

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Orchard Villa Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 26 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 27 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 32 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Orchard Villa Elementary School

5720 NW 13TH AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://orchardvillaelementaryschool.dadeschools.net/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 10/11/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Orchard Villa Elementary School provides the highest quality education focused on high standards and building positive relationships so that all of our students are equipped to lead productive and fulfilling lives as lifelong learners and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Orchard Villa Elementary faculty and staff are committed to providing the highest quality education for all students while fostering a positive environment that promotes academic excellence, honesty, respect, and compassion.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Daly-Barnes, Tanya | Principal | As the school's principal, Ms. Daly-Barnes provides and monitors the mission and vision for academic success for all students. Ms. Daly-Barnes establishes the expectations for all students and ensures that data is being utilized to drive decision-making, and professional development by the school leadership team and teachers. |
| Williams, Angel | Assistant Principal | As the assistant principal, Mrs. Williams-Rumph works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission of the school. Mrs. Williams-Rumph monitors the academic data of all subject areas in grade levels K-5; works in collaboration with staff to develop and facilitate professional developments aligned with student and faculty needs. |
| Hall, Ceexta | Reading Coach | As the reading coach, Ms. Hall provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success and provide professional development throughout the year. |
| Hartman, Allyson | Reading Coach | As the reading coach, Ms. Hartman provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success and provide professional development throughout the year. |
| Dolly, Jeff | Math Coach | As the mathematics coach, Mr. Dolly provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success and provide professional development throughout the year. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Teacher participation in the SIP development is in the form of survey responses. The leadership team analyzed data reported by teachers via climate and PD surveys to identify areas of focus for the 23-24 school year. Parent and familial input is considered using PTA minutes. Grade Level Chairpersons and Department Heads represent their grade level and act as a liaison between teachers and the leadership team, reporting data findings and potential areas of focus. Grade-level chairs conduct monthly, comprehensive data reviews and report any concerns or grade-level trends that emerge. Teachers and grade-level chairs confer with coaches regarding data findings to evaluate intervention efforts. The counselor acts as a liaison for special services and facilitates any necessary behavioral interventions.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be thoroughly analyzed to collect data to identify trends, patterns, and areas of improvement. After disaggregating data for disparities between different student groups, particularly those with the greatest achievement gap, the school will identify specific interventions, strategies, and action steps to address the achievement gap. Professional development opportunities for teachers will be delivered to enhance their knowledge and skills in addressing the achievement gap identified through the monitoring of the SIP.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 99% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 18 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 15 | 15 | 25 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 10 | 24 | 9 | 33 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 10 | 24 | 9 | 33 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 37 | 60 | 53 | 37 | 62 | 56 | 23 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 31 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 52 | 66 | 59 | 43 | 58 | 50 | 24 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 17 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 71 | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | 33 | 58 | 54 | 34 | 64 | 59 | 9 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 63 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 61 | 63 | 59 | 61 | | | 44 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 218 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 442 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 35 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 48 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 57 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 38 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 63 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 37 | | | 52 | | | 33 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 40 | | | 30 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | 33 | | | 57 | | | | | | | 4 | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | | | 51 | | | 37 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 54 | | | 52 | | | | | | | 4 | 65 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | | | 49 | | | 35 | | | | 5 | 67 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 37 | 66 | 69 | 43 | 61 | 71 | 34 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 33 | 60 | | 21 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | 64 | | | | | | | | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 38 | 66 | 73 | 41 | 63 | 82 | 34 | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 64 | | 50 | 54 | | | | | | | 59 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 66 | 73 | 42 | 63 | 77 | 34 | | | | | 63 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 23 | 31 | | 24 | 17 | | 9 | | | | | 44 |
| SWD | 5 | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 10 | | | 30 | | | | | | | | 44 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 25 | | 25 | 14 | | 8 | | | | | |
| HSP | 11 | | | 22 | | | | | | | | 44 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 31 | | 24 | 17 | | 9 | | | | | 40 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 56% | -25% | 54% | -23% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 58% | -19% | 58% | -19% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 52% | -26% | 50% | -24% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 63% | -13% | 59% | -9% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 64% | -19% | 61% | -16% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 58% | -22% | 55% | -19% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 50% | -24% | 51% | -25% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that shows the lowest performance varied across grades and content areas. The ELA data component that showed the lowest performance among third graders is PMA data, indicating the students performed lowest with standards R.2.1 and R.2.3. The factor most notably contributing to low performance among the 3rd-grade cohort is a foundational skills deficit that consequently impairs grade-level comprehension. 49% of the cohort started the school year 2 or more grade level below, and 22% of the cohort are ESOL levels 1-3. Despite interventions, 35% of the cohort remains 2 or more grade levels below. The low performance of R.3.1 in 4th grade can be attributed to the limited interactions with and assessments of the benchmark (4). As for the fifth, the data component that showed the lowest performance was FAST, with a 17-point difference between school and state scale score averages. Low performance can be attributed to instruction.

Regarding math, 3rd grade demonstrated low performance with MA. 3.M.1.1, the factor most notably contributing to low performance is a lack of understanding of geometry and its use within word problems. Data indicates both fourth and fifth grades performed lowest with measuring and solving problems with two-dimensional shapes, and fifth also performed low in plotting points on a coordinate plane.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA-The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior school year is PMA data. Both 4th and 5th grades experienced a decrease in the percentage correct on PMAs, of 3% and 9% respectively. This decrease can be attributed to new benchmarks, as well as the varying abilities of each cohort.

MATH- The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior school year is PMA data in 5th grade. 5th grade experienced a decrease in the percentage correct from the previous year from 29% to 25%. This decrease can be attributed to new benchmarks, as well as attendance.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA - 3rd-grade data reveals the trend of low performance in two reporting categories on the FAST assessment compared to state performance, namely prose and poetry and reading across genres. The percentage of 3rd-grade students that scored "above the standard" on prose and poetry was 12%, compared to state performance of 26%. In reading across genres, the cohort performed with 16% above-standard proficiency, in comparison to the state proficiency of 30%. The factor most notably contributing to this gap is the substantial deficiency in foundational skills exhibited by a substantial number of students at the start of the school year, as 28 students out of 52 scored two or more grade levels below on AP1 (including non-accountable students). While the number of students who scored two or more grade levels below on AP2 decreased to 19, mitigating these foundational skills deficits remains imperative. Other factors contributing to low performance include the high demographic of ESOL students and irregular class attendance.

4th-grade data indicates that the lowest performance category on PM3, both overall and compared to state performance, was reading across genres and vocabulary. Factors contributing to the low performance within this domain include a limited opportunity to compare texts effectively (R.3.3, comparative reading) and low performance on benchmarks 3.1 and 3.2 (paraphrasing and summarizing). Low performance in this reporting category exists as a trend across intermediate grades, making the standards a priority for the 23-24 school year.

5th grade had the highest scale score difference compared to state averages. The cohort performed lowest in the category of prose and poetry. Results show that the cohort performed better on informational text compared to literature.

MATH - 3rd-grade data reveals the trend of low performance in one reporting category when compared to state performance was number sense and additive reasoning.

4th-grade data indicates the lowest performance category on PM3, both overall and compared to state performance, was Geometric Reasoning, Measurement, and Data.

5th-grade data indicates the lowest performance category on PM3, both overall and compared to state performance, was Geometric Reasoning, Measurement, and Data.

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 48 % of 5th-grade students were proficient in Math as compared to the state average of 55 %, which is a 7% difference, and the district average of 57%, which is a 9% difference. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors, the high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels limited abilities to master grade-level tasks, and student attendance.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA Intermediate

The data component that showed the most improvement from the prior school year for ELA is FAST data. Compared to the 22-23 school year, proficiency on the state-wide assessment increased from 37% to 40%. The actions that contributed to this increase include individualized interventions and targeted support from interventionists and coaches.

MATH

According to the 2022-2023 Student Assessment Explorer, as it pertains to Topic Assessment averages of percentage correct, tiered 3 schools' district averaged 65% compared to our 4th-grade average of 73%, which is a 9% difference.

According to the 2022-2023 Student Assessment Explorer, as it pertains to Topic Assessment averages of percentage correct, tiered 3 schools' district averaged 57% compared to our 3rd-grade average of 69%, which is an 11% difference.

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 58% of 4th-grade students were proficient in Math as compared to the state average of 51%, which is an increase of 7%.

Based on the data and the identified contributing factors concrete and explicit instruction, shift to online DI/online response mechanism, and collaborative planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

ELA -1st, 3rd, and 5th grade.

Math - 5th grade

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

ELA Intermediate

- 47% of students in the 3rd grade (including non-accountable) scored a level 1 on PM3, making interventions of retained students a priority, as well as interventions for students passed by a Good Cause. Of the 34 rising second graders, 21 scored below the 50th percentile, and 16 scored below the 20th percentile. Additionally, the cohort is comprised of 9 retained students, meaning 51% of this cohort's students scored either a Level 1 or below the 10th percentile on FAST. The objective is to continue to provide necessary interventions for students with foundational skill gaps, in an effort to strengthen comprehension and increase proficiency.

-In reference to instructional priorities, data indicates that 5th grade had the lowest percentile grouping change from PM1 to PM2 and the lowest number of students performing above standards on PM3. Accordingly, an additional priority is the tiered instruction of 5th grade, both whole-group and differentiated.

-School-wide low performance in reporting category three on the FAST assessment, the instruction and monitoring of benchmarks 3.1-3.3 is a priority across all grades.

MATH

-According to the 2023 PM3 Data, 58% of 3rd grader students were proficient in math as compared to the district average of 66%, which is an 8% difference, making the 2023-2024 4th graders the highest priority for mathematics.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to FAST PM3 data, overall ELA proficiency for the 22-23 school year was 40%. The average scale score of the third-grade cohort was 283, compared to the state average of 297. Fourth graders averaged a scale score of 300, in comparison to the state average of 312. Fifth grade experienced the highest disparity in scale score compare to the state, scoring 303 and 320, respectively. The reporting categories with the lowest performance in comparison to the state were Reading Across Genres and Prose and Poetry. Low performance within these domains can be attributed to the limited interactions with and assessments of the benchmarks within the reporting categories, as well as a foundational skill deficit among select students that consequently impairs grade-level comprehension. Moreover, data analysis reveals that 40% of rising intermediate students scored Level 1 or below the 10th percentile on the 22-23 FAST assessment, thus necessitating immediate interventions and a focus on benchmark-aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of the successful implementation of interventions and benchmark-aligned instruction, OVE should experience a score increase of 2% within both reporting categories by PM3, thereby increasing overall proficiency. In reference to Reading Across Genres, 3rd grade above-standard performance should experience and increase from 16 to 18%, 4th grade 12 to 14%, and 5th grade 8 to 10%. As for Prose and Poetry, 3rd grade should experience a 2% growth to 14%, fourth grade to 17%, and fifth grade to 7%.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor student performance in the aforementioned reporting categories, Progress Monitoring and FAST data should be reviewed following each assessment. Data from PM1 to PM2 will be the most significant indicator of progress, gauging whether students made adequate improvement between each testing window. Student performance in each reporting category should increase a minimum of 1% from PM1 to PM2. Progress monitoring assessments will provide data regarding student performance for each specific benchmark within each reporting category, as well as indicate necessary areas of remediation.

To monitor the instruction of benchmarks that make up each reporting category, the coach and administration will conduct observations and walkthroughs. Coach will use findings from observations to develop coach-teacher-collaboration cycles that support benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tanya Daly-Barnes (tdaly-barnes@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention to be implemented for this Area of Focus is Instructional Support and Coaching. The transformation coach will work in partnership with teachers to analyze student data and plan measurable goals accordingly. The coach will utilize Coach-Teacher Collaboration Cycles as a mechanism to support teacher instruction and monitor student performance among reporting categories.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intention behind utilizing Instructional Support and Coaching as the evidence based intervention to support this AOF is to provide opportunities for coach-teacher collaboration. This collaboration includes collaborative planning sessions to disaggregate data, plan for instruction, and monitor student performance. Similarly, utilizing this strategy will allow the coach and teacher to participate in Coach-Teacher Collaboration Cycles as a mechanism to support teacher instruction and to monitor student performance among reporting categories.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ELA coaches will plan for and facilitate collaborative planning sessions to focus on benchmark-aligned instruction. The objective of planning benchmark-aligned instruction in partnership with teachers is to develop in-depth instructional plans to address the benchmarks within different reporting categories.

Person Responsible: Allyson Hartman (332244@dadeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative planning focused on benchmark-aligned instruction should be implemented as early as August 18th.

To monitor benchmark-aligned instruction and progress toward proficiency, the leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to review lesson plans, observe instructional delivery, and review student work products. The objective is to create a sense of accountability among all school personnel, as well as to ensure the consistency and fidelity of benchmark-aligned instruction. Classroom Walkthroughs will be conducted throughout the year by the administration and instructional coaches to monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of standards-based instruction by observing instructional delivery and student work products. As a result of these classroom walkthroughs, identified teachers will receive Coach Teacher Collaborations (CTC) to provide support and model appropriate implementation of Standards-Based Instruction.

Person Responsible: Tanya Daly-Barnes (tdaly-barnes@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first instructional walkthrough should have taken place by August 25th.

The leadership team will conduct data chats with teachers after progress monitoring diagnostics and formative assessment data to monitor, collaborate, and readjust instruction and resources to meet the needs of students. An online tracker will monitor bi-weekly assessment data to ensure adequate progress, along with student data trackers to allow students to take ownership of their learning.

Person Responsible: Ceexta Hall (ceexta@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first data chat with the leadership team should take place following FAST PM1 and at least one PMA assessment, no later than September 25th.

Orchard Villa Elementary will be hosting Parent Data Chat Nights following each FAST PM Assessment. These events will be designed to provide parents, with valuable insights into their child's academic progress. Our aim is to foster a strong partnership between home and school, to actively support your child in areas where they may need additional assistance.

Person Responsible: Allyson Hartman (332244@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first parent data chat with parents will take place following FAST PM1, no later than October 13, 2023.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2023 PM3 Data, 58% of 3rd grader students were proficient in math as compared to the district average of 66%, which is an 8% difference. The factor most notably contributing to low performance among the 3rd grade cohort is an understanding of geometry and its use within word problems. The selected Targeted Element is Benchmark-aligned Instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of the successful implementation of interventions and benchmark-aligned instruction, OVE should experience a score increase of 3% within the reporting categories by PM3, thereby increasing overall proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor student performance in the aforementioned reporting categories, Progress Monitoring and FAST data should be reviewed following each assessment. Data from PM1 to PM2 will be the most significant indicator of progress, gauging whether students made adequate improvement between each testing window. Student performance in each reporting category should increase a minimum of 3% from PM1 to PM2. Progress monitoring assessments will provide data regarding student performance for each specific benchmark within each reporting category, as well as indicate necessary areas of remediation.

To monitor the instruction of benchmarks that make up each reporting category, the coach and administration will conduct observations and walkthroughs. Coach will use findings from observations to develop coach-teacher-collaboration cycles that support benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Dolly (306535@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention to be implemented for this Area of Focus is Instructional Support and Coaching. The transformation coach will work in partnership with teachers to analyze student data and plan measurable goals accordingly. The coach will utilize Coach-Teacher Collaboration Cycles as a mechanism to support teacher instruction and monitor student performance among reporting categories.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intention behind utilizing Instructional Support and Coaching as the evidence-based intervention to support this Area of Focus is to provide opportunities for coach-teacher collaboration. This collaboration includes collaborative planning sessions to disaggregate data, plan for instruction, and monitor student performance. Similarly, utilizing this strategy will allow the coach and teacher to participate in Coach-Teacher Collaboration Cycles as a mechanism to support teacher instruction and to monitor student performance among reporting categories.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The Math coach will plan for and facilitate collaborative planning sessions to focus on benchmark-aligned instruction. The objective of planning benchmark-aligned instruction in partnership with teachers is to develop in-depth instructional plans to address the benchmarks within different reporting categories.

Person Responsible: Jeff Dolly (306535@dadeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative planning focused on benchmark-aligned instruction should be implemented as early as August 18th and will continue weekly.

To monitor benchmark-aligned instruction and progress toward proficiency, the leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to review lesson plans, observe instructional delivery, and review student work products. The objective is to create a sense of accountability among all school personnel, as well as to ensure the consistency and fidelity of benchmark-aligned instruction. Classroom Walkthroughs will be conducted throughout the year by the administration and instructional coaches to monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of standards-based instruction by observing instructional delivery and student work products. As a result of these classroom walkthroughs, identified teachers will receive Coach Teacher Collaborations (CTC) to provide support and model appropriate implementation of Standards-Based Instruction.

Person Responsible: Tanya Daly-Barnes (tdaly-barnes@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first instructional walkthrough should have taken place by August 25th and continue weekly.

The leadership team will conduct data chats with teachers after progress monitoring diagnostics and formative assessment data to monitor, collaborate, and readjust instruction and resources to meet the needs of students. An online tracker will monitor bi-weekly assessment data to ensure adequate progress, along with student data trackers to allow students to take ownership of their learning.

Person Responsible: Jeff Dolly (306535@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first data chat with the leadership team should take place following FAST PM1 and at least one PMA assessment, no later than September 25th.

Orchard Villa Elementary will be hosting Parent Data Chat Nights following each FAST PM Assessment. These events will be designed to provide parents, with valuable insights into their child's academic progress. Our aim is to foster a strong partnership between home and school, to actively support your child in areas where they may need additional assistance.

Person Responsible: Jeff Dolly (306535@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first parent data chat with parents will take place following FAST PM1, no later than October 13, 2023.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2023 Climate Survey, results indicated that 28% of staff do not feel their ideas are listened to and considered, as compared to 18% of staff in 2022. This data was identified as a critical need based on the increase in staff rating from the school year 2022 to 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully provide opportunities for the staff to engage in meaningful conversation, professional development, and collaboration with the administration throughout the school year, our 2023-2024 Climate Survey data should increase to 75% of staff feel their ideas are listened to and considered.

Monitoring:

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

The administration team will survey the staff throughout the school year to provide opportunities to express their ideas/ concerns. An open forum during faculty monthly coffee with the principal will allow staff to provide input regarding school-wide experiences and individual issues.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ceexta Hall (ceexta@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Administrative/Leadership Team Visibility and Accessibility influence everything that happens in their schools. Their omnipresence inspires people while it provides opportunities to inspect, direct, or correct. The Administrative/Leadership Team's omnipresence sets a tone for a school and gives it a personality. Examples include: conducting walkthroughs, visible during the switching of classes, maintaining an open-door policy, eating lunch at different times and places, making morning announcements, answering the phone, serving food in the cafeteria, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for the evidence-based strategy, Distribution of Leadership, establishes an infrastructure that provides individuals, collegial groups, and staff members' personal visions to contribute to the school's collective vision and leadership opportunities. This strategy involves deliberate dialogue, listening carefully, and enthusiastically enriching everyone's professional values.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monthly "Coffee with the Principal," will give the staff an opportunity to connect with the administration, and express individual and or school-wide concerns.

Person Responsible: Tanya Daly-Barnes (tdaly-barnes@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first event will begin on August 16 and will continue on a monthly basis.

Monthly Family Engagement Calendar will be created with staff and PTA to provide opportunities for all stakeholders to engage monthly. This action step will decrease the rate of staff members feeling their ideas are not listened to and considered, as well as promote cohesion among all stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Ceexta Hall (ceexta@dadeschools.net)

By When: The first calendar and communication with stakeholders will begin on August 16 and will continue on a monthly basis.

Staff will be surveyed to gauge whether they feel listened to and valued quarterly. The survey will also allow staff to convey how the leadership team can best support in their development.

Person Responsible: Angel Williams (awilliams01@dadeschools.net)

By When: On one Wednesday of each month, beginning August 2023 and continuing on a monthly basis.

A professional learning community (PLC) will be established at the school to provide monthly development on components of the professional that show a need for development.

Person Responsible: Angel Williams (awilliams01@dadeschools.net)

By When: On one Wednesday of each month, beginning September 2023 and continuing on a monthly basis.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In light of the examination of the FAST PM3 student data, our educational institution stands to gain from the systematic integration of Tier 3 Reading Intervention practices. Analysis of the student data has revealed that in primary grades (K-2) 57% of English Language Arts (ELA) achievement is at or above the 40% percent mark, within which 1% pertains to English Language Learners (ELLs).

Furthermore, an analysis of intermediate data has revealed that 19 ELL students attained scores at or below level two, necessitating Tier 3 intervention as a mechanism to mitigate the academic deficits of English Language Learner (ELL) students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the event of the successful implementation of Tier 3 Reading Intervention for our English Language Learners (ELL), it is anticipated that the English Language Arts (ELA) achievement rate within the ELL subgroup will experience an augmentation of 5% among intermediate students. This enhancement is projected to elevate the current rate from 6% to 11%.

Monitoring:

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

In order to maintain a trajectory toward proficiency, the leadership team will conduct data discussions following each PM assessment, with a particular focus on student performance within the ELL subgroup. Additionally, the leadership team will review skill checks and assessment outcomes deriving from the reading intervention program during data discussions. To ensure the effectiveness of instructional strategies, instructional coaches will rely on progress monitoring and skill check data to routinely fine-tune the materials employed in the Tier 3 reading Intervention for these specific groups. Furthermore, the progress of skill checks and online intervention assessments will be meticulously overseen through an online tracking system, guaranteeing satisfactory advancement for students encompassed within this subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tanya Daly-Barnes (tdaly-barnes@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The chosen evidence-based strategy earmarked for implementation in this Area of Focus is the Tier 3 Intervention. This strategic approach promises a methodical framework for addressing the specific requirements of English Language Learners (ELL) students while concurrently mitigating any potential learning setbacks. The resources for Tier 3 Reading intervention will draw upon the district's specially designed Tier 3 Reading Intervention Pacing Calendars, substantiated by assessment data that guides our decision-making. These processes will be diligently tracked and managed through the utilization of data trackers, ensuring a comprehensive and data-driven approach to the intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leveraging disaggregated data as a driving force for differentiated instruction holds the potential to effectively address the unique instructional needs of each learner, thereby contributing to the enhancement of proficiency levels among English Language Learners (ELLs). Moreover, the dynamic

implementation of Tier 3 intervention, complemented by strategically designed strategies and resources, will undergo periodic adjustments to ensure unwavering adherence, continued relevance, and alignment with the benchmarks of standards-based instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Both the administration and instructional coaches will engage in bi-weekly walkthroughs during intervention sessions. The primary purpose of these walkthroughs is to diligently oversee and assess the execution and fidelity of Tier 3 Intervention strategies.

Person Responsible: Ceexta Hall (ceexta@dadeschools.net)

By When: Initiating on August 28, 2023, instructional walkthroughs are slated to be a bi-weekly fixture, providing consistent oversight and enhancement.

A collaborative effort involving teachers, transformation coaches, and administrators will entail conducting data chats with both students and teachers. These discussions will center around the analysis of data pertaining to English Language Learners (ELLs) subsequent to each progress monitoring and skill check assessment.

Person Responsible: Allyson Hartman (332244@dadeschools.net)

By When: Data discussions are scheduled to commence on September 5, 2023, following FAST PM1 assessments, and will subsequently occur on a quarterly rhythm, ensuring consistent evaluation and analysis.

A bi-weekly forum for collaborative planning will be orchestrated to engender discourse surrounding optimal methodologies and approaches pertinent to the successful implementation of Tier 3 reading intervention. The anticipated outcome of these structured collaborative sessions is the cultivation of an enhanced proficiency among teachers, interventionists, and the ESOL teacher in the realm of tailored instructional dissemination. This will be achieved through a concerted focus on refining personalized pedagogical techniques, aligning instructional materials with curriculum objectives, and establishing mechanisms for diligent tracking of student advancement.

Person Responsible: Ceexta Hall (ceexta@dadeschools.net)

By When: The collaborative planning for Tier 3 is set to commence on August 28, 2023, and will continue bi-weekly, fostering regular engagement and strategic coordination.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

A comprehensive process, encompassing academic data analysis, instructional observations, staff performance ratings, and collaborative engagement with stakeholders, is employed to review and allocate school improvement funding during the months leading into the new academic year. This multifaceted

approach ensures that resources are distributed in alignment with identified needs according to trends and subgroups. Through the synergy of other components such as budget conferences and EESAC meetings, the school ensures data-driven allocation of resources, ultimately fostering a targeted and impactful approach to enhancing educational outcomes and overall school improvement.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

The FAST data reveals that 67% of kindergarten students, 55% of first graders, and 53% of second-grade students scored below the 40th percentile on the FAST assessment. In aggregate, 43% of students encompassing grades K-2 did not attain proficiency in the 2023 FAST assessment.

As a consequence of these findings, the pedagogical emphasis for grades K-2 will be directed towards the implementation of Differentiated Instruction (DI), an evidenced-based strategy renowned for its efficacy in addressing this identified challenge of leading students to proficiency.

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

The percentage of third-grade students who scored below a Level 3 on the 22-23 F.A.S.T PM3 was 66%. In fourth-grade, 50% of students scored below a Level 3 on F.A.S.T, PM3. The percentage of fifth-grade students who scored below a Level 3 on the F.A.S.T, PM3, was 59%.

Accordingly, the area of focus for grades 3-5 during the 23-24 school year will be Differentiated Instruction (DI). DI will be used as the mechanism to address the students significantly below grade level, specifically by providing opportunities to remediate foundational skills.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Upon successful implementation of the targeted area of focus, it is projected that the percentage of kindergarten students performing below the 40th percentile will exhibit a reduction of 5 percentage points, thereby reaching a level of 62%. Analogously, among first-grade students, the proportion scoring below the 40th percentile on the F.A.S.T PM3 assessment is anticipated to diminish by 5 percentage points, culminating in a rate of 50%. Moreover, for second-grade students, the percentage scoring below Level 3 on the F.A.S.T assessment is expected to undergo a parallel decrease by 5 percentage points, resulting in a rate of 48%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If the area of focus is implemented successfully, the percentage of third-grade students who score below Level 3 on the PM3, should decrease by 6 percentage points, to 60%. Similarly, the percentage of fourth-grade students who score below a Level 3 on F.A.S.T PM3 should decrease by at least two percentage points to 48%, less than half of the cohort. The percentage of fifth-grade students who score below Level 3 on the F.A.S.T should also decrease by four percentage points to 55%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Subsequent to periodic diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments, the leadership team will engage in data discussions to monitor school-wide progress towards proficiency. The collaborative efforts of administration, instructional coaches, and teachers will focus on the recurrent refinement of Differentiated Instruction (DI) groupings and resources, drawing insights from progress monitoring data. Furthermore, administration and instructional coaches will diligently oversee the assessment process through an online tracking system, thereby ensuring the consistent and satisfactory trajectory of progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williams, Angel, awilliams01@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

The attainment of the measurable outcome for grades K-2 will be facilitated through the incorporation of evidence-based practices. These practices encompass the systematic implementation of the gradual release model, the strategic utilization of the SPADE annotating strategy, and the integration of graphic organizers.

The evidence-based practices that will be implemented to achieve the measurable outcome for 3-5 include
Before, During, and After Reading (BDA) Strategies and the Gradual Release Model.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The application of Differentiated Instruction, coupled with the integration of Graphic Organizers, empowers students to enhance their comprehension of diverse texts and adeptly formulate written responses. In tandem, the incorporation of the SPADE strategy for annotating during Differentiated Instruction equips students with the ability to discern vital details, discern patterns, and grasp key vocabulary within a given text. The practice of annotating, rooted in engagement, serves as a potent tool for refining text comprehension and bolstering the retention of information.

Differentiated instruction that utilizes the BDA Reading Strategies enables students to become strategic readers. BDA Reading Strategies allow students to set a purpose for reading, annotate important details, use vocabulary strategies, and respond to text-based questions adequately.

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 |
|---|---|
| <p>Literacy leadership will be exemplified through the consistent implementation of bi-weekly classroom walkthroughs throughout the academic year. These walkthroughs, undertaken by the administration, will serve as a mechanism to ascertain the adherence to differentiated instruction principles and to assess the quality of student work outputs.</p> <p>Simultaneously, the administration team will engage in bi-weekly Collaborative Planning sessions dedicated to Differentiated Instruction. These sessions, conducted in partnership with instructional coaches, will facilitate a platform for productive discussions and strategizing. Moreover, they will enable the provision of requisite follow-up and constructive feedback concerning Coach Teacher Collaborations (CTCs), thereby reinforcing the collaborative enhancement of pedagogical endeavors.</p> | <p>Rumph, Angel, arumph@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>In the realm of literacy coaching, a pivotal action to address the focal area involves the initiation of collaborative planning for Differentiated Instruction (DI). To this end, instructional coaches will facilitate a series of weekly collaborative planning sessions. These sessions will be dedicated to the deliberate exploration of differentiated instructional strategies, the meticulous examination of disaggregated data, and the seamless adaptation of small group methodologies.</p> <p>Additionally, instructional coaches will undertake a proactive role in the form of Coach and Teacher Collaborations (CTC). This dynamic involves providing targeted support and exemplifying the precise implementation of Differentiated Instruction for teachers necessitating supplementary guidance. The identification of teachers meriting additional assistance will stem from a comprehensive process involving classroom observations, teacher inquiries, and an exhaustive analysis of student assessment data. Through these initiatives, the coaching framework will diligently foster the cultivation of effective instructional practices.</p> | <p>Williams, Angel, awilliams01@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>Within the domain of assessment, instructional coaches will actively collaborate with teachers and interventionists to meticulously analyze and dissect the data and outcomes derived from Ongoing Progress Monitoring assessments (OPMs). Through this collaborative effort, a comprehensive understanding of student performance and areas necessitating attention will be attained.</p> <p>Subsequent to the data analysis, instructional coaches will engage in thorough discussions with teachers and interventionists. These conversations will encompass the selection of instructional materials tailored to address the identified needs, alongside the delineation of pertinent procedures and optimal practices to be embraced during instruction. By facilitating these deliberate dialogues, instructional coaches will effectively foster an environment conducive to informed pedagogical decisions and the purposeful alignment of instructional strategies.</p> | <p>Hartman, Allyson, 331144@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>Continual professional growth is integral, and as such, instructional coaches will partake in a structured regimen of differentiated instruction and professional development. These activities will be seamlessly integrated into monthly content collaboratories, affording instructional coaches the opportunity to gain enriched insights and expertise. Subsequently, they will adeptly relay and impart this knowledge to teachers and interventionists during their weekly collaborative planning sessions.</p> <p>In addition to internal resources, instructional coaches will also benefit from external</p> | <p>Hall, Ceexta, ceextha@dadeschools.net</p> |

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| support in the form of Curriculum Support Specialists. This external collaboration is designed to enhance the depth of understanding and mastery of differentiated instruction practices. Through these multifaceted initiatives, the professional advancement of instructional coaches will be strategically nurtured, leading to a cascading effect of enriched teaching methodologies within the educational ecosystem. | |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The circulation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Schoolwide Plan (SWP) to pertinent stakeholders will be executed through multiple channels, including newsletters, Connect-ed calls, announcements on the Schoology School Page, as well as through the convening of both ESSAC and PTA meetings. This multifaceted approach ensures that the information reaches a diverse array of interested parties.

Furthermore, parents and families will be accorded the platform to contribute their insights and perspectives concerning the allocation of funds during the annual Title I meeting, thus fostering a collaborative and inclusive decision-making process.

Similarly, the school's dedicated staff members will be afforded analogous opportunities to meticulously review and assess the efficacy of the SIP, a process that will transpire at the inception of the school's faculty meeting.

For further information and engagement, please visit our official school website:
www.orchardvillaelementary.net.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school envisions the cultivation of constructive associations with all stakeholders by instituting a variety of communication avenues, organizing family engagement occasions, and facilitating consistent interaction with staff members. This comprehensive approach is designed to cater to diverse communication preferences, foster engagement, and ensure continuous connectivity.

The establishment of a diverse range of communication methods serves to guarantee that parents remain well-informed across various dimensions, encompassing school activities, academic matters, safety protocols, and policy updates. This tailored approach takes into account individual preferences, enabling effective and personalized communication.

The orchestration of monthly family engagement events, complemented by the availability of parent conferences and active participation in school functions, plays a pivotal role in cultivating a shared culture and fostering positive relationships between the school and its stakeholders.

For additional insights and engagement, please refer to our official school website: www.orchardvillaelementary.net.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The educational institution is committed to enhancing the efficacy of its academic programs through a systematic approach to student performance evaluation encompassing a spectrum of formal and informal assessments, including but not limited to Progress Monitoring, Topic Assessments, and the FAST dataset. Subsequent to each assessment iteration, a meticulous analysis of the gathered data will transpire with the intent of pinpointing the salient markers of advancement.

This rigorous assessment process entails a comprehensive evaluation of the extent to which students have demonstrated substantial growth, thereby determining whether their progress is in consonance with established benchmarks. Accordingly, these insights will inform the strategic allocation of academic instruction and support, ensuring that interventions are tailored to meet the unique needs of individual students.

By engaging in this discerning evaluation procedure, the institution aims to optimize student outcomes and bolster the overall effectiveness of its educational offerings.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The formulation of this plan has been a collaborative endeavor orchestrated in conjunction with our esteemed district support office, The Education Transformation Office (ETO), with a particular focus on augmenting the school's academic framework. Through a coordinated effort with this office, the school benefits from a spectrum of supplementary resources aimed at fortifying its academic initiatives.

Among these resources are additional support personnel assigned to facilitate targeted small group instruction catering to tier 2 and 3 students. Concurrently, a heightened allocation of resources and materials is provided to further enrich the instructional environment. Additionally, the school benefits from the dedicated presence of weekly Curriculum Support Specialists (CSS) whose mandate encompasses multifaceted roles.

These CSS professionals synergize with instructional staff to foster collaborative ventures, contrive innovative instructional approaches, and provide unwavering assistance in refining both pedagogical delivery and progress monitoring. The CSS's pivotal role is also reflected in its contribution to ongoing professional development endeavors, thereby nurturing a culture of continuous growth and educational excellence within the school community.