Shingle Creek Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Shingle Creek Elementary

5620 HARCOURT AVE, Orlando, FL 32839

https://shinglecreekes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Bernadette Jaster

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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

Shingle Creek Elementary

5620 HARCOURT AVE, Orlando, FL 32839

https://shinglecreekes.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	97%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to 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
Schafer, Jennifer	Psychologist	
Palencia, Zoraida	Reading Coach	Ms. Palencia's role as an ELA coach is to promote and model best practices in ELA instruction. During weekly PLC's, she creates a collaborative environment focusing on data analysis, standards based instruction and best practices in order to build teachers pedagogical skills. Ms. Palencia offers daily support to classroom teachers by coaching, modeling and providing on the spot actionable feedback. She provides staff with ongoing professional development focusing on effective instructional ELA strategies and collaborates with the MTSS coach in order to ensure all students are provided either enrichment or intervention support.
Reyes, Joyce	Instructional Coach	Ms. Reyes is the Math Coach for grades K-5, as well as the Instructional Coach for Grades 3-5. As a Math Coach Ms. Reyes supports standards-based planning, assists in facilitating hands-on and engaging instruction, provides ongoing actionable feedback for teachers and monitors science data school-wide. Ms. Siegel also facilitates weekly PLC meetings in which she is able to provide teachers with professional development in science instruction. As an Instructional Coach, Ms. Reyes provides teachers with coaching, guidance and support in best practices for instruction. She works with teachers to set goals designed to help develop and monitor growth of their pedagogy and practice.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/22/2022, Bernadette Jaster

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.*

3

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

733

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.

12

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	132	94	99	108	123	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	679
Attendance below 90 percent	15	37	32	37	27	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	47	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	46	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
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	0	3	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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

Monday 8/22/2022

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	89	94	113	112	103	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	38	33	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	2	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	89	94	113	112	103	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	38	33	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	2	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	38%	56%	56%				39%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						53%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						51%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	46%	50%				53%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						50%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						49%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	61%	59%				47%	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	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	63%	-10%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	57%	-21%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	53%	-11%
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	13	46	38	23	64	67	8				
ELL	39	58	41	46	59	63	48				
BLK	34	57	52	43	69	70	47				
HSP	42	55	40	47	61	65	46				
FRL	39	57	45	45	68	66	47				
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	20		29	20		18				
ELL	26	35	35	31	28	57	31				
BLK	37	40	50	38	23	55	36				
HSP	28	37	17	33	35	63	35				
FRL	32	40	33	36	24	60	35				
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	21	46	53	40	51	47	33				
ELL	35	56	48	50	52	53	42				
BLK	36	52	52	53	47	50	53				
HSP	41	54	50	52	50	51	43				
WHT	67	50		73	60						
FRL	39	52	54	53	48	47	51				

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	52
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	53
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	50
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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?

In all areas assessed, the school experienced having increases in proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25%.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in ELA.

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

Shingle Creek has a high ESOL population. Language acquisition is a contributing factor to ELA proficiency.
Teachers will provide direct instruction to meet skills lacking in foundational skills.

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

The most improvement was shown in the Math learning gains.

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

Strategic support was provided to students in Math.

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

Students will be offered acceleration instruction during school and during after school tutoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will attend IMPACT trainings as part of ongoing professional development.

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

Students will be offered before and after school tutoring, Spring Break instruction and Summer instruction.
Additional support will be provided by intervention teachers.

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.**	When looking at subgroup data, it is evident that we must take a closer look at core instruction in all content areas for our students with disabilities. In ELA, Math and Science, our SWD population scored at least ten points lower than any other subgroup population. In order to support these students, we must continue to improve our MTSS process and track the progress of identified students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	As we continue to look at all aspects of the achievement gap at Shingle Creek Elementary, our goal is to increase ELA proficiency of Students with Disabilities by 10%, from 13% to 23%, and to increase Science proficiency by 40% from 8% to 48%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	School administration will be responsible for monitoring all action steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Schafer (jennifer.schafer@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The strategy for improvement will be two fold. First, teachers will be supported in all phases of the planning process by school leadership. Then, within the planning process, school leadership with guide teachers to effectively embed cooperative learning structures that support student engagement. All these components combine to support the development of a well-rounded student, regardless of their skin color, language spoken or financial situation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Cooperative learning strategies such as Kagan Structures, provide positive outcomes for students including increased achievement, improved social skills and relations and improved classroom climate.
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.	
Teachers will implement SIPPS as part of reading intervention.	
Person Responsible	Zoraida Palencia (zoraida.palencia@ocps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Social and emotional development will continue to be a focus for the 2022-23 school year. We have embedded into the professional development of teachers to build and establish a school-wide culture with embedded social and emotional learning at our school for adults and students which will include SEL training focused on the CASEL core SEL competencies and linking them to a safe learning environment for both staff and students that allows for a focus on academic achievement. Based on the Early Warning indicators, one of the biggest impactors to student achievement continues to be student attendance so this will continue to be a focus.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will continue to promote a safe learning environment for all students with a continued focus on achievement.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Health/SEL lesson plans, professional development implementation, attendance and truancy data, parent/community involvement data for PEL events related to the goals and classroom walk trend data will all be used to help monitor the progress towards meeting the goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Schafer (jennifer.schafer@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Using distributive leadership and social and emotional learning through PD to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration, we will continue to build expertise and self-competence in the areas of the five CASEL SEL competencies (self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision making, relationship skills and social awareness). As a part of these practices, we will continue to implement opportunities for increased parent and family involvement. Truancy policies will be followed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to provide social awareness and build relationships skills (CASEL SEL interpersonal competencies). Family training and involvement will provide a school-to-home connection and recognition will build extrinsic motivation that can be scaffolded to intrinsic motivation tied to

academic achievement (CASE interpersonal competencies).

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.

School administration will be responsible for monitoring all action steps.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Schafer (jennifer.schafer@ocps.net)

Implementation of Caring School Community, including morning meetings, closing circles, learning buddies, and character lessons

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

Teachers in K-2 will implement Orton Gillingham daily as part of the Reading/ELA block.

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

Teachers in grades 3-5 will focus on small group, differentiated instruction during the 120 hour Reading block.

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)

Shingle Creek students in K-2 will show 10% growth from the beginning of the year STAR assessment to the end of the year STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Shingle Creek ELA proficiency as measured on the FAST assessment will increase by 10% from 38% during the 2021-22 school year, to 48% for the 2022-23 school year.

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 Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, MTSS meetings, data meetings, lesson plan review and coaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Palencia, Zoraida, zoraida.palencia@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

These practices are evidence based and meet Florida's definition of evidence based. They align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence based Reading plan. These practice align to the BEST ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

These evidence based practices address the identified ELA deficiency.

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
In the area of Literacy Coaching, teachers will receive ongoing Literacy Coaching by the leadership team.	Palencia, Zoraida, zoraida.palencia@ocps.net
Teachers will analyze assessment data on an ongoing basis and make adjustments to instruction accordingly.	Palencia, Zoraida, zoraida.palencia@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, the school 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, the school will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team
dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional

learning, the school use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support
a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support
student success. A core team of teachers and administrators, which includes a mental
health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works
with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for
school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with
stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and
determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district
programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge
the community and school culture.

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

During the 2022-23 school year, Shingle Creek Elementary will be a Caring School Community. Every staff
member will be part of Morning Meetings with classrooms. Everyone has a crucial role in promoting a
positive culture and environment at the school.