

Orange County Public Schools

Wedgfield School



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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wedgefield School

3835 BANCROFT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32833

<https://wedgefieldk8.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Pritts

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
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: A (72%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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	N/A
* 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wedgefield School

3835 BANCROFT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32833

<https://wedgefieldk8.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)
Combination School PK-8	No	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Longhouse, Randall	Principal	<p>Provides a common vision for the use of databased decision-making. - Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. - Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. - Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. - 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. - Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities</p>
Vanmali, Ranji	Instructional Coach	<p>Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met. - Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies. - Facilitates grade level common planning. - Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. - Provides support and assistance to teachers</p>
Gutzmore, Cheyenne	Instructional Coach	<p>Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met. - Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies. - Facilitates grade level common planning. - Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. - Provides support and assistance to teachers</p>
Osteen, Mary	School Counselor	<p>Provide assistance and support of implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. - Provides counseling and support to students in need</p>
Lark, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<p>Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met. - Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies. - Facilitates grade level common planning. - Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. - Provides support and assistance to teachers</p>
Markley, Christine	Assistant Principal	<p>Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Develops documents to monitor data and</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

address areas of need. - Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. - Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. - Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. - Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Matthew Pritts

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.*

2

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

890

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

8

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

8

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	75	90	92	111	94	113	106	102	103	0	0	0	0	886
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	8	11	11	9	14	12	9	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	3	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	11	1	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	23	12	12	24	20	0	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	21	8	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	8	3	0	0	0	0	20

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/17/2022

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	76	94	94	90	115	103	100	84	102	0	0	0	0	858
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	13	12	21	12	10	8	19	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	10	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	9	10	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	76	94	94	90	115	103	100	84	102	0	0	0	0	858
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	13	12	21	12	10	8	19	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	10	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	9	10	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	62%	57%	55%				64%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						52%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						42%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	70%	41%	42%				64%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	78%						61%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%						48%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	71%	57%	54%				62%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	63%	59%				79%	74%	78%

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	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2022					
	2019	60%	52%	8%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
07	2022					
	2019	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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	63%	63%	0%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2022					
	2019	36%	43%	-7%	55%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	36%	23%	46%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	64%	54%	10%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	49%	8%	48%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	80%	66%	14%	71%	9%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%

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	16	33	28	37	67	72	26	45			
ELL	33	54	48	46	74	65	20				
ASN	71			92							
BLK	63	64	50	64	75		67				
HSP	56	58	47	65	77	78	64	85	81		
MUL	67	82		78	75						
WHT	64	60	49	72	78	84	75	81	93		
FRL	51	57	48	59	76	80	62	73	87		
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	12	41	40	17	43	44	21	40			
ELL	18	30	31	23	30	14					
BLK	60	48		57	45		67				
HSP	49	49	46	47	48	42	47	77	83		
MUL	63	70		56	70						
WHT	62	52	44	64	52	53	64	79	86		
FRL	46	45	44	48	49	48	49	63	88		
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	11	35	35	27	43	42	10	23			
ELL	35	44	53	36	52	38	40				
ASN	77	73		69	91						
BLK	68	45	50	63	64	36	71	69	92		
HSP	52	48	43	56	56	42	49	59	81		
MUL	50	57		69	50						
WHT	68	54	43	67	62	52	65	85	90		
FRL	52	48	46	54	56	41	52	71	88		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	695

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	82
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	64
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	67
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	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	73
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	65
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?

ELA Achievement is 62% for the school, with only one outlier of 77%. Math learning gains were strong at 78% and in lowest quartile of 82%.

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

ELA Achievement and ELA LG of lowest 25%; Math achievement in middle school courses

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

Curriculum resource choices that are tightly aligned to new benchmarks and are appropriately rigorous; small group instruction to students in lowest quartile.

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

Math Learning Gains increased by 27 points, and Math Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile increased by 39 points.

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

Increased rigor of instructional materials; increased opportunities for student practice; increased small group instruction

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

Differentiation and incorporation of digital resources.

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.

Collaborative structures, Core Connections Writing, Modeling and assisting with centers implementation

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

Consistent and systemic focus on student achievement and vetting of instructional resources in PLCs; student outcomes monitored and adjustments made as needed.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

More than half of our students in the lowest quartile (52%) did not demonstrate a year's worth of academic growth based off prior year FSA ELA score (e.g. learning gain).

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

75% of students in our lowest quartile will meet the ELA typical growth target by measuring growth from the beginning i-Ready diagnostic to the end of year diagnostic.

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

Student performance on unit assessments will be monitored as well as mid-year diagnostic results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

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

Students in the lowest quartile in ELA will receive increased opportunities for small group instruction, targeted writing support, and participate in tutoring.

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

Student achievement is positively impacted by appropriately rigorous small-group instruction.

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.

Students will be celebrated as they make progress toward their individual targets through parties and opportunities to shop at our school store.

Person Responsible

Christine Markley (christine.markley@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.

Student achievement in our middle school math courses was less than in our elementary grade levels. 58% of students in middle school math courses scored Level 3+ on FSA.

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

70% of our students in middle school math courses will achieve proficiency on statewide year-end assessment.

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

Student outcomes on unit assessments and statewide progress monitoring assessments will be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

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

Backwards design planning process from culminating assessment through the preceding lessons will be implemented to ensure lessons and student practice opportunities are appropriately aligned and rigorous and plentiful.

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

Student achievement is positively impacted when students have ample practice opportunities to demonstrate what they know, and when teachers can provide targeted feedback on-the-spot to address misconceptions.

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.

Students will earn incentives and be rewarded for their achievement and growth on common unit assessments and statewide assessments.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

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

n/a

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. 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?

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

n/a

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

School stakeholders are surveyed and two-way communication occurs throughout the year to identify areas for growth and to collaborate on ways to create and maintain a positive school culture. We recognize and celebrate teachers, students, and staff members, and invite members of the community in to share on these occasions. Teacher and staff input is sought when making decisions for the school, and SAC and FAC provide opportunities for voices to be heard.

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

Faculty, staff, parents, students and community members all have a voice and are all important members of our school community. Through a shared sense of purpose and values, we collaborate on maintaining a positive school culture that is focused on student success and the social-emotional well-being of students and staff.