

Orange County Public Schools

Aloma Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.ocps.net

Demographics

Principal: Donald Vega

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2017

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)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.ocps.net

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>78%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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 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
Vega, Donald	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups
Compton, Emily	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff -Supports MTSS through PLC team collaboration while leading teachers to a common goal of student achievement -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities -Discipline -Develops documents necessary to manage and display data that addresses areas of focus identified in the SIP -Monitors classroom walk-through frequency and pinpoints areas of support with the leadership team for coaching - Assists with school screening programs that provide appropriate, evidence-based intervention and differentiated teaching strategies
Engler, Nicole	Staffing Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Serves as the school liaison for ESE -Identifies specific students for ESE testing -Determines students that may need a behavior/discipline plan -Identifies students for evaluation -Facilitates IEP team meetings with parents and teachers -Monitors and disaggregates ESE students reading/math data and maintains data and works closely with the school psychologist and school social worker -Monitors compliance regarding the development and implementation of IEP plans: as well as remains informed of current policies and procedures as they relate to students with disabilities.
Meredith, Morgan	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides a developmental, systematic comprehensive program addressing the academic, career, and interpersonal/social needs of all students -In partnership with other educators, parents, and the community, the guidance counselor ensures that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to become effective students, responsible citizens, productive workers, and lifelong learners -Measures student competencies in the areas of academic and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interpersonal/ social development -Monitors student progress, identifies opportunities for improvement each year based on results data -Shares successes of the program with stakeholders -Integral member of the school SEL team providing site based professional development.
Thornburgh, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and data driven instruction -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA and Math Plan -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Supports the implementation and documentation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP; supports common planning -Facilitates Tier III intervention groups
Lufkin, Lauren	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs -Identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches -Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies -Assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk" -Assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis -Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and data driven instruction -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA and Math Plan -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Supports the implementation and documentation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP; supports common planning -Designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assessments -Facilitates a grade level intervention group.
Quinonez, Priscilla	ELL Compliance Specialist	- Monitors ELL students and ensures that teachers are using appropriate ELL strategies to safeguard student success - Facilitates Imagine Learning, MPLC and grade level ELL support. -Organizes, trains and administers WIDA Access for ELL testing

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/8/2017, Donald Vega

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

540

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

2

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	107	63	90	98	86	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	7	15	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	3	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	14	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	20	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	7	20	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/27/2022

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	10	65	81	105	75	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	6	27	20	25	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	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	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	10	65	81	105	75	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	6	27	20	25	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	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	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	57%	56%	56%				65%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						56%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						56%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	46%	50%				63%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						51%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						30%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	61%	59%				44%	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	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	63%	0%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	53%	-12%
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	17	42	47	29	46	25	6				
ELL	50	69	67	64	77	64	46				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	45	68	58	49	50	23	44				
HSP	51	67	71	55	73	72	44				
WHT	71	57		77	80		61				
FRL	48	70	78	52	66	56	42				

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	18			23							
ELL	53	56		52	44		65				
ASN	100			85							
BLK	43			37							
HSP	53	33	20	46	31		47				
WHT	67	33		60	40		53				
FRL	42	24	23	35	22	31	22				
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	22	29		22	33						
ELL	48	56	67	61	51	38	28				
ASN	83			75							
BLK	57	57		54	52		25				
HSP	60	55	53	60	46	31	42				
WHT	76	56		75	64		57				
FRL	57	49	55	55	45	30	35				

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	61
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	62
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	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	62
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	69
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	59
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 the 2022 state assessment data we have seen improvement in math across all the grade levels with the least amount of growth in 2nd grade. The science data for fifth grade dropped from 49% at 48% proficiency and will be an area of focus for this year. Learning gains in ELA have increased dramatically however proficiency dropped from 58% to 57% and will also be an area of focus for grades 3-5. Lastly, our students with disabilities still does not meet the 41% threshold so this too will be an area of focus.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the 2022 state assessments, Aloma's students with disabilities demonstrate the strongest need for improvement. Currently, Aloma Elementary is below the 41% proficiency threshold in the ESSA subgroup for students with disabilities.

