4. Provide teachers with additional resources to support our ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged students.
5. Students identified in the ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will be invited to attend tutoring programs.

Person Responsible	Lauren Ayala (lauren.ayala@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 5th Grade Math Learning Gains of 58% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide assessment, there was a slight increase of 2% points from 56% on the school-wide 2020-2021 Math Learning Gains FSA results. Also, although there was improvement in Math overall proficiency in 3rd grade from 30% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide assessment to 43% 2021-2022 FSA state-wide assessment (a 13 point increase), it still indicates over 50% of our students aren't showing proficiency. The structures that were put in place for the 2020 - 2021 school year yielded trends that were indicating growth, however due to loss of learning from the previous years, we identify 3rd grade and 5th grade students as areas of focus in this critical area. This area of focus is to provide intentional instructional support to all students in Math, but specifically to upcoming 4th graders (last year's 3rd graders).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on the 5th Grade Math Learning Gains data of 56% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 58% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test, the school plans to increase Math Learning Gains to 64% on the Math state assessment. Based on the Math Proficiency data of 30% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 43% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test (just under 50%), the school plans to increase Math Proficiency to 54% on the Math state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-We will monitor through formative assessments and common assessment data, as well as using the progress monitoring tools suggested by the district and the quarterly PMA assessments. Support in weekly PLCs-grades 3, 4, 5-weekly (with a specific target on 4th grade) -Review agendas and debrief in lead meetings for possible added supports-weekly -Formative/Summative assessment analysis-weekly -Intentional Small Groups + Centers planning-weekly
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashlynn Ramirez (ashlynn.ramirez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	In order to build our culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success, we will increase our systematic use of explicit instruction by setting an expectation of maximizing instructional time. Teachers will meet once a week with a coach and administrator to discuss standards-based instruction, implementation of instruction, how to appropriately differentiate the instruction, and data analysis of common assessments. Instructional coaches will communicate support and monitor these strategies during weekly PLCs with teachers. Teachers will identify the students that are in ESSA subgroups (ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged) and collaboratively plan specific

implemented for this Area of Focus.	standard aligned questions and differentiated strategies to guide their instruction. Teachers will be provided with resources to support students and students will receive intervention weekly. Teachers will progress monitor students using research-based resources and make data-driven decisions as needed.
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 these strategies are to develop administrator and teacher capacity to make data-driven instructional decisions based upon common assessments results. These strategies were selected to ensure that administrators and teachers learn and systematically implement explicit instruction, with differentiation, for the identified grade levels, as well as all students.

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.

1. Systematically identify the Learning Gains of students in Math
2. Administrators and Math Coach will receive trainings on evidence-based strategies to support professional growth and inform performance evaluations of instructional personnel.
3. Provide research based monthly PD to teachers on how to support students with disabilities, including topics such as accommodations, monitoring, and differentiation.
4. Create standards based intervention groups based upon data and progress monitor on a weekly basis.
5. Implementation of strategies that will increase math proficiency.
6. Students identified in the ELL and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups will be invited to attend the Before and After School Tutoring program.

Person Responsible   Le Nguyen (le.nguyen@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

By focusing on small group instruction, we will ensure that we are adequately monitoring teacher performance with meaningful feedback as well as monitoring student performance throughout the academic school year.

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

We will incorporate small group instruction to target deficit standards to support all students making progress towards proficiency, with a focus on our ESSA

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)

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 43% on the first grade 2021-2022 EOY iReady diagnostic, the school plans to increase first grade ELA Proficiency to 54% on the ELA state assessment for the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 36% on the third grade 2021-2022 FSA ELA state-wide test, the school plans to increase third grade ELA Proficiency to 45% on the ELA state assessment for the 2022-2023 school year.

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 36% on the fourth grade 2021-2022 FSA ELA state-wide test, the school plans to increase fourth grade ELA Proficiency to 54% on the ELA state assessment for the

2022-2023 school year.

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 42% on the fifth grade 2021-2022 FSA ELA state-wide test, the school plans to increase fifth grade ELA Proficiency to 50% on the ELA state assessment for the 2022-2023 school year.

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.

We will monitor through formative assessments and common assessment data, as well as using the progress monitoring tools suggested by the district. We will also closely monitor the data of the first two F.A.S.T. assessments and make adjustments to instruction as needed.

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

Ayala, Lauren, lauren.ayala@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?

In order to achieve the measurable outcomes previously stated for each grade level, we will be using iReady during small group targeted instruction during the ELA reading block and SIPPS and Corrective Reading for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. iReady is aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards and has proven to have a strong correlations between proficiency on the diagnostic along with that of state assessments. Both SIPPS and Corrective Reading have statistically shown a significant effect on improving students outcomes in reading fluency which in turn supports reading comprehension.

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?

All three selected programs address the identified area of focus which is to improve ELA proficiency. Students who are struggling readers needs the support with SIPPs and/or Corrective Reading. Once they

show mastery, they can then use iReady to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary. All three programs have a proven record of effectiveness on the Lowest 25% of students in each grade level.

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
Ensure all students are placed in the appropriate Tier 2 interventions (and Tier 3 if applicable). SIPPS and Corrective Reading will both be used to address this area of focus. -Pick appropriate staff members to lead these programs. -Track Data every 2 weeks using the provided mastery checks. -Provide teachers with quarterly professional development on how to best implement the listed programs above.	McGovern, Kimberly, kimberly.mcgovern@ocps.net
Ensure iReady is being used in the classroom to support small group instruction. -Train teachers on how to use the data collected from iReady to adjust instruction and differentiate. -Use the teacher toolbox lessons to asses and reassess when needed. -Provide trainings on how to align iReady with those strategies being taught in the classroom.	Ayala, Lauren, lauren.ayala@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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional development 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 a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this 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 staff and families, based on school and community needs. 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.

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

PTA -SEL for parents and community members
SAC -SEL for parents and community members
FAC -SEL for teachers and staff
Students -SEL and Zones of Regulations, Conscious Discipline
Leadership Team -SEL, Trauma-informed, Zones of Regulations, Conscious Discipline
Instructional Staff -SEL, Trauma-informed, Zones of Regulations, Conscious Discipline
Classified Staff -SEL, Trauma-informed, Zones of Regulations, Conscious Discipline
PIEs -SEL, Trauma-informed, Conscious Discipline
Community Members -SEL, Trauma-informed, Conscious Discipline
PEL -SEL, Trauma-informed, Zones of Regulations, Conscious Discipline