

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

### **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Orange - 1141 - Little River Elementary - 2022-23 SIP

### Little River Elementary

100 CASWELL DR, Orlando, FL 32825

https://littleriveres.ocps.net/

Demographics

### Principal: Tracey Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 5/24/2020

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes   |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: C (53%)<br>2018-19: C (43%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) In  | formation*  |
| 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. F   | 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

### 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               | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Orange - 1141 - Little River Elementary - 2022-23 SIP

# Little River Elementary

100 CASWELL DR, Orlando, FL 32825

### https://littleriveres.ocps.net/

**School Demographics** 

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F |                     | 2021-22 Title I School | Disadvan            | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | chool               | Yes                    |                     | 100%   |
| Primary Servic<br>(per MSID F     | •••                 | Charter School         | (Reporte            | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation            | No                     |                     | 90%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ory                 |                        |                     |  |
| Year<br>Grade                     | <b>2021-22</b><br>C | 2020-21                | <b>2019-20</b><br>C | <b>2018-19</b><br>C                                  |
| School Board Appro                | val                 |                        |                     |  |

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

### 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 our families and 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Gibson,<br>Tracey   | Principal              | <ul> <li>Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention</li> <li>Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement</li> <li>Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement using the new BEST state standards in both ELA and Math , K-5.</li> <li>Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups</li> <li>Assists in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings</li> <li>Monitors the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions</li> <li>Implements the processes for academic instruction and monitoring for SWD subgroup as part of ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement</li> </ul> |
| Abel,<br>Kristin    | Assistant<br>Principal | The Assistant Principal develops documents to monitor data and address<br>areas of need. The Assistant Principal completes student schedules and<br>oversees transportation at the school level. The Assistant Principal ensures<br>collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and<br>implementation of intervention support and documentation. The Assistant<br>Principal ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process,<br>conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate<br>professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation.<br>Furthermore, the Assistant Principal communicates with all stakeholders<br>regarding school-based plans and activities.   |
| Stanton,<br>Merrill | Instructional<br>Coach | The instructional coach will provide guidance, support, mentoring, and<br>modeling of rigorous K-5 instruction aligned to the Florida BEST Standards.<br>The coach will partner with teachers to support the implementation of BEST<br>standards, as well as facilitate the collection and analysis of data of student<br>learning. Furthermore, the instructional coach will provide professional<br>development on the instructional framework. The coach will also work with<br>new teachers to the county and to the profession to provide individualized<br>coaching and mentoring. The instructional coach is also responsible for<br>training teachers and staff on administering assessments.   |
| Quinones,<br>Tania  | Staffing<br>Specialist | The Staffing Specialist conducts child find processes for all students and<br>leads staffing meetings to include initial evaluations, IEP annual reviews, and<br>re-evaluations for exceptional educational students. The Staffing Specialist<br>conducts child find processes for consideration for section 504. Staffing<br>Specialist also screens students for possible gifted services. Staffing<br>Specialist also meets with all teachers both school based and district based<br>to ensure that IEP's and section 504 plans are properly implemented. In  |

| Name                             | Position<br>Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
|                                  |                                 | addition, the Staffing Specialist is a resource and provides support through<br>intervention and problem solving processes through data collection and data<br>analysis to support student academic and behavior needs.  |
| Walters-<br>Phillips,<br>Barbara | Science<br>Coach                | The STEM coach will provide guidance, support, mentoring, and modeling of rigorous K-5 instruction aligned to the depth of knowledge of the Florida Standards in science and with the new BEST math standards. The coach will partner with teachers to create lesson plans and common assessments as well as facilitate the collection and analysis of data of student learning. Furthermore, the STEM coach will provide professional development on math and science content and strategies. The coach will also work with new teachers to the county and to the profession to provide individualized coaching and mentoring.                  |
| Martinez,<br>Margie              | ELL<br>Compliance<br>Specialist | The ESOL Compliance specialist is responsible for testing, identifying and supporting second language learners and maintaining documentation in compliance.<br>Holds meetings and administers assessments to keep ELL students in compliance.<br>Provides support and assistance to teachers on ELL strategies and compliance procedures in the classroom.<br>Holds meetings with parents to keep them informed about their rights and responsibilities having to do with ELL students.<br>Provides intervention support to ELL students.<br>Administer ACCESS assessment to monitor second language acquisition.                                |
| Richards,<br>Erin                | School<br>Counselor             | The counselor works directly with the student population to support, monitor<br>and guide students through life skills. The counselor supports teachers and<br>students who may need assistance with behavioral structures and facilitates<br>support groups. The counselor provides staff with professional development<br>related to working with students and monitors student data and classroom<br>performance. The counselor holds Threat Assessment meetings.   |
| Schofield,<br>Jessica            | Teacher,<br>ESE                 | <ul> <li>-Facilitates and supports data collection activities</li> <li>-Monitor Students With Disabilities Data as part of the ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement</li> <li>-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success</li> <li>-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Ensure practices are in place for the best practices in inclusive education</li> </ul> |

### Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 5/24/2020, Tracey Gibson

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.

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 38

**Total number of students enrolled at the school** 337

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.  $\ensuremath{\$}$ 

**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  |    |    |    |    | Gr | ade | Le | ve | I |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | Κ  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 24 | 64 | 68 | 59 | 61 | 61  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 337   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 15 | 26 | 29 | 22 | 12 | 23  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2  | 6   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 6  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 12 | 20  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 10 | 20  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 11 | 16  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | ade | Le | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7  | 8           | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 22  | 0   | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |  |
| 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

Wednesday 7/20/2022

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

| Indicator  |    |    |    |    | Gr | ade | Le | ve | I |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 24 | 73 | 47 | 69 | 72 | 76  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 361   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6  | 19 | 13 | 13 | 19 | 21  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 4  | 1   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 16  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 10  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| 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  | 6  | 16 | 13 | 24  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                            | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |  |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 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  |       |

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

| Orange - 1141 | - Little River | Elementary - | 2022-23 SIP |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
|---------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|

| Indicator  |    |    |    |    | Gr | ade | Le | ve | I |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | K  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 24 | 73 | 47 | 69 | 72 | 76  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 361   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6  | 19 | 13 | 13 | 19 | 21  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 4  | 1   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 16  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 10  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| 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  | 6  | 16 | 13 | 24  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | de | Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 13  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantan                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 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  |       |

### 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 50%    | 56%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 46%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 65%    |          |       |        |          |       | 45%    | 58%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 50%    |          |       |        |          |       | 45%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 51%    | 46%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 48%    | 63%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 35%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48%    |          |       |        |          |       | 34%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 42%    | 61%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 45%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 43%    | 55%      | -12%                              | 58%      | -15%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | •        |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 42%    | 57%      | -15%                              | 58%      | -16%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -43%   |          |                                   | <b>I</b> |                                |
| 05        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 35%    | 54%      | -19%                              | 56%      | -21%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -42%   |          |                                   | <b>i</b> |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparisor |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 51%    | 62%      | -11%                              | 62%   | -11%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | • • • |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 52%    | 63%      | -11%                              | 64%   | -12%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -51%   |          |                                   | · ·   |                                |
| 05        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 27%    | 57%      | -30%                              | 60%   | -33%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -52%   |          |                                   | • •   |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIENC   | E                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 38%    | 54%      | -16%                              | 53%   | -15%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 13          | 59        | 53                | 13           | 45         | 46                 | 13          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 33          | 66        | 50                | 34           | 57         | 40                 | 31          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 48          | 62        |                   | 48           | 62         |                    | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 49          | 68        | 52                | 47           | 66         | 53                 | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 47          |           |                   | 65           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 46          | 65        | 52                | 45           | 60         | 48                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 4           |           |                   | 4            |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 28          | 35        |                   | 28           | 35         |                    | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 46          |           |                   | 26           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 40          | 42        |                   | 41           | 46         | 30                 | 34          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 37          | 38        | 45                | 31           | 34         | 30                 | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       |             | 23        |                   |              | 23         | 30                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 24          | 31        | 35                | 39           | 48         | 50                 | 13          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 46          | 53        |                   | 52           | 35         |                    | 46          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 43          | 44        | 46                | 47           | 38         | 43                 | 39          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 38          | 41        | 50                | 41           | 32         | 38                 | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |

### 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  | 53   |
| 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 | 55   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 424  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 38   |

Orange - 1141 - Little River Elementary - 2022-23 SIP

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 46  |
| 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                                | 52  |
| 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   |

Orange - 1141 - Little River Elementary - 2022-23 SIP

| White Students   |          |
|--|----------|
| Federal Index - White Students   | 56       |
| 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  | 50       |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 50<br>NO |

### 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?

iReady data in Reading across the school K-5 continued to trend upward from BOY 23%, MOY 42% and EOY 57%. The same occurred in math with an upward trend of BOY 12%, MOY 32% and EOY 48%. Though overall growth occurred, 1st, 2nd, and 5th grade ELA and Math on grade level stayed below the 50% mark. FSA Learning gains in both Reading and Math achievement increased from prior year data; Reading LG 2021-43% to 2022- 65%. Math LG 2021-43% to 2022-63%. The bottom 25% LG subgroup increased in both reading 42% to 50% and math 33% to 48%. Also, science data went up from 40% to 42% but here was a drop of 3% from 2019. PMA data throughout the year reflected this result with PMA 1-36%, PMA 2- 33% and PMA 3- 39% (all students) All students for Science SSS-38%.

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

The data component for core content that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement is Math. Math data on iReady though trending up- BOY 12%, MOY 32% and EOY 48% was still below the 50% mark and started very low. FSA Math data reflected 51% achieving on grade level, up only 3% from 2019 but up 11% from 2021. Raw data including all students for math achievement was 46%.

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

The contributing factors for improvement include the environmental conditions (Pandemic) which created major loss of skills for our students. Another contributing factor is the loss of instruction at the end of the 2019-2020 school year and the different Instructional Models available to students and the changing of those Instructional Models frequently throughout the 2020-2021 school year. Students returned to school with many gaps in their learning. Attendance rates were inconsistent for our students. Those out due to Covid 19 struggled to make up content missed in math. The new actions that will need to be taken to address this need include piloting Symphony Math a computer-based program for grade K-5. Professional development for our instructional staff on the new BEST standards as well as our new state adopted Math textbook will need to occur throughout the year. Also designating a specific time for additional math intervention during the school day will continue to be in each grade levels' daily schedule.

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

Reading showed the most improvement when looking at the three components of 2022 FSA data in comparison to the 2021 data. Reading achievement increased from 44% to 50%. Reading Learning Gains increased from 43% to 65%. Lowest 25% increased from 42% to 50% iReady data increased K-5 from 23% BOY to 58% MOY.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement included ensuring FBS/Enrichment had the materials and personnel to support all of our students. Resource teachers (instructional coach, ESOL Compliance Specialist, Guidance Counselor, Media Specialist) as well as the Assistant Principal were included in the support of this time period to target specific loss of skills to students in need. Groups were flexible and fluid throughout the year. Midway through the year we increased support with Tier One Interventionist positions in second, third, fourth and fifth grade. Progress monitoring became a schoolwide event with iReady minutes and pass rate data posted for students and teachers to see on each week. After school tutoring utilized the Minority Achievement Office Acceleration Framework model of instruction. Second grade was included in our after school tutoring program this year. Read to Succeed tutors were added to help identified First Graders with decoding and vocabulary.

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

We will be implementing a Walk-To Model for Reading Intervention in all grades 1-5 starting in August 2022 and expanding to include Kindergarten in this model in January 2023. This will allow us to strategically intervene for our struggling students as well as to provide enrichment to those students who excel. We will be utilizing the Instructional Coach to support the teachers with the new BEST standards in Reading. Tier One interventionists as well as specific leadership team members will be differentiating instruction during the the reading block and in the FBS intervention time. Strategic placement of students through data analysis for grouping of students for math intervention. We will be utilizing the STEM Coach to support teachers with the new math BEST standards and newly adopted math series. The Tier One Interventionists will help in the differentiating of instruction during the standard math intervention time. The continuation of the Acceleration Model for math during after school tutoring.

# 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.

District and schoolwide professional development for our staff on the new BEST standards as in Reading and Math as well as our new state adopted Math textbook and 3-5 Wonders Reading Curriculum will be provided throughout the year. Grade level PLCs are scheduled to allow teachers time to collaborate on the new standards in both Reading and Math. The district has created a Train the Trainer model- "Best Problem Solvers team " with the STEM Coach attending the trainings to support our teachers with the new math BEST standards. Classroom teachers will be attending virtual professional development on Symphony Math our new computer based math program being piloted in the district.

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

Fully Staffed team of Tier I interventionist from the start of the year in grades 1-5. Read to Succeed tutor in Kg 4 days a week. The UCF SUBstantial Junior Internship pilot will be implemented in partnership with UCF to provide instructional support as well as substitute coverage twice a week which will allow support staff members more time for coaching and mentoring instructional staff.

### Areas of Focus

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

5

| #1. Instruction  | nal Practice specifically relating to ELA  |
|--|--|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale<br>that explains<br>how it was<br>identified as<br>a critical<br>need from<br>the data<br>reviewed. | On the 2022 Florida Standards assessment (FSA), data indicated that 53% of third, fourth<br>and fifth grade students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA-all<br>students raw data). Fifty percent of the lowest 25% were also below grade level.  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should<br>be a data<br>based,<br>objective<br>outcome.         | The 2022 FAST data (Spring 2023) will show at least 58% of the students in 3-5 will be on grade level in ELA. K-2 grade will also show 58% of the students will be on grade level.   |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe<br>how this<br>Area of<br>Focus will<br>be<br>monitored<br>for the<br>desired<br>outcome.  | Progress monitoring will occur with the Fall and Winter administration of the FAST assessment. We will utilize iReady data, SIPPS Mastery Assessments, Core Phonics Survey data, Classroom Walkthrough data, District Standards Based Unit Assessments and K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments. We will monitor the after school tutoring students' data to ensure growth is occurring through the Acceleration Model.   |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:   | Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-<br>based<br>strategy<br>being   | 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 bi-weekly to discuss standards based instruction utilizing the new BEST standards, implementation of instruction, and data analysis of common assessments. Instructional coaches will support and monitor these strategies during weekly PLCs with teachers. Teachers will identify students that are in our ESSA subgroup (Students with Disabilities & English Language Learners) and collaboratively plan specific questions for their Tier 2 & Tier 3 students. Teachers will be |

provided resources to support students and students will receive intervention daily. implemented Teachers will monitor students using research-based resources and make data-driven for this Area decisions as needed. Coaches will work with teachers to incorporate differentiated small of Focus. group instruction to meet the needs of the students and prepare them to answer and analyze scientific questions.

### Rationale for

based

**Evidence-**In reviewing the 2021-2022 Progress Monitoring data for ELA, the rationale for selecting these strategies are to provide teachers with effective strategies to make data-driven Strategy: instructional decisions about student performance from FAST progress monitoring as well Explain the as common assessments.. It is important to have teachers engaged in the continuous rationale for improvement model. When teachers are intentional and analyze their instructional selecting practices, they will present instruction with a focus on student achievement. Teachers will this specific use data from FAST and common assessments to drive instruction of the standards that strategy. were at a deficit. The coaches and teachers will use the data analysis to determine which **Describe the** standards will be incorporated for differentiated small group instruction, intervention, and resources/ tutoring programs. This allows for teachers to provide the necessary support needed to criteria used lessen the deficits of particular standards and fill in any gaps caused by loss of skills due to for selecting pandemic.

### strategy.

this

### Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide professional development opportunities on the new ELA BEST standards and the newly state adopted "Wonders" reading series and FAST assessment to all instructional staff.

### Person

Merrill Stanton (merrill.stanton@ocps.net) Responsible

Strengthen the common planning process through offering extra planning days during the summer and throughout the year.

### Person

Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net) Responsible

MTSS Problem Solving Team will meet regularly to review student academic and behavioral data to ensure that student needs are being identified in order to provide appropriate interventions. Data analysis is routinely part of the meeting process and adjustments are made to interventions based on the team findinas.

The MTSS team will provide professional development on the MTSS process and ESE procedures throughout the year to share best practices and to ensure proper implementation of practices, processes and procedures.

Person Tania Quinones (tania.quinones@ocps.net) Responsible

Enrich the Positive Culture and Environment of our school by including families and the community in our capacity building by providing various family events focused on literacy.

Person Tracey Gibson (tracey.gibson@ocps.net) Responsible

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale<br>that explains<br>how it was<br>identified as<br>a critical<br>need from<br>the data<br>reviewed. | On the 2022 Florida Standards assessment (FSA), data indicated that 53% of third, fourth<br>and fifth grade students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA-all<br>students raw data). Fifty-two percent of the lowest 25% were also below grade level.  |  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should<br>be a data<br>based,<br>objective<br>outcome.         | The 2022 FAST data (Spring 2023) will show at least 58% of the students in 3-5 will be on grade level in Math. K-2 grade will also show 58% of the students will be on grade level.  |  |  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe<br>how this<br>Area of<br>Focus will<br>be<br>monitored<br>for the<br>desired<br>outcome.<br>Person  | Progress monitoring will occur with the Fall and Winter administration of the FAST assessment. We will utilize iReady data, Classroom Walkthrough data, District Standards Based Unit Assessments and Symphony Math data. We will monitor the after school tutoring students' data to ensure growth is occurring through the Acceleration Model.   |  |  |
| responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:   | Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)   |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-<br>based<br>strategy<br>being   | 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 bi-weekly to discuss standards-based instruction utilizing the new BEST standards, implementation of instruction, and data analysis of FAST and common assessments. Instructional coaches will support and monitor these strategies during weekly PLCs with teachers. Teachers will identify students that are in our ESSA subgroup (Students with Disabilities & English Language Learners) and collaboratively plan specific questions for their Tier 2 & Tier 3 students. Teachers will |  |  |

be provided resources to support students and students will receive intervention daily.
 Teachers will monitor students using research-based resources and make data-driven decisions as needed. Coaches will work with teachers to incorporate differentiated small group instruction to meet the needs of the students and prepare them to answer and analyze scientific questions.

#### Rationale for Evidence-

| Evidence-     |   |
|---------------|---|
| based         | In reviewing the 2021-2022 Progress Monitoring data for MATH, the rationale for selecting   |
| Strategy:     | these strategies are to provide teachers with effective strategies to make data-driven      |
| Explain the   | instructional decisions about student performance from FAST, Symphony Math and              |
| rationale for | common assessment results. It is important to have teachers engaged in the continuous       |
| selecting     | improvement model. When teachers are intentional and analyze their instructional            |
| this specific | practices, they will present instruction with a focus on student achievement. Teachers will |
| strategy.     | use data from FAST, Symphony Math and common assessments to drive instruction of the        |
| Describe the  | standards that were at a deficit. The coaches and teachers will use the data analysis to    |
| resources/    | determine which standards will be incorporated for differentiated small group instruction,  |
| criteria used | intervention, and tutoring programs. This allows for teachers to provide the necessary      |
| for selecting | support needed to lessen the deficits of particular standards.                              |
| this          |   |

### strategy.

### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

Provide professional development opportunities on the new Math BEST standards and the newly state adopted "enVision math series to all instructional staff.

### Person

Responsible Barbara Walters-Phillips (barbara.walters-phillips@ocps.net)

Pilot the districts' "Symphony Math" computer based program. Monitor the students' progress through district schedules assessments.

#### Person Barbara Walters-Phillips (barbara.walters-phillips@ocps.net)

Responsible

Enrich the Positive Culture and Environment of our school by including families and the community in our capacity building by providing various family events focused on Math. Additional family events focused on math will be facilitated by our Parent Engagement Liaison throughout the year

Person Responsible

### 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

iReady EOY data showed Kindergarten with 10% not on grade level, 1st grade with 53% scoring below grade level and 2nd grade at 57% below grade level. As our K-2 students lack foundational skills for decoding and encoding, this directly affects their ability to independently comprehend text for understanding and application.

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

FSA 2022 data showed 3rd grade with 54% below grade level and 5th grade with 57% below grade level. Our 3rd-5th grade students have reading gaps and loss of skills due to the previous two years of environmental conditions (pandemic and absences).

### 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)

iReady EOY data showed Kindergarten with 10% of the students not on grade level, 1st grade students with 53% scoring below grade level and 2nd grade students at 57% below grade level. The 2022 FAST data in ELA. K-2 grade will show 58% of the students will be performing on grade level.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

FSA 2022 data showed 3rd grade with 54% of the students below grade level and 5th grade with 57% of the students below grade level. The 2022 FAST data (Spring 2023) will show at least 58% of the students in 3-5 will be performing on grade level.

### 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 will monitor K-3 students with the Core Phonics survey and PAST assessment to help us ensure proper placement in our FBS Walk to Intervention model. FSA Level 1 and 2 students in grades 4 and 5 will also be monitored using the Core Phonics survey at the start of the school year for placement in their FBS groups.

Progress monitoring will occur with the Fall and Winter administration of the ELA FAST assessment. We will utilize iReady Reading data, Classroom Walkthrough data, and the ELA District Standards Based Unit Assessments data. We will monitor the after school tutoring students' data to ensure growth is occurring through the Acceleration Model.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stanton, Merrill, merrill.stanton@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. §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 Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

\*Core Phonics Survey K-3 and 4-5, level 1 and 2 students

\* PAST Assessment K-3

\*Heggerty Phonological Awareness Screener K-2

\*Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions

\*Phonics for Reading Levels 1-3

\*iReady Teacher Tool Box

- \*FAST progress monitoring (PM 1, PM2, PM3)
- \*SIPPS Beginning, Extension and Challenge Levels
- \*Performance Coach
- \*Support Coach

\* Curriculum Associates ELA Magnetic Learning grades 2-5

\*Scholastic Bookroom student book sets and resources K-5

All of these materials are recommended and approved by OCPS as supplementary materials which are aligned to the B.E.S.T Standards.

### 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?

The programs chosen to provide intervention and remediation are all recommended and approved by OCPS as supplementary materials in addition to Wonders to address the B.E.S.T Standards and fill in the educational gaps caused by the interruption of face to face instruction due to the covid pandemic and online instruction.

These programs are proven to help students gain foundational skills in phonemic awareness, which in turn lead to fluency and comprehension. These programs have a record of effectiveness with struggling readers, second language learners and ESE students.

### 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<br>for Monitoring          |
|---|---|
| Literacy Coaching -<br>Instructional Coach will provide training and support on B.E.S.T Standards, Wonders,<br>lesson planning, modeling lessons, and attending Reading PLC's to ensure teachers<br>receive support they need to support all students. A literacy Committee with a member<br>from each grade level will be formed where the team can address issues schoolwide and<br>collaborate to ensure that literacy is being addressed school wide. Literacy nights and<br>literacy events to build capacity with families will also be held throughout the year. | Stanton, Merrill,<br>merrill.stanton@ocps.net |
| Assessment - FAST Assessment and progress monitoring will take place K-5 three times a year. CORE and PAST will be administered to K-2 students and below grade level students to measure foundational skills. iReady Reading assessment will be administered 3 times year to progress monitor. Progress monitoring will take place biweekly and monthly for students receiving intervention.   | Stanton, Merrill,<br>merrill.stanton@ocps.net |
| Professional Learning - Teachers will receive training on the implementation of the B.E.S.T standards. The Wonders reading series as well as the FAST assessment and progress monitoring system to ensure that they are delivering instruction that meets the rigor of the standards and they are continuously monitoring to ensure all students are making gains for learning and achieving.   | Stanton, Merrill,<br>merrill.stanton@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, Little River Elementary is establishing a school wide growth mindset initiative with various activities that help communicate our theme of "Planting Positivity to Grow Success". Little River Elementary will embed life skills into daily practices to strengthen a more positive school culture in order to build student success.

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

School leadership team collaborates with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. The 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. Little River Elementary strategically utilizes the Parent Engagement Liaison and our staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement.