

Orange County Public Schools

Castle Creek Elementary



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

Castle Creek Elementary

1245 N AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

Demographics

Principal: Alyson Muse

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2022

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Castle Creek Elementary

1245 N AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://castlecreekes.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	82%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Berson, Rosemary	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Monitors instruction and data while providing timely and actionable feedback for improving classroom instruction. -Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the school improvement goals -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant and standards based -Common Planning - Supports assigned grade levels
Velazquez, Ruth	Assistant Principal	<p>Supports principal in implementation and monitoring of best practices and coaching teachers to perform to the best of their ability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitors instruction and data and provide timely yet effective feedback for improving classroom instruction. -Discipline -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant and standards based -Common Planning - Supports assigned grade levels -Threat Assessment Team Member -Conducts Observations
Camacho Moody, Maria	Instructional Coach	<p>Provides support for K-5 teachers in all subject areas. Participates in K-5 PLC with student-focused data analysis, lesson planning, and intervention support. Conducts coaching cycles. Provides research-based professional development based on the needs of the school. Provides support for new teachers through the Teacher Induction Program. Testing coordinator</p>
Rosado, Alicia	ELL Compliance Specialist	<p>Ensures ELL compliance and progress monitoring of all ELL data sets while identifying overall trends. Provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers regarding ELL strategies and scaffolds.</p>
Sullivan, Michelle	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success - Facilitates and supports data collection activities - Assists in data analysis - Supports the implementation of Tier I, II and III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP. -Supports ESE students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Craig, Laura	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist monitors the accommodations provided to ESE students and ensures IEPs and 504 plans are up to date and followed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/13/2022, Alyson Muse

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

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

539

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

6

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

7

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	81	66	85	98	85	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	1	12	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	7	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	23	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	17	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	1	1	15	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	

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	1	0	1	12	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
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 7/13/2022

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	68	86	112	100	117	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	9	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	3	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	12	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	68	86	112	100	117	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	9	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	3	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	12	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	53%	56%	56%				55%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						51%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						38%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	59%	46%	50%				59%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						51%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						22%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	61%	59%				61%	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	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
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	26	33	22	45	58	7				
ELL	29	39	46	48	59	55	22				
ASN	73			93							
BLK	48	44	25	50	63	70	42				
HSP	48	56	44	57	57	56	45				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	64	57		64	66		63				
FRL	43	49	39	48	58	58	38				

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	3	20		13	21		8				
ELL	37	62	50	40	38		48				
ASN	100			82							
BLK	48	50		40	50		38				
HSP	40	39	38	38	25	12	38				
MUL	62			62							
WHT	54	41		62	47		65				
FRL	37	38	27	33	18	13	34				
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	5	29	30	14	28	21					
ELL	38	39	31	47	39	15	43				
ASN	95	69		100	62						
BLK	52	51	47	54	43	25	56				
HSP	47	48	39	52	50	21	51				
WHT	65	53	23	66	55		74				
FRL	48	45	43	49	46	25	46				

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	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	43
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trend data indicate an increase across all content areas, in comparison to 2021. ELA's lowest twenty-five percent indicated the lowest increase with 4% and Math's lowest twenty-five percent indicated the highest increase with 38%.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency of the lowest twenty-five percent was 22%, resulting in the lowest performance when compared to 3rd and 5th grade and the lowest cell set overall, for the 2022 FSA. Fifth-grade Math proficiency was lowest at 40% when compared to 3rd and 4th grade.

Within the 2022 data, students with disabilities (SWD) were the only sub-group that fell under the 41% federal index with 32%.

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

The data components that have demonstrated the greatest need for improvement are our lowest 25% in ELA and our SWD subgroup. From 2021 to 2022 SWD has shown an increase in the following area: ELA percent proficiency from 3% to 19%, ELA LG from 20% to 26%, Math prof. from 13% to 22% and Math LG from 21% to 48%. However, this is the only subgroup that has fallen under the 41% federal index threshold, by having 32%.

5th ELA was the lowest percentage proficiency with 48% and 4th grade lowest twenty-five percent with 22% learning gains. Fifth-grade math proficiency is another area in need of improvement, with only 40% of students receiving proficiency.

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

Contributing factors for this need for improvement are that students were not provided a universal screener at the start of the school year and were not leveled for intervention support. In addition to not having a running MTSS structure and administration not having a schedule for frequent instructional walks.

For this school year, all students are taking both an ELA and Math universal screener. They will then be structured into intervention groups and tiered for support. Each grade level will have an ELA walk-to model of intervention support with a content specialist focusing on the lowest 25%. Students will be aggressively tracked and moved accordingly, based on our 3-week MTSS data analysis cycle. In math intervention, upon the completion of the math screener, students will be grouped accordingly and

teachers will be given focus areas within an instructional focus calendar of lessons to address specific gaps and foundational needs. The teacher table will be targeted around the focus areas and the other rotational stations will be at the student individual level, with a focus on their areas in need of improvement. This is in addition to an instructional walkthrough schedule for school administration.

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

The data component, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement was math. With math proficiency increasing by 13% and learning gains by 27% and learning gains of the lowest twenty-five percent by 38%, in comparison to the 2021 FSA data.

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

A contributing factor was the implementation of content-specific support within the math intervention block. Fourth grade had the biggest focus of support, with an ability grouped structure that resulted in 70% math proficiency, 80% math LG and 57% LG of the lowest 25%; the highest percentages in the entire school's FSA data. This grade level also had IFC focused on specific skills for math intervention. As a result of the success of last year, this practice will be implemented school-wide.

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

Strategic and aggressive data collection with a quick turnaround of utilizing the data analysis to restructure student groupings and support, based on trends. Effective implementation of the new B.E.S.T. benchmarks and best practices of instructional implementation. Targeted engagement supports. Implementation of flexible and fluid collaborative group structures. Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded support. Collaboration between professionals to increase student success for ESE and non-ESE students and improved targeted support for ELLs. 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.

Professional development on effective math intervention strategies and reading foundational practices. Teachers will also learn data analysis and the next steps for effective implementation of strategies to support areas needing improvement. In addition to professional learning on B.E.S.T. benchmarks, instructional best practices, student engagement (not limited to Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures), and behavior de-escalation strategies.

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

An effective MTSS data collection and analysis structure. In addition to the strategic implementation of support for foundational gaps in both ELA and math. To further ensure sustainability we will intentionally plan for our areas of focus and strategically target specific subgroups. We will collaborate with teachers to develop action plans to address areas of need and will monitor for the fidelity of implementation and the effectiveness of the plan. Teachers will be provided with actionable feedback to assist them in enriching their instructional practice. We will utilize Tier 1 Interventionists to provide additional and more targeted support in reading and math.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and**

Rationale: ELA's lowest twenty-five percent indicated the lowest increase with 4% when compared to 2021 FSA data. Fourth grade ELA proficiency of the lowest twenty-five percent was 22%, resulting in the lowest performance when compared to 3rd and 5th grade and the lowest cell set overall, for the 2022 FSA. While 5th ELA was the lowest percentage proficiency with 48%. This focus area will include a strategic approach to SWD, as it's our only subgroup that fell below the federal index.

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

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 55% on the 2018-2019 FSA state-wide test to 47% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 53% 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test, the school plans to increase ELA Proficiency to 60% on the ELA state assessment and 41% for SWD.

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

We will monitor through:

- Formative assessments
- District Standards-based Unit Assessments
- The district suggested progress monitoring i-Ready diagnostic
- SIPPS Mastery Assessments
- Classroom Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rosemary Berson (rosemary.berson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in intermediate grades to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. In order to adequately monitor and analyze data, we will utilize the Castle Creek data item analysis spreadsheet to determine the greatest deficits based upon benchmarks, have data-driven discussions within PLCs, and analyze instructional practices specific to small group instruction by providing coaching cycles for identified teachers with consistent monitoring and feedback across grade levels. Teachers will be provided opportunities during PLCs to adjust their instruction to improve student learning, plan for misconceptions, and enhance instructional

implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>decision-making. Coaches will work with teachers to incorporate benchmark-aligned small group instruction, including comprehension and foundational skills.</p> <p>Intentionally planning, implementing, and monitoring, a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for reading in grades Kindergarten through fifth.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	<p>The strategy above was selected because there is strong evidence to support the fact that teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers. 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 benchmarks and address deficiency. 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 on the current data analysis.</p> <p>Implementing the MTSS process with fidelity for reading will help to address to lessen the gaps in learning for SWD. With the guidance and support of our Staffing Specialist and MTSS coordinator, staff will be able to select appropriate and effective resources to implement. The staff will be able to monitor for improvement and consistently use data to inform their decision-making.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Professional Development - of B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and training for Intervention team and instructional paras.
- Planning: Common planning, meet bi-weekly to analyze the data and share/explain best practices for small group instruction, intervention walk to model support, and the support of the leadership team.
- Monitoring: within the MTSS process, use diagnostic data to place students in research-based supplemental reading intervention programs and observe small group instruction weekly based upon the data analysis of deficit benchmarks.
- Provide teacher feedback: Meaningful and actionable feedback on a continuous bases
- Provide teachers with additional resources to support our ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Person Responsible Maria Camacho Moody (maria.camachomoody@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Math lowest twenty-five percent indicated the lowest increase with 4% when compared to 2021 FSA data. From 2021 to 2022 SWD has shown an increase in Math prof. from 13% to 22% and Math LG from 21% to 48% but is the only subgroup that has fallen under the 41% federal index threshold, by having 32%.

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

Based on the Math Proficiency data of 59% on the 2018-2019 FSA state-wide test to 46% on the 2020-2021 FSA state-wide test to 59% 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test, the school plans to increase Math Proficiency to 70% on the Math state assessment and 41% for SWD.

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

We will monitor through:
 -Formative assessments
 -District Standards-based Unit Assessments
 -The district suggested progress monitoring i-Ready placement
 -Symphony Math diagnostic assessments
 -Classroom Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rosemary Berson (rosemary.berson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other students who need math fluency to understand place value and foundational math skills. In order to adequately monitor and analyze data, we will utilize the Castle Creek data item analysis spreadsheet to determine the greatest deficits based upon benchmarks, have data-driven discussions within PLCs, and analyze instructional practices specific to small group instruction by providing coaching cycles for identified teachers with consistent monitoring and feedback across grade levels. Teachers will be provided opportunities during PLCs to adjust their instruction to improve student learning, plan for misconceptions, and enhance instructional decision-

implemented for this Area of Focus.	making. Coaches will work with teachers to incorporate benchmark-aligned small group instruction, including targeted math foundational skill intervention groups. Intentionally planning, implementing, and monitoring, a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for math in grades Kindergarten through fifth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Using math data to drive instruction will track progress towards the school's goals. Utilizing iReady as a screener and indicator for instructional grouping allows the grade levels to create fluid groups of intervention based on student needs. Symphony will be used to plan math fluid daily math interventions lesson. We will utilize PLC time to disaggregate data in order to inform our instruction. This will ensure students are successful and demonstrate growth. Implementing the MTSS process with fidelity for math will help to address to lessen the gaps in learning for SWD. With the guidance and support of our Staffing Specialist and MTSS coordinator, staff will be able to select appropriate and effective resources to implement. The staff will be able to monitor for improvement and consistently use data to inform their decision-making.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Professional Development - of B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and training for Intervention team and instructional paras.
- Planning: Common planning, meet bi-weekly to analyze the data and share/explain best practices for small group instruction, intervention small groups, and the support of the leadership team.
- Monitoring: within the MTSS process, use diagnostic data to place students in research-based supplemental math intervention programs and observe small group instruction weekly based upon the data analysis of deficit benchmarks.
- Provide teacher feedback: Meaningful and actionable feedback on a continuous bases
- Provide teachers with additional resources to support our SWD students.