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

The contributing factors causing the need for improvement with students with disabilities include adapting the instructional practices to ensure success for all students with disabilities. Actions will be taken to address this area of need are tailoring our PLCs so the ESE resource teacher is able to attend and plan with teachers to support these students both in the general education classroom and in the ESE resource room.

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

Based on the 2021 and the 2022 state assessments and progress monitoring data we had the greatest improvement in Math especially in the learning gains for all students and our lowest quartile. In ELA, we have also had significant improvement in our learning gains for all students including our lowest quartile for ELA.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement was a strategic focus on our low performing students in Math. Providing extra small group instruction for our lowest quartile as well as providing each math teacher with an interventionist to support all students contributed to their success. Utilizing data to group and plan for instruction for our lowest quartile during the intervention time contributed to the

improvements seen in this area.

The action plan for the 2022-2023 school year will include intentional planning for small group instruction, implementation of Symphony Math to support math in all grade levels, walk to intervention for grades 1 through 5.

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

We will incorporate the MAO Acceleration strategy for specific students in grades 3 through 5. These students will be front-loaded with critical concepts and associated vocabulary and the dispelling of common misconceptions before the delivery of core instruction. This model will be incorporated into our after school tutoring program, as well.

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.

We will have our teachers take part in both district and school based professional developments opportunities to dive deep into the new BEST standards, new curriculum resources and best practices for implementation for all learners. The leadership team has again established differentiated levels of support for teachers based on changes of assignments and last year's observation and class walkthrough data. The East Learning Community walkthrough form will continue to be used to identify trends within standards aligned instruction, small group differentiated instruction, pacing and student engagement. Based on the data collected, targeted support will be provided through modeling, coaching cycles and planning and delivery of instruction.

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

The leadership team will increase the level of support they provide during walk to intervention time. All members of the leadership team will provide intervention to specific students within the lowest quartile in grades 3 through 5. SIPPS will continue to be used and monitored in order to continue to close the literacy gap and strengthen foundational reading skills for all students.

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.

The area of focus is to accelerate student performance by increasing the overall proficiency for the ESSA subgroup, The targeted goal is to increase the overall ELA and math proficiency of the Students with Disabilities to a minimum 41% proficiency as identified by ESSA. Students with Disabilities have underperformed for the last two years as identified by ESSA resulting in identification as a Targeted Support and Improvement school.

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

Increase the overall ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 16% to a 41% minimum proficiency as outlined in the Every Student Success Act.

Increase the overall math proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 27% to a 41% minimum proficiency as outlined in the Every Student Success Act.

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

The Students with Disabilities, ESSA subgroup, will be routinely monitored during weekly Professional Learning Communities to ensure small group instruction is specifically targeted to meet the individual needs of these students. Identified students will work with a designated staff member during intervention time. In addition, a Tier I core instruction teacher will be assigned to grades 3 and 5 to strengthen core instruction. A monthly progress report will be created to monitor students towards individual IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

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

Build our culture of collaboration between professionals, ESE and non-ESE, to increase student success through data-based Professional Learning Communities, common planning, support facilitation and input in the MTSS process. As a result, both general education and ESE teachers will provide intensive standards aligned reading and math instruction.

Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings (e.g., co-taught). Collaboration with individuals or teams requires the use of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-

Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar

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

needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.

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.

Collaboration between ESE and non-ESE teachers to support student learning through intensive standards-based reading and math instruction. Collaboration will occur once a month during PLCs and coverage will be provided for the ESE teacher to attend. The focus will be on adapting instruction and developing materials to match the unique learning styles and strengths of the students. The effectiveness will be monitored by teachers and leadership staff utilizing common assessment and FAST progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

Monthly data meetings with leadership team to monitor the implementation of instruction as assessed through common assessments. Trend data will allow students to be identified for Tier II interventions as part of the initial MTSS process. Interventions are then implemented in both small group and FBS.

Person Responsible Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

Common planning and data-driven Professional Learning Communities that allow teachers to collaborate and identify trends in order to adjust instruction and intervention.

Person Responsible Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

#2. 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.

ELA and science scores have decreased since 2021. Aloma scored 57% percent proficiency in ELA and 48% in science. This marks a one point decline from the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Increase proficiency in ELA and science by at least 5 percentage points. Through support, feedback and collaborative planning our staff will understand and plan standards-based instruction through the use of content specific, complex texts and standards aligned tasks, as well as the use of text-dependent questions to increase student achievement in proficiency within ELA to 62% and science to 53%.

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

1. Leadership team will support teachers during weekly PLCs to analyze formative assessment data and develop data-informed lesson plans and learning tasks.
2. The leadership team will meet weekly to debrief on grade level data and PLC meetings and review PLC notes to ensure the implementation of complex texts, and standards aligned tasks as well as planned text-dependent questions.
3. Weekly classroom walkthroughs observations will help ensure fidelity of the implementation.
4. Monitor iObservation data and PLC notes regarding student learning tasks during daily class instruction.
5. Data meetings will indicate if students are progressing through standards-based assessments.
6. Monthly review of school-wide data spreadsheet.
7. Leadership team will review student performance data to monitor whether the strategy successfully increased students' academic performance through use of content specific and complex texts to align tasks to standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Compton (emily.compton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Explicit Systematic Instruction

Rationale for

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Explicit systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. This strategy is effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including ELL and ESE students.

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.

1. Analyze ELA data from previous FSA as well as the FAST progress monitoring assessment and PMA data for science.
2. Identify students that are below proficiency and on the threshold of proficiency and provide support and resources.
3. Provide professional development on FAST progress monitoring reports to use for grouping students to meet their needs.
4. Monitor and adjust Success Time (Intervention) groups utilizing FAST and intervention progress monitoring data.
5. Conduct data chats with teachers monthly to review growth and areas that need support.
6. Provide professional development on Study Island and increase usage and monitoring in the classroom to support science instruction.

Person Responsible Donald Vega (donald.vega@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

N/A

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

52% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3 on the 2022 Spring ELA FSA

Measurable Outcomes:

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

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

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase the proficiency of all 5th grade students by 10 percentage points as measured by the FAST end of year assessment.

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.

Progress monitoring will be conducted throughout the year using beginning of year and middle of year FAST assessment and classroom standards based common assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Vega, Donald, donald.vega@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?

Explicit systematic instruction

Small group instruction

Walk to intervention - Tier II instruction

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?

Explicit systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. It is effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including ELL and ESE students.

Small group instruction is tailored to address specific student needs as well as various student ability levels. It has a strategic focus on standards based differentiated instruction in order to support all learners.

Walk to intervention is Tier II reading intervention, 45 mins four days a week. It is a research based program that is used to close learning gaps for students. Groups are determined based on previous year data but are readjusted routinely throughout the year as new data is collected and analyzed. Grade level teams along with the leadership team graph student data, discuss trends, and make adjustments to meet the needs of students to close learning gaps to raise proficiency levels.

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
Provide professional development on FAST for grouping students to meet their needs.	Lufkin, Lauren, lauren.lufkin@ocps.net
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze ELA data from previous FSA as well as BOY FAST diagnostic - Progress monitor ELA proficiency and student growth using the MOY FAST diagnostic - Identify students that are below proficiency and on the threshold of proficiency and provide support and resources - Monitor common assessment data 	Compton, Emily , emily.compton@ocps.net
Conduct Data chats with teachers monthly to review growth and areas that need support.	Vega, Donald, donald.vega@ocps.net
Provide instructional rounds for teachers to see and learn best practices for standards aligned teaching.	Thornburgh, Jennifer, jennifer.thornburgh@ocps.net
Monitor and adjust walk to intervention groups to close learning gaps for students.	Lufkin, Lauren, lauren.lufkin@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.

Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Our school will strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

The Panorama survey will be given to faculty, parents and students. Panorama data will be analyzed in order to make needed changes throughout the campus.

The leadership team will analyze and review the Spring Annual Stakeholders Survey and identify areas of growth and develop an action plan.

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

The school SEL team which includes a mental health designee attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership team collaborates with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Aloma strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.