

Orange County Public Schools

# Cheney Elementary



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Cheney Elementary

2000 N FORSYTH RD, Orlando, FL 32807

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Robin Broner**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (66%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

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

## Cheney Elementary

2000 N FORSYTH RD, Orlando, FL 32807

<https://cheneyes.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	81%

### School Grades History

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

### 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
Broner, Robin	Principal	The principal leads the school and ensures all faculty and staff are working towards the school's mission and vision. She conducts formal observations to make sure all instructional employees are implementing the Marzano Instructional Framework. She utilizes data-based decision making to ensure the students are provided a meaningful education. The principal is responsible for ensuring students are provided standards-based and differentiated instruction, as well as intervention services. She facilitates data meetings and school leadership team meetings to discuss student academic progress. The principal regularly communicates with stakeholders regarding the school and students' academic progress.
	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (AP) provides teachers with observations and feedback to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. He is in charge of discipline, facilities and emergency drills at our school and helps create a safe learning and working environment for all staff and students. The AP provides support to students, staff, and parents. This role is monitored through discussions during the leadership team meetings and sharing at PLC meetings.
Wallace, Audrey	Math Coach	Math/Science Coach- Audrey Wallace: Mrs. Wallace oversees the math and curriculum implementation. She attends math and science common planning meetings and completes the coaching cycle. She analyzes data and provides support for students during their math intervention time. Additionally, she leads staff development that pertains to the pedagogy of teachers for math and science content.
Munoz, Heidi	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach ensure grade levels implement the core programs and provide support with identifying and locating supplemental materials. She facilitates weekly reading and math common planning with all grade levels. The coach assists with whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for children considered "at risk." In addition, she assists in the development and implementation of progress monitoring. She routinely participate in the design and delivery of professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding standards-based instruction, planning and lesson implementation. The instructional coach models lessons and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction. The coach is also an integral part of developing common assessments.
DeWitte-Vogt, Ursula	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Quinones serves as the school liaison for ESE. She identifies specific students for ESE testing. She determines students that may need a behavior/ discipline plan, identifies student for 504 plans, identifies students for re-evaluation. She facilitates IEP team meetings with parents and teachers. In addition, she facilitates child study team meetings. Mrs. Quinones also monitors and



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		disaggregates ESE students reading/math data and maintains data and works closely with the school psychologist and school social worker.
Williams, Lakeisha	ELL Compliance Specialist	As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Williams coordinates assessments for English Language Learners, oversees placements and supports in the general education classroom. She is responsible for monitoring and tracking ELL student performance in order to identify trends in instruction. She provides professional development trainings in accountable areas.
Bigio, Charlene	Instructional Media	Ms. Bigio creates a schoolwide love for reading by developing and administering an integrated school library media program. She instructs students and staff in effective use of the media center, information and technology literacy skills, and use of equipment. She teaches literacy skills that are aligned with the standards. She provides leadership and guidance to teachers and students for effective reading strategies Develop knowledge of curriculum in all subject areas. Instruct teachers, administrators, and other staff in the use of new information technologies. Recommends and procures resources for staff for use in meeting their instructional objectives.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/20/2022, Robin Broner

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

35

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

411

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

4

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

5

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	18	27	29	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	8	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	8	0	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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	17	72	62	76	72	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	388
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	13	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	8	19	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

**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	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**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	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	

**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	17	72	62	76	72	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	388
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	13	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	8	19	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

**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	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	56%	56%				53%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						59%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						67%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	46%	50%				69%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						62%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						49%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	61%	59%				55%	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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	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	5			25							
ELL	44	50	18	58	70	73	43				
BLK	45	50		58	78		64				
HSP	48	53	29	58	70	61	38				
WHT	58	56		67	62		79				
FRL	49	52	26	59	69	59	54				

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	21			29							
ELL	44	56	58	61	64		39				
ASN	86			93							
BLK	38	33		40	42		21				
HSP	43	38	50	54	46	29	37				
WHT	57	46		65	57		38				
FRL	42	37	39	49	49	43	36				
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	26	32	33	48	55	42	13				
ELL	43	51	58	64	61	44	45				
BLK	60	80		83	79						
HSP	50	57	66	65	59	48	51				
WHT	47	47		71	58						
FRL	52	60	63	64	57	51	56				

### 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	51

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
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?

Based on data trends our students in the lowest quartile showed a significant decline of 9 percentage points in reading (43% to 34%) from 2020-21 to 2021-22. There was a lack of consistent guided reading that focused on key reading skills. Additionally, implementation and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan was not continuous.

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

According to the 2021-2022 FSA, ELA lowest quartile declined by 9 percentage points (43% to 34%). There was a lack of implementation of best practices for instructional accommodations; to include standards-based instruction, vocabulary, and abstract thinking tasks, and small group instruction. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement a plan for remediation.

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

There was limited implementation of best practices for instructional accommodations; to include standards-based instruction, vocabulary, and abstract thinking tasks. In addition, teachers didn't effectively implement a plan for remediation or enrichment and consistency with the re-teach and reassessment plan.

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

Based on FSA 2021-22 data trends, reading proficiency showed a 6 percentage point gain (47% to 53%), our math proficiency showed a 7 percentage point gain (56% to 63%). Additionally, our math overall gains showed a 21 percentage point gain (49% to 70%) and science proficiency showed a 18 percentage point gain (36% to 54%) improvement. Also our lowest quartile in math showed a 20 percentage point gain (35% to 55%)

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

A strategic action plan was implemented to increase student achievement in reading, math, and science. The action plan encompassed standards-aligned tasks and assessments, and coaching support. Students in the lowest quartile were targeted for intervention and extra instruction in math and reading. Student data was monitored bi-monthly to identify trends and progress. A math intervention time was created to allow



students to productively struggle through math problems. In addition, a re-assessment and re-teach plan was implemented during math instruction consistently. Also, science instruction was targeted based on the most difficult big ideas and a re-teach and reassessment structure was consistently put into place. Students also had the more of an opportunity to have independent practice and struggle time.

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

In order to accelerate learning, purposeful common planning will need to be consistent. Implement a tutoring program that promotes acceleration. Implement standards-aligned tasks and assessments that are rigorous and student-centered. Additionally, implement meaningful reading small group instruction that is based on student needs and skill set.

**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.**

Guided Reading strategies  
 Meaningful literacy centers  
 Math Strategies training (mathematical practices)  
 Data meetings  
 Caring School Community  
 Marzano's Instructional Practices  
 BEST Standards  
 Common Planning (grade level PLC's)

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

We will continue to conduct bi-weekly data chats. In addition, we will also continue to conduct targeted walk-throughs with actionable feedback and implement purposeful professional development.

**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.**

Based on 2021-22 FSA data, the lowest quartile in reading showed a decline by 9 percentage points (43% to 34%).

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students will demonstrate one year of growth resulting in an increase of 10% overall learning gains (43%).

**Monitoring:**

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

The administration will create a weekly monitoring schedule and provide ongoing written actionable feedback that is given to teachers. The administration and school-based leadership team will analyze progress monitoring data bi-weekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identify building trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

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

1. Build background knowledge and foundational skills
2. Frontload academic vocabulary
3. Implement the core skills to utilize academic discourse to answer text-dependent questions: elaborate and clarify, support Ideas with examples, build on and/or challenge a partner's idea, paraphrase, and synthesize conversation points.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Students' analysis of reasoning deepens their understanding of content knowledge and enhances long term retention, decision making, critical thinking and problem solving.

**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.

Action Step 1- Facilitate ongoing professional development focused on the implementation of effective instructional strategies, standards-based instruction, close reading strategies, text-dependent questioning, and morphology.

**Person Responsible**

Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 2- Vocabulary strategies to support all students will be intentionally planned for during common planning. Strategies will include the use of visual representation, oral language, and scaffolds.

**Person Responsible**

Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@ocps.net)

Action Step 3- Implement structured bi-weekly data meetings to track and monitor student progress. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standards and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support subgroups and our ESSA priority.

**Person Responsible** Robin Broner (robin.broner@ocps.net)

Action Step 4- Maintain and monitor the effectiveness of a structured process to be used for interventions, which includes a tracking system to collect consistent data to meet the identified needs of students, aligned to our subgroups and our ESSA priority (students with disabilities).

**Person Responsible** Heidi Munoz (heidi.munoz@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.**

In 2021-22, FSA math data indicated that there was a slight increase in math proficiency (56% to 63%)  
These results demonstrate a need to adjust instructional practices and to implement structured progress monitoring throughout the school. Teachers will effectively integrate mathematical practices to include standards-based instruction, real-world applications, fluency and abstract thinking tasks.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students will continue to demonstrate mastery of math standards resulting in an increase of math overall proficiency to 70 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

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

The administration will create a weekly monitoring schedule and provide ongoing written actionable feedback that is given to teachers. The administration and school-based leadership team will analyze progress monitoring data bi-weekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identify building trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

1. Frontload academic vocabulary
2. Utilize Backward Design Model when planning for math instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

By using the Backward Design Model, teachers will intentionally plan for standards-based instructions. They will also purposefully embed vocabulary throughout instruction and incorporate deeper fluency practices.

**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.

Action Step 1- Implement math small group interventions that include a strategic remediation and reassessment plan for all targeted math standards.

**Person Responsible**

Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Action Step 2- Facilitate weekly common planning with an intense focus on targeted standards-based instruction through the use of collaborative structures and metacognitive strategies.

**Person Responsible**

Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Action Step 3- Implement structured data meetings to track and monitor student progress in math. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support.

**Person Responsible**

Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@ocps.net)

Action Step 4- Students will have opportunities to apply real-world math concepts through rigorous lessons, web simulations, and hands-on math activities. A before and after school math acceleration will be offered. Curriculum will focus on pre-teaching upcoming math standards, vocabulary, and process skills.

**Person Responsible**

Audrey Wallace (audrey.wallace@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**

NA

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

Based on FSA assessment data, 51% of fifth grade students scored below level 3

**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)**

NA

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

Fifth grade students will demonstrate proficiency growth resulting in an increase of eight percentage points (49% to 57%).

**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.

The administration will create a weekly monitoring schedule and provide ongoing written actionable feedback that is given to teachers. The administration and school-based leadership team will analyze progress monitoring data bi-weekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standard and identify building trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Munoz, Heidi, heidi.munoz@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?

1. Build background knowledge and foundational skills
2. Frontload academic vocabulary
3. Implement the core skills to utilize academic discourse to answer text-dependent questions: elaborate and clarify, support Ideas with examples, build on and/or challenge a partner's idea, paraphrase, and synthesize conversation points.

**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?

Students' analysis of reasoning deepens their understanding of content knowledge and enhances long term retention, decision making, critical thinking and problem solving.

**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
Action Step 1- Facilitate ongoing professional development focused on the implementation of effective instructional strategies, standards-based instruction, close reading strategies, text-dependent questioning, and morphology.	Munoz, Heidi, heidi.munoz@ocps.net
Action Step 2- Vocabulary strategies to support all students will be intentionally planned for during common planning. Strategies will include the use of visual representation, oral language, and scaffolds.	
Action Step 3- Implement structured bi-weekly data meetings to track and monitor student progress. The administrators and school-based leadership team will analyze data biweekly with teachers to determine progress toward mastery of the standards and identify school-wide trends. This data will be used to inform and adjust interventions and support subgroups and our ESSA priority.	Munoz, Heidi, heidi.munoz@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, Cheney Elementary will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, we will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through professional develop, we will utilize a common language that encompassess the CASEL Core

Competencies and the Caring School Community curriculum resource school-wide. This will support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect interpersonal and intrapersonal skills to support student success.

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

Our SEL core team will work with the SEL school site team to implement professional learning for school stakeholders. Additionally, teachers will embed and implement the Caring School Community curriculum within their daily instruction. This curriculum will focus on social and emotional learning and provide lessons on diversity and inclusion, empathy and critical thinking, communication, problem solving, and peer relationships. The school counselor will also provide individual, group and class lessons that are geared towards social emotional learning. We will incorporate a SEL corner in monthly family newsletters to involve parents and the community in creating a positive inclusive school culture.