Person Responsible Maria Camacho Moody (maria.camachomoody@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

Historically, students who are one or more grade levels behind on progress monitoring assessments and on the End-of-Year iReady diagnostic, continue to struggle in intermediate grades. In the primary grades, students learn to read while in the intermediate grades, they read to learn. Without the foundational skills, students cannot become fluent readers. Based on the EOY iReady ELA Diagnostic, 33% of Kindergarten students were performing below grade level. Thirty-seven percent of first graders were one grade level behind, and seventeen percent of the second graders scored 2 or more grade levels below. Fifty-one percent of our second graders scored one grade level below. Our lowest performing readers were in second grade, with 47% scoring at least one grade level below on the EOY iReady Reading Diagnostic. An area of instructional practice we will implement will be developing an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. We will also continue to support our readers by teaching them to decode words and analyze word parts.

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

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA, only fifth-three percent of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient or higher. In fifth grade, 49% scored a Level 3 or higher on the FSA. Learning gains of the lowest twenty-five percent in fourth grade were the lowest among the tested grades, with only 22% of students demonstrating learning gains.

Based on the EOY iReady Reading Diagnostic, 80% of fifth grades were at least one or more grade levels below. Our biggest area of focus in the intermediate grades is Tier one instruction for ELA, especially in fifth grade's lowest twenty-five percent. We will support our readers by building upon their decoding skills in order to read complex multisyllabic words.

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)

Sixty percent of students in grades K-2 will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 3 for ELA. Additional assessments will also be considered.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Sixty percent of students in grades three through five will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 3 for ELA. Common assessments will also be considered.

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.

Areas of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways.

- Weekly walkthroughs with feedback will be conducted by the administration.
- Common Assessment day will be monitored after each unit.
- Tier two data and reteach data will be monitored bi-weekly.
- Tier three data will be monitored on a weekly basis.
- Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and learning community leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Berson, Rosemary, rosemary.berson@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?

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, the district's k-12 comprehensive evidence-based reading plan and aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks -

- Haggerty - Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters;
- SIPPS- Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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?

See A above

Consider that the below use the above Practice guide strategies meet ESSA strong level of evidence:

-use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)

-Heggerty (Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)

-SIPPS (Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. And Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership Teams</p> <p>Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.</p>	
<p>Literacy Coaching</p> <p>Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc... to fit area(s) of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.</p>	
<p>Assessment</p> <p>Use and analysis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -FAST -iReady diagnostic -Haggerty Assessments -District created Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -The district created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades K-2) <p>Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Berson, Rosemary, rosemary.berson@ocps.net</p>
<p>Professional Learning</p> <p>Schools develop their professional learning plans based on the needs of their schools. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options available include literacy coach meetings, Coach B.E.S.T. Book study, K-5 ELA Impact Series.</p>	

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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 of authentic family engagement among school staff.

Students will be taught to put school-wide CHAMPS and Zones of Regulation guidelines into action. We will keep parents informed of student responsibility via dojo, newsletters, and phone/all calls. The importance of teaching and re-teaching the expectations will remain ongoing throughout the school year, with character education, Safety Matters Lessons, classroom and campus individualized lessons, small group social skills training, a quarterly review of the Code of Student Conduct, and social-emotional reminders and tips on morning announcements.

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

Principal- shapes the culture and communicates the mission and vision of the school to all stakeholders, and create norms that build values

School staff- provide an environment that is safe, supportive, encouraging, challenging but inviting for students, and engage students in daily SEL lessons

Parents- encourage and motivate children to do well in school, provide feedback, and participate in school activities

Community members- establish a presence within the school and provide resources to students and families