

Orange County Public Schools

Engelwood 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 | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 23 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 23 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 26 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Engelwood Elementary

5985 LA COSTA DR, Orlando, FL 32807

<https://engelwoodes.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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Spooney, Danielle | Principal | Ms. Spooney provides the vision for the school to ensure high academic achievement is attained for all students. She implements and evaluates programs within the school to ensure that the achievement gap is closing among subgroups. As an administrator, she performs classroom observations to manage and support alignment for student learning. Additionally, actionable feedback is provided to the teachers for improvement of instruction. She ensures weekly Professional Learning Community meetings are held at each grade level with the instructional team members and the support coaches to discuss standards-based instruction, Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions, along with enrichment lessons for students who are working above grade level. All discussions are focused toward increasing student achievement through fostering a growth mindset. Ms. Spooney coordinates the operation and management of all school functions, community relations, and school budget in compliance with district policies. She also participates in the School Advisory Council (SAC). |
| Candelario, Aislinn | Assistant Principal | As the Assistant Principal (AP), Mrs. Candelario is responsible for assisting the principal with carrying out the school's vision and mission. Her role as an instructional leader includes the collection and analysis of data and supervisory support of all grade levels with an intense focus in K-5 math. She attends common planning and data meetings. She conducts classroom observations and provides feedback and support to teachers on instructional practices and classroom interventions. |
| Pokorny, Cristina | Math Coach | Mrs. McDonnell (Pokorny) serves in the role as the instructional coach and math coach. In this role, she supports 3-5 math. She supports school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as the 3-5 math instructional coach, and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. She oversees and monitors the math assessments and student data. She supports and monitors Professional Learning Communities for math and coordinates the math diagnostic assessment schedules. |
| Cooke, Tanya | Reading Coach | Ms. Cooke serves in the role as the 3-5 ELA coach. She provides support to teachers as the 3-5 ELA coach during Professional Learning Communities and in the classroom. She provides actionable feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. She oversees and monitors the reading assessments and student data. |
| Anderson, Leslie | | As the MTSS school facilitator, Mrs. Anderson ensures families are made aware of interventions that are available to decrease deficiencies. She is responsible for collecting and analyzing Tier 2 and Tier 3 data and keeping student curriculum folders updated with the proper paperwork. She facilitates "Kid Data Chats" to discuss the academic progress of the students in the lowest 25%. Mrs. Anderson provides academic and behavior strategies to teachers to increase their pedagogy in Tier 2 and Tier 3 |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|
| | | interventions and conducts classroom walkthroughs to observe the implementations and provides actionable feedback. |
| Privitera, Julie | Staffing Specialist | As the staffing specialist, Mrs. Privitera is responsible for coordinating the staffing and special educational planning process on campus. She provides professional development when necessary. |
| Soltren, Carmen | ELL Compliance Specialist | Mrs. Soltren serves as the ELL Compliance Specialist and K-2 reading coach. In this role, she ensures testing is completed for all ELL students and monitors their data. In addition, she supports K-2 ELA by providing support and guidance to teachers during common planning and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. She oversees and monitors the K-2 reading assessments and student data. |
| Patrick, Twyla | School Counselor | Ms. Patrick provides counseling services to our students. She supports the implementation of mental health services. She assists with our Attendance meetings that are held with identified families. |

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.

When developing the SIP, feedback from the annual Stakeholder survey was used. Members of the school's leadership team also helped to create the plan.

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 monitored throughout the school year. Once the SIP is completed, the goals and actions we be shared with all stakeholders during SAC meetings and faculty meetings. As we analyze student achievement data during data meetings (Standards Based Unit Assessments and diagnostics), we will look to see how we are progressing towards are goals. The SIP will also be discussed with our Principal Leaders during our school data meetings. The mid-year reflection will also be completed. This will provide another opportunity to further analyze our data and help us to determine if we must revise our plan.

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 | 90% |
| 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) 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: D |
| 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 | 10 | 38 | 18 | 30 | 34 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| 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 | 8 | 41 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 39 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 20 | 20 | 46 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | |

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 | 13 | 6 | 23 | 49 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 11 | 39 | 27 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 24 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 13 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | |
| 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 | 25 | 16 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 11 | 39 | 27 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 24 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 13 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | |
| 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 | 25 | 16 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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* | 34 | 57 | 53 | 34 | 56 | 56 | 29 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 59 | | | 42 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 44 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 39 | 60 | 59 | 38 | 46 | 50 | 22 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69 | | | 24 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 63 | | | 31 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 44 | 63 | 54 | 32 | 61 | 59 | 38 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 56 | 59 | 59 | 61 | | | 46 | | |

* 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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 206 |
| 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 | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 405 |
| 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 | 18 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 42 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

| 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 | 37 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 48 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 52 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 34 | | | 39 | | | 44 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 7 | | | 9 | | | 16 | | | | 5 | 47 |
| ELL | 25 | | | 37 | | | 33 | | | | 5 | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | 32 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 33 | | | 42 | | | 45 | | | | 5 | 56 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 35 | | | 25 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| FRL | 33 | | | 37 | | | 39 | | | | 5 | 57 |

| 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 | 34 | 59 | 49 | 38 | 69 | 63 | 32 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 12 | 47 | 45 | 12 | 51 | 50 | 24 | | | | | 57 |
| ELL | 25 | 52 | 48 | 34 | 68 | 61 | 34 | | | | | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 53 | | 33 | 63 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 61 | 48 | 40 | 69 | 68 | 32 | | | | | 62 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 40 | | 29 | 80 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 58 | 48 | 38 | 65 | 60 | 32 | | | | | 58 |

| 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 | 29 | 42 | 44 | 22 | 24 | 31 | 38 | | | | | 46 |
| SWD | 5 | 41 | | 7 | 24 | | 0 | | | | | 40 |
| ELL | 23 | 42 | 46 | 20 | 32 | 31 | 25 | | | | | 46 |

| 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 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | | | 22 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 44 | 40 | 21 | 26 | 33 | 36 | | | | | 46 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | 42 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | 47 | 55 | 21 | 26 | 36 | 39 | | | | | 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 | 29% | 54% | -25% | 54% | -25% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 60% | -18% | 58% | -16% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 52% | -25% | 50% | -23% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 59% | -25% | 59% | -25% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 62% | -17% | 61% | -16% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 55% | -16% | 55% | -16% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 59% | -19% | 51% | -11% |

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.

As evidenced on the F.A.S.T. PM3, the data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA. On the 2022 FSA, 35% of 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient. On 2023 F.A.S.T., 31% of 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient.

Contributing factors to last year's low performance include new B.E.S.T. Benchmarks in ELA and math, new core curriculum, and low student attendance.

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

As evidenced on the F.A.S.T. PM3, the data component that showed the greatest decline was ELA. On the 2022 FSA, 35% of 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient. On 2023 F.A.S.T., 31% of 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient.

Contributing factors to last year's low performance include new B.E.S.T. Benchmarks in ELA and math, new core curriculum, and low student 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.

The state data hasn't been uploaded yet. Therefore, we are unable to provide an explanation.

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

As evidenced on the science state assessment, the data component that showed the most improvement was science. The proficiency rate increased by 8%.

The improvement in science can be attributed to strategic grouping of students based on achievement data. Science labs were used to provide students hands-on experience. In addition, the school received support from a program specialist who brought a wealth of knowledge to our teachers and students. Towards the end of the school year, teachers utilized a spiral review resource to prepare students for the state assessment.

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

Using the EWS data, two potential areas of concern are low student attendance and the number of Level 1s on the F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA and Math.

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

- 1) Intentional and purposeful planning
- 2) Student-centered learning
- 3) Data-driven instruction
- 4) Increase students' daily attendance and punctuality

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

To improve reading achievement in the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup, teachers require additional support with data-driven instruction, student-centered learning, and purposeful, intentional planning.

On the 2023 PM3 ELA F.A.S.T., 37% of SWD achieved proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, proficiency for Students with Disabilities will increase from 37% to 41%, as evidenced on the PM3 ELA F.A.S.T.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly common planning will be facilitated to allow teachers the opportunity to discuss and demonstrate how they will implement benchmark-based lessons and incorporate student-centered activities that foster collaboration and meaningful engagement. School-based leadership team members, in collaboration with district personnel, will conduct classroom observations to determine if instruction aligns with the planning. Actionable feedback will provided after all observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Spooney (danielle.spooney@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.)

Evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus include Professional Development on the topics of: student-centered activities and monitoring. Data meetings will be conducted after diagnostics and Student-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) to monitor student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student achievement and classroom observation data indicates that teachers will benefit from additional support and professional development on the aforementioned topics. As a result of the professional development and consistent data analysis which will be used to drive instruction, student achievement will increase.

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.

Monitor through weekly classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Danielle Spooney (danielle.spooney@ocps.net)

By When: Until May 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.

To increase student achievement and close the achievement gap, Engelwood Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency by ensuring that instructional teams collaboratively develop math unit plans that meet the needs of our students and assure student mastery of standards-based benchmarks. The primary focus will be on student-centered learning and data-driven instruction.

Student achievement data and observation data indicates teachers will benefit from collaboratively developing math unit plans that ensure student mastery of benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

May 2023, we expect to see an overall increase of 12% in the performance of students meeting grade level proficiency in math as evidenced by the PM3 math F.A.S.T.

Monitoring:

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

Consistent, ongoing common planning, as well as monitoring of instructional practices, coupled with actionable feedback to teachers and coaches will allow us to remain focused on the most critical information and meet our end-of-year goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aislinn Van Buren (98771@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.)

Professional development on the topics of student collaboration and hands-on math instruction, as well as, how to monitor students and using the data to drive instruction will be provided to teachers throughout the school year. Professional development will be presented in workshops and facilitated common planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PM3 math student data indicates 38% of 3rd-5th grade students are proficient. Classroom observation data indicates teachers need additional support implementing pedagogical practices to include collaboration and engaging activities that allow students to authentically interact with content.

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.

Common planning that affords teachers the time to explain and model how they will teach math problems to students.

Person Responsible: Aislinn Candelario (aislinn.candelario@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing August 2023-May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Engelwood Elementary will establish and nurