Orange County Public Schools

William Frangus Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

William Frangus Elementary

380 KILLINGTON WAY, Orlando, FL 32835

https://franguses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Decheryl Britton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2020-21: (39%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Britton, DeCheryl	Principal		Mrs. Britton is the building-level administrator who oversees the daily school operations and curricula implementation school-wide. In addition, she ensures the fiscal and nonfiscal resources are appropriately utilized to foster a wellrounded learning environment for students and staff, and routine updates to community and staff regarding district-wide initiatives and requirements are communicated to all stakeholders.
Bowmer, Sean	Assistant Principal		Mr. Bowmer is the Assistant Principal who oversees the daily operations of William Frangus Elementary and assists with implementing classroom instruction. This entails but is not limited to school-wide discipline, monitoring of SIP, professional development, monthly egress drills, facilities, and supporting curriculum and instruction in kindergarten through second-grade classrooms and fifth-grade math and science classrooms.
Webster, Arlene	Instructional Coach		Mrs. Webster is the 3rd-5th grade ELA Coach and 4th and 5th grade Writing Coach. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. In addition, Mrs. Webster is the beginning teacher lead coordinator and the State and District school based testing administrator.
Hosey, Karrie	Instructional Coach		Mrs. Hosey is the Kindergarten- 2nd-grade InstructionalCoach for ELA and Math & MTSS Coordinator. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. As the MTSS coordinator, she oversees the intervention process for students who need additional academic support or a diversified educational plan.
Smith, Waletta	Guidance Counselor		Mrs. Smith is the School Counselor who ensures that the social-emotional well-being of all students is taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.
Moncur, Patricia	Staffing Specialist		Mrs. Moncur is the Staffing Specialist. She identifies, monitors, and staffs students based on their needs as depicted through the MTSS process and then transitioning to the individual exceptional student plan.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Joseph, Nadine	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Joseph is ELL Compliance Teacher. She identifies, monitors, and staffs students based upon their language deficiency needs. She oversees the parent leadership council and monitors and maintains FTE & ELL compliance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Decheryl Britton

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

0

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

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

390

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

15

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

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	12	86	50	75	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	6	30	17	20	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/10/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	17	54	67	67	62	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	4	18	21	13	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	17	54	67	67	62	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
Attendance below 90 percent	4	18	21	13	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	57%	56%	43%			50%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	62%	61%	43%			59%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	52%	47%			59%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	61%	60%	33%			53%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%	66%	64%	32%			48%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	56%	55%	40%			27%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	56%	51%	37%			51%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	63%	-20%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	19		14	33		9				
ELL	25	50		37	48		26				
BLK	46	62	56	44	62	50	35				
HSP	36	56		34	41		29				
WHT	50			63							
FRL	35	59	50	39	63	57	30				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12			20							
ELL	29	36		17	27						
BLK	44	44		30	30		34				
HSP	38	30		32	30						
WHT	43			57							
FRL	34	44	40	24	29	40	25				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	38	42	28	50	36	30				
ELL	41	61	62	48	47	36	53				
BLK	49	62	70	49	46	21	49				
HSP	42	45		60	50		56				
WHT	64	60		59	48		43				
FRL	45	55	55	48	46	29	44				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends based on the FSA 2022 data indicate that the ELA and Math proficiency levels across 3rd-5th grade levels were almost the same within 2% points. This trend is also represented in the ELA and Math learning gains across the grade levels almost being the same by 1%. The 5th-grade science proficiency trend represents lower student performance than NGSS 2019 performance data. ESSA Subgroup's overall performance indicates students with disabilities are below the 41% range.

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

5th-grade science proficiency data indicates the greatest need for improvement. NGSS 2019 data revealed 48% student proficiency and NGSS 2022 data shows 35% student proficiency. Progress monitoring data represents the same need for science improvement.

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

Some contributing factors for the low performance encompass reading comprehension and vocabulary development, student engagement, and staff professional development. In order to address the contributing factors more professional development centered around Science resources to support professional growth and instructional science strategies that yield high results for student engagement and retaining of skills/concepts.

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

Math learning gains and the bottom 25% data show the most improvement compared to FSA 2019 and FSA 2022. The bottom 25% increased performance from 27% to 43%; Learning gains increased from 48% to 59%.

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

Teachers and administration collaborated during joint planning to plan for the differentiated whole group and small group instruction that was culturally relevant. Professional learning communities met to discuss common assessments and the next steps for targeted instruction. In addition, teachers conducted student data chats to hold students accountable for their learning and academic success.

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

Continue to provide teachers with ongoing professional learning opportunities that allow them to gain more competence in engaging students in academic discourse conversations and writing across the content area. In addition, teachers will share successful strategies during professional learning communities to continue to promote a growth mindset toward the development of self-efficacy.

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

B.E.S.T. Math Professional Development- district and school level
Kagan Structures

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

The continuous improvement cycle will be implemented with fidelity- plan, do, check, and act through professional learning communities, teacher /administration data chats, and student/teacher data chats.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The science proficiency level for 5th-grade students who took the NGSS 2022 is 35%. On the NGSS 2019, the science proficiency level was 51%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The expectation is that the 5th-grade science proficiency level will increase from 35% on the NGSS 2022 assessment to 45% as measured by the NGSS 2023 assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Assistant Principal will monitor through classroom walks/observations on a regular basis and provide feedback to teachers on instructional methodologies to improve academic discourse and writing across the content area to improve classroom instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Bowmer (sean.bowmer@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategies that will be used to enhance academic achievement in science are hands-on learning- experiments to promote meaningful academic discourse among students and teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Increasing opportunities for hands-on learning through collaborative structures will provide opportunities for students to better understand the skill/concept which will increase student achievement on district and state assessments.

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.

Provide teachers with ongoing professional learning opportunities that allow them to gain more competence in engaging students in academic discourse conversations and writing across the content area.

Person Responsible	Arlene Webster (arlene.webster@ocps.net)

Provide school-level science professional development opportunities focusing on the district resources available in the Instructional Management System, and provide opportunities to participate in district-level elementary science Impact professional developments.

Person Responsible	Sean Bowmer (sean.bowmer@ocps.net)

Teachers and administration collaborate during common planning to plan for the delivery of whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Sean Bowmer (sean.bowmer@ocps.net)

Professional learning communities will meet to discuss common assessment data and the next steps for targeted classroom instruction and student support.

Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The achievement gap for the Students With Disabilities Subgroup was below 41% as indicated on the ESSA FSA 2022 performance.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The expectation is that the Students with Disabilities subgroup performance will increase to 42% or higher on the ESSA 2023 end of the year FAST.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Professional Learning Community- analyzing students with disabilities ELA and Math common assessment data and identifying actionable next steps through the continuous improvement model process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia Moncur (patricia.moncur@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Increase our systematic use of explicit instruction during the whole group.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Explicit instruction will provide the opportunity for more examples and non-examples as well as language to facilitate student understanding, anticipate common misconceptions, highlight essential content, and remove distracting information.

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.

ESE professional development on learning strategies through district and school-based professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible	Patricia Moncur (patricia.moncur@ocps.net)

The General Education teacher, Support Facilitator, and Staffing Specialist will collaborate and determine the best practices for explicit instruction based on the standard during common planning, professional learning
communities, IEP meetings, and ESE data teacher data chats.

Person Responsible	Patricia Moncur (patricia.moncur@ocps.net)

The leadership team will monitor the use of explicit instructional strategies through classroom observations, common assessment data, and i-Ready weekly data outcomes.

Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

53% of 1st graders and 58% of 2nd graders scored below proficiency on the Reading iReady Diagnostic End of Year diagnostic 2022. The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd grade- Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

55% of 3rd graders and 65% of 5th graders scored below a level 3 on ELA FSA 2022. Collectively, 3rd through 5th graders had 60% ELA learning gains on FSA 2022. The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd grade- Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. The following IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements: Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9- Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The goal is to increase the number of students reading proficiency levels in 1st grade from 47% to 55% and in 2nd grade from 42% to 50% as indicated on the Reading iReady End of the Year diagnostic 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The goal is to increase the number of students' ELA proficiency in grade 3 from 45% to 50% and in grade 5 from 35% to 40% as indicated on the State-wide Progress Monitoring FAST assessment number 3.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Weekly support by school-based coaches and classroom walk feedback by administrators will impact the monitoring of desired outcomes. In addition, district-created standard-based unit assessments will be monitored through the professional learning communities (PLCs) in order to revise the instructional delivery model, provide remediation - Plan, Do, Check, Act (continuous improvement model), and increase the instructional pedagogy of the teachers.

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

Britton, DeCheryl, decheryl.britton@ocps.net

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

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

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

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

Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.

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

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

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

It is important for students to have a strong foundation in all 6 areas of reading. Focusing on phonics in the primary grades, this will help student confidence regarding fluency and comprehension. Based on the need of the students, SIPPS will be used to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write to recognize words. In addition, it will be used to build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

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
Literacy Coaching- Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc to fit area(s) of need. The literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Webster, Arlene , arlene.webster@ocps.net
Assessment- Use and analysis of: FAST, iReady diagnostic, District created Standards-Based Unit Assessments	Britton, DeCheryl, decheryl.britton@ocps.net
-MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure: Students are appropriately identified. Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.	Hosey, Karrie, karrie.hosey@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district
programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

School Counselor- will ensure that the social-emotional well-being of all students is taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.

SEL Site Team- will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

All Staff - will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support a positive organization improvement and change through the distributive leadership model.