Zellwood Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

https://zellwoodes.ocps.net/

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.

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, 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
Grimando, Caroll	Principal	Budget Management, Operations, Personnel Hiring, Staff Evaluations, Discipline, Parental Concerns, Data Analysis, Public Relations, Staff Management, Mentoring, Coaching, Facilities Management
Ward, Cecelia	Assistant Principal	Master Calendar, Support Staff Scheduling, Staff Evaluations, Discipline, Parental Concerns, Coverage for Absences, Title IX, Threat Assessment Team, Summer School Coordinator, Skycap, MAO Liaison, etc.
Cordero, Evelisse	School Counselor	Mental Health Designee, Threat Assessment Team Coordinator, SEDNET Contact, Homeless and Foster Care Contact, Individual and Group Counseling, Child Safety Matters Facilitator, Student Awards/Incentive Coordinator, Counseling Events, etc.
Dickmyer, Jennifer	Staffing Specialist	Exceptional Student Education Coordinator, Individual Education Plan Compliance and Implementation, Section 504 Designee, State Restraints Reporting, Risk Management Contact, Individual Health Care Plans, Exceptional Student Education Data Entry/Accuracy
Dozier, Jamie	Instructional Coach	Professional Development, PLC Support, Deliberate Practice Support, Instructional Rounds, Teacher Induction, Parent Trainings, Orton-Gillingham Coordinator, Technology Problem Solving, Coaching/Modeling Lessons, Skyward and Canvas Support, Textbook Coordinator
Reyes, Vicvelyn	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Master Calendar, School Event Manager, Curriculum Coordinator, Good Cause Promotion, Teach-In Coordinator, Sky Cap, Testing Coordinator, Data Analysis
Barnard, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Coach/Coordinator, Implementation of Tier II and Tier III for Academic and Behavior, Intervention Resources, Partner in Education Coordinator, Data Analysis, House System Coordinator, OCPS Gives Coordinator, Truancy Monitoring
Tennis-Slotsve, Melody	Behavior Specialist	Social Skills Instructions Groups/Individuals, Mentoring Program Coordinator, Crisis Prevention Intervention Lead

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.

At the end of the school year, the School Advisory Council is given a survey that asks for suggestions on what they would like to implement during the school year that will support student learning as well as parent involvement.

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))

Each month during the School Advisory Council meeting, it will be noted on the agenda to review and discuss the School Improvement Plan and its goals to ensure we are working on our goals.

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	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 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	3	15	18	13	26	12	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	34	11	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	19	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	7	15	34	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	2	2	35	11	0	0	0	52

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	2	6	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	5	26	20	27	12	25	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	12	22	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	6	19	0	0	0	36
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	0	0	12	5	16	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	5	26	20	27	12	25	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	12	22	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	6	19	0	0	0	36
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	0	0	12	5	16	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	45	57	53	40	56	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				59			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			41		
Math Achievement*	57	60	59	43	46	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				61			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			35		
Science Achievement*	66	63	54	39	61	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	59	59	53			52		

* 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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	50			

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	41			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	45			

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	45			57			66					65
SWD	15			26							4	50
ELL	27			48			50				5	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			41			67				4	
HSP	37			54			66				5	66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65			69			67				4	
FRL	36			52			62				5	66

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	40	59	50	43	61	63	39					53
SWD	15	39	47	27	58	71	12					57
ELL	23	52	42	35	52	56	26					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	63	60	36	67	65	27					
HSP	35	58	45	39	56	59	38					51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	58		58	68		50					
FRL	28	57	46	34	59	58	25					50

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	41	41	41	39	44	35	40					52
SWD	12	35	31	20	29	25	12					33
ELL	23	36	25	29	41		22					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	35		30	33		29					
HSP	35	39	25	33	40	33	30					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	44		58	54		63					
FRL	26	34	40	28	34	29	26					48

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	44%	54%	-10%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	52%	-16%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	62%	-5%	61%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	51%	9%

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.

Forty-seven percent of the students scored at proficiency on the 2022-2023 FAST ELA assessment. This is a seven percent increase from the previous year. This past year, by emphasizing instruction targeting phonemic awareness and morphology, we were able to increase reading fluency and reduce the number of students scoring Level 1. Our students continue to struggle with comprehension due to their inability to read and understand rigorous text. This year, our focus will be on moving these new Level 2 students to Level 3, by explicitly and systematically teaching vocabulary and comprehension.

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

When comparing the 2021-2022 and the 2022-2023 assessments, there wasn't a decline in our performance. In each area, the students increased in proficiency. In ELA, the students increased from forty percent to forty-seven percent; Math from forty-three percent to sixty-three percent, and Science from thirty-nine percent to sixty-six percent.

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.

Compared to the state average, Zellwood has the greatest gap in the area of Reading, 47% of students who "counted" for Zellwood scored a Level 3 or higher versus the state average of 54%. This represents a gap of 7%. While we have seen improvement in reading and we increased the percentage scoring at proficiency from 40% to 47%, we still have room to improve and want to move more students from Level 2 to Level 3 this year by focusing on comprehension strategies.

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

On the 2022-2023 Florida Statewide Science Assessment, sixty-six percent of the fifth-grade students scored proficiency. This is a 25% increase from the previous year of thirty-nine percent proficiency. We placed a strong focus on incorporating morphology lessons to help students' academic vocabulary. Weekly, the students were involved in a class competition that focused on Science vocabulary. Also, Tier 1 Interventionists were strategically placed to assist with hands-on lessons and engage the students in cooperative competitions reviewing science concepts.

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

Our school continues to battle a significant amount of students with attendance issues. An "Attendance Team" worked to reduce the percentage of students chronically absent by monitoring attendance, sending truancy warning letters, and following up with parents. The school team also conducted Attendance Child Study Team meetings, to collaborate with parents of the most chronic offenders, in an attempt to find solutions to each student's attendance concern.

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

1. We would like to close the achievement gap in ELA so that we have more students scoring proficiency and fewer students needing Tier III Interventions.
2. To assist with closing the achievement gap, we need to ensure students are attending school. Therefore, we will need to closely monitor the students' attendance, especially those who already have historical truancy concerns.
3. We would like for our students with learning disabilities to show learning gains and move more of them toward proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math.

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 ELA

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.

On the 2023 FAST Assessment, students in grades 3 - 5 increased overall proficiency in the area of ELA from 40% to 47%. Thirty-nine percent of the third graders were proficient and fifty-four percent of the students in fourth grade were proficient. Our major focus for the 2023-2024 school year will be working with teachers of students in grades 3-5 to increase their effectiveness in delivering consistent, systematic, and explicit instruction in decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The team will provide vital professional development for the General Ed and ESE teachers, as well as ensure that effective interventions are in place, and conducted with fidelity, to increase the reading achievement of students.

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

Students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in ELA from 47% to 52% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Assessment.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing both common assessments and progress monitoring assessments during PLC data meetings. This will also be monitored through evaluating instructional practice during classroom visits and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.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.)

Teachers will effectively implement standards-aligned, whole-group instruction, and small-group instruction. Small group instruction will be focused on closing the achievement gaps. The Orton-Gillingham approach, as well as analyzing the Exact Path diagnostic assessment to monitor students' individualized learning paths, will enable us to plan for strategic intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers consistently monitor student progress, they will be able to analyze and interpret the data, resulting in an increased ability to respond to students' needs promptly. Additionally, the consistent monitoring of student data in intervention and enrichment allows for timely and strategic adjustments to be made to the instructional programs.

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.

We will continue to serve as an Orton-Gillingham Model School with 100% of 3rd - 5th grade teachers trained at the Associate's Level. We will provide professional development in the Orton-Gillingham approach, specifically in the areas of morphology, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Person Responsible: Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

The Instructional Coach will help support teachers by modeling lessons/strategies/skills, reviewing data, and providing feedback to teachers to improve upon the skills and strategies necessary to drive small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

By When: March 2024

Teachers in grades 1-5 will complete a book study of "The Knowledge Gap" by Natalie Wexler and receive corresponding professional development, including the use of Expanding Expression Tools to aid in the building of content knowledge and application of vocabulary strategies, which will positively impact reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

By When: December 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.

On the 2023 FAST Assessment, students in grades 3 - 5 increased overall proficiency in the area of Math from 43% to 63%.

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

On the 2024 FAST Assessment, students in grades 3 -5 will increase their Math proficiency by five percentage points from 63% to 68%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing both common assessments and progress monitoring assessments during PLC data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.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.)

Teachers will implement effective instructional strategies in response to purposeful monitoring of student data throughout the school year. Formative assessments will be analyzed to provide differentiated small-group instruction using our Tier I Interventionists. The use of SuccessMaker will also be used to provide individualized support in the area of math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The screener and diagnostic assessment data of Success Maker will be analyzed and provide information to assist teachers in responding to students' needs promptly. Teachers will be able to provide differentiated small-group instruction to close gaps.

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.

Through PLCs and schoolwide professional development, teachers will be trained on the B.E.S.T. Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards, as well as best practices for the utilization of manipulatives to support daily mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible: Jamie Dozier (jamie.dozier@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023

The instructional coach will conduct coaching cycles, as well as model and co-teach math lessons, to introduce teachers to effective instructional strategies to implement during their math block. The coach, along with the math interventionist, will assist the teachers with data analysis to make instructional adjustments and plan for differentiated math interventions, including SuccessMaker.

Person Responsible: Cecelia Ward (cecelia.ward@ocps.net)

By When: March 2024

To increase proficiency in mathematical fact fluency, accuracy, and computation, we will implement schoolwide weekly math challenges. These challenges will be differentiated by grade level and determined by areas of need based on data. In grades 3-5, students will be challenged to learn their multiplication and division facts during lunch. In grades 1-2, students will be challenged to learn their addition and subtraction facts.

Person Responsible: Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

By When: April 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Based on students' 2023 Panorama survey data, Zellwood student ratings substantially increased from the previous year. In the area of Rigorous Instruction, the students' rating was 85%, a 10% increase; School Safety rating was 72%, a 16% increase; Self-Management rating was 72%, an increase of 10%, Sense of Belonging rating was 73%. an increase of 12%, Social Awareness rating was 70%, an increase of 10%, and Student/Teacher relationships was 81%, an increase of 6%. In the area of School Climate, the student rating was 65%, only a 3% increase from the previous school year. This provides us with an area to target for improvement.

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

Using the data from the 2024 school generated survey, our school improvement efforts in these Life Skills areas will show an increase of 10% in the area of School Climate from 65% to 75%. With our efforts, we hope to see a significant improvement in the school's climate data as it relates to the students' learning environment.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations, analysis of truancy data, analysis of referral data, and staff and student surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.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 Characteristic of Resiliency traits will be enforced monthly in the classroom under the guidance of the school counselor.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the students' Panorama Survey, 64% of the students in grades 4 and 5 felt that the behavior of others impeded their learning.

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.

A positive reinforcement plan for student behavior will be implemented by the administration and the school counselor. Students will be challenged to consistently display the monthly "Resiliency Trait" and then be recognized for their efforts through our "World Changer" Awards Program.

Person Responsible: Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

By When: The monthly "Resiliency Traits" will begin the month of August and continue through May.

There is a need for consistency within classrooms for teachers to address Level 1 behaviors so they are quickly extinguished and don't become disruptive to the learning environment. A professional development will be provided during preplanning, presented by Administration and the Behavior Specialist, to provide classroom management tips. CHAMPS is being utilized school-wide for behavior management.

Person Responsible: Caroll Grimando (caroll.grimando@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

The Behavior Specialist position will be instrumental in supporting our ESE students in need of behavioral interventions. She will work closely with teachers and students to provide support with classroom interventions and support the MTSS process for students who struggle with self-management.

Person Responsible: Melody Tennis-Slotsve (m.tennis-slotsve@ocps.net)

By When: This will begin August during Pre-Planning week.

Based on discipline data and teacher recommendations, behaviorally "at risk" students will be identified, selected and paired up with an adult mentor on campus. The adult will build a relationship with the student, meet with them daily and engage them in goal-setting activities in an attempt to proactively address misbehaviors.

Person Responsible: Melody Tennis-Slotsve (m.tennis-slotsve@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

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

On the FAST ELA assessment, 64% of our Kindergarten students scored a level 3 or higher; 59% of our First grade students scored a level 3 or higher, however, 45% of our Second-grade students scored a level 3 or higher. Therefore, 54% of our Second-grade students scored below proficiency on the FAST ELA assessment. Based on this data, our focus will be to build students' fluency by teaching them to decode words by analyzing the word parts, which will also assist with the students comprehending the text. Using the Orton-Gillingham strategies including the multisensory components will assist students with decoding words and begin to recognize them to become fluent readers.

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

An Area of Focus, based on historical data at Zellwood, as well as last year's FAST data, must be increasing the percentage of students scoring at proficiency in reading. Last year, on the FAST EOY, only 38% of third graders scored Level 3 and above. In fifth grade, only 47% of students scored Level 3 and above. We have been successful in reducing the percentage of students scoring Level 1 and reducing it from 37% on the 2022 FSA to 24% on the 2023 FAST. The goal now is to move more students from Level 2 into Level 3.

Beginning of the year FAST data shows an urgent need to routinely use comprehension-building strategies to help students make sense of text. On the most recently administered FAST BOY, only 15% of 3rd graders, 20% of 4th graders, and 26% of 5th graders scored Level 3 and above. It will be imperative that our school strategically meet these students where they are, filling in gaps that may exist in their foundational skills in order to increase their ability to decode and develop fluency. At the same time, we must also focus on the development of vocabulary and comprehension skills so students can successfully read and understand more complex text.

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

For grade 2, our goal is to move from 45% of students scoring Level 3 and above on the ELA FAST EOY to 50% Level 3 and above.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

For grade 3, our goal is to move from 38% of students scoring Level 3 and above on the ELA FAST EOY to 50% Level 3 and above.

For grade 5, our goal is to move from 47% of students scoring Level 3 and above on the ELA FAST EOY to 50% Level 3 and above.

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.

Our Area of Focus, increasing the percentage of students "passing" the FAST test at the End of the Year, will be monitored closely throughout the year by the school's Leadership Team. By participating in weekly "data dives" with PLCs, and through monitoring achievement outcomes on unit assessments, OG assessments, FAST assessments, etc... we will ensure that data is used to make instructional

adjustments and to determine students in need of additional support to allow for a greater percentage of students to reach proficiency.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Grimando, Caroll, caroll.grimando@ocps.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?

Zellwood will continue to use Orton-Gillingham strategies, which are aligned with the Science of Reading, to support Early Literacy instruction; helping students develop phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency skills. Through morphology lessons, students will be able to understand more complex, multisyllabic words and enhance their vocabulary development. Finally, implementing direct instruction in comprehension strategies, focusing on guiding the students to draw meaning and make sense of the rigorous text, will increase proficiency on the state assessments.

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?

Orton-Gillingham is an evidence-based approach that has been transformative within our school for the past two years. We have seen reduced numbers of students scoring level 1 on state assessments and an increase in the percentage of students who are considered "fluent" readers. Additionally, fewer students need Tier 3 interventions. Data coming from grades K-1 show that large percentages of students are now scoring "proficient" due to the consistent use of OG practices in these early literacy grade 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
The Leadership team will share the 2023 FAST PM3 data will the staff and the school's goals for the 2024 school year.	Grimando, Caroll, caroll.grimando@ocps.net
Quarterly professional development will be provided to the staff to ensure instructional best practices, specifically Orton-Gillingham strategies, are being fully understood and used appropriately and effectively.	Dozier, Jamie, jaime.dozier@ocps.net
The Instructional Coach will help support teachers by modeling lessons/strategies/skills, reviewing data, and providing feedback to teachers to improve upon the skills and strategies necessary to drive small group instruction.	Dozier, Jamie, jaime.dozier@ocps.net
Teachers in grades 1-5 will complete a book study of "The Knowledge Gap" by Natalie Wexler and receive corresponding professional development, including the use of Expanding Expression Tools to aid in the building of content knowledge and application of vocabulary strategies, which will positively impact reading comprehension.	Dozier, Jamie, jaime.dozier@ocps.net
Data will be monitored bi-weekly to determine growth or need for additional support.	Grimando, Caroll, caroll.grimando@ocps.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

https://www.floridacims.org