Wolf Lake Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wolf Lake Elementary

1771 W PONKAN RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://wolflakees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Tamara Barton

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (64%)
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

Wolf Lake Elementary

1771 W PONKAN RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://wolflakees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

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

Wolf Lake Elementary is proud to be of service to the parents and students of the Apopka community. Our mission is to create a passionate and supportive environment where our students are provided with exceptional educational experiences as a result of dedicated and innovative teachers delivering a rigorous curriculum through engaging lessons and experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure every student has a promising and successful future while being a recognized leader in elementary education and a source of pride within our community and Orange County Public Schools.

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
Barton-Buggs, Tamara	Principal	
Wolfe, Wendy	Assistant Principal	
Jules, Deborah	Reading Coach	
Torrance, Beverly	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Tindell, Marlena	Curriculum Resource Teacher	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 8/21/2022, Tamara Barton

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.*
4

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
53

Total number of students enrolled at the school
722

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
19

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

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	101	115	107	125	114	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	1	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	1	6	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	12	128	149	168	180	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	796
Attendance below 90 percent	5	10	19	10	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	1	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	12	128	149	168	180	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	796
Attendance below 90 percent	5	10	19	10	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	64%	56%	56%				70%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						67%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						54%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	74%	46%	50%				77%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						68%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						55%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	61%	59%				75%	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	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%	
Cohort Comparison		-63%					
05	2022						
	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%	
Cohort Comparison		-67%					

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	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	63%	18%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	53%	21%
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	10	27	25	31	50	43	19				
ELL	34	44		55	78	62	64				
BLK	58	53	24	66	69	60	53				
HSP	54	64	50	67	78	61	61				
MUL	70	80		74	60						
WHT	72	71	42	81	75	55	81				
FRL	48	59	37	57	75	61	60				
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	19	43	47	20	33	33	15				
ELL	44	60		42	67		36				
ASN	81			94							
BLK	54	52	47	47	52	53	39				
HSP	62	66	50	55	58	54	53				

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
MUL	79			79							
WHT	77	79	53	81	80	64	81				
FRL	58	58	48	51	54	50	46				

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	19	35	34	33	53	46	26				
ELL	51	62	50	63	76	65	63				
ASN	94	90		94	80						
BLK	56	61	55	64	58	43	59				
HSP	66	65	51	70	69	65	67				
MUL	82	70		82	70						
WHT	78	71	53	86	73	60	89				
FRL	53	61	53	60	62	51	55				

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	66
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	64
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	71
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	68
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	60
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?

Our Students with Disabilities demonstrated decreases in proficiency, learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains on the 2022 ELA FSA. Overall, grades 3 - 5 on ELA FSA also demonstrated decreases in proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile learning gains.

Both math and science scores demonstrate an increase in proficiency and learning gains for students in grades 3-5 and our students with disabilities. .

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

Reading proficiency and learning gains for our students in grades 3-5 and students with disabilities is the area of greatest need for improvement.

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 the decrease in reading proficiency and learning gains are a lack of consistency with tier one small group instruction and providing effective tier 2 reading interventions with fidelity.
In order to increase the level of proficiency in reading across grade levels and students with disabilities, an ongoing series of professional development with a focus on tier one small group instruction will be facilitated. Teachers have been tiered for coaching support as part of the coaching cycle with a focus on research-based instructional practices and progress monitoring.
Tier 2 reading interventions have been streamlined and coaches are providing ongoing support and training. In addition, the Multi Tiered System of Support process now includes scheduled reviews to assure that students are being monitored and adjustments made to interventions as needed.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement are math proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains for the lowest quartile for both students in grades 3-5 and our subgroup, students with disabilities. In addition, Science proficiency for grade 5 and students with disabilities have shown improvement.

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

The contributing factors that resulted in an increase on the Math FSA were effective instructional practices within the Math lesson delivery. Teachers facilitated bi-weekly data chats with students. In addition, leadership team members facilitated small groups to provide intensive intervention support for our lowest quartile students. Ongoing professional development with a focus on math instructional practices was the focus on the school-wide professional development plan for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

In order to accelerate learning, tier one small groups will need to be implemented with fidelity for all Math classrooms. Enrichment instruction will need to be provided for those students that are at or above grade level. Differentiation of instruction for all levels will be a focus for the 2022-2023 school year.

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.

In order to support teachers with accelerating learning, professional development will need to be provided on how to effectively differentiate instruction to meet student needs and on planning and implementing effective tier one small group lessons across subject areas.

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

An additional service that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement is providing support to teachers to analyze data in order to adjust their instruction and provide effective interventions based on individual student needs.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the FSA 2021-2022 ELA results, 29 % of our SWD subgroup were proficient. This has been the fourth year of SWD falling below the 41% acceptable state percentage. This area is a critical need of attention and support. Reading will be of focus for our SWD subgroup this year. Providing professional development for General Ed and ESE teachers will be vital as well as ensuring that effective interventions are in place and conducted with fidelity to increase the reading levels of all SWD students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	For the year 2022-2023, it is expected that our SWD will increase from 29% to 45% proficiency on the state standardized ELA assessment (FAST).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring the progress of SWD in ELA will consists of classroom walkthroughs in general education and ESE classrooms, monitoring FAST PM1 and PM 2 data, student common and summative assessments, and IEP meeting/notes on a daily and weekly basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	In order to increase achievement of SWD, there will be an increased focus on effective Tier one instructional strategies in all classrooms. Aligning the instruction within the Special Education classroom to the students' IEP goals will help focus on closing learning achievement gaps for Students with Disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale for selecting these strategies is the observed need for SWD to increase in learning achievement in Reading. Classroom walkthrough data, classroom assessment data, progress monitoring data, and review of student IEP's identified the need to focus on direct and differentiated tier one instruction for SWD.

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 will have a focus on small group differentiated instruction and effective tier one instructional strategies.

Person Responsible   Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

Conduct classroom walkthroughs with a focus on aligning Tier One instruction with SWD IEP goals.

Person Responsible   Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

Conduct bi-weekly data chats with general education and ESE teachers to review student progress.

Person Responsible   Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on the 2021-2022 FSA results for students in grades 3-5, our proficiency, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile show a decrease. The proficiency decreased from 68% to 64%. Learning gains decreased from 68% to 66% and the learning gains of the lowest quartile decreased from 49% to 40%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	For the year 2022-2023, it is expected that our students in grades 3-5 will increase from 64% to 75% proficiency on the state standardized ELA assessment (FAST).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitoring the progress of proficiency in ELA will consist of classroom walkthroughs, monitoring FAST PM1 and PM2 data, and student common and summative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	In order to increase proficiency in ELA, there will be an increased focus on effective Tier one instructional strategies in all classroom as well as implementation of effective tier 2 interventions with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The rationale for selecting these strategies is the observed need for students in grades 3-5 to increase in learning achievement in Reading. Classroom walkthrough data, classroom assessment data, and progress monitoring data identified the need to focus on direct and differentiated tier one instruction for reading.

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 will have a focus on small group differentiated instruction and effective tier one instructional strategies.

Person Responsible	Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

Conduct bi-weekly data chats with teachers to review student progress.

Person Responsible	Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

Conduct classroom walkthroughs with a focus on instructional practices and monitoring of student comprehension.

Person Responsible	Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@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, WLES will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning that will focus on social and emotional learning. Through a distributive leadership model, schools will use CASEL Core Competencies to create equitable learning environments while strengthening students' emotional development. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use this as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

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

A core team of teachers and administrators from our school, which includes our mental health designee, will attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team will then work with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for our school's stakeholders, based on our school and community needs. The School's SEL leadership team will collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council and the House Council to reflect on implementation and determine best practices. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through continuous conversations with parents via the SAC, PTO and school events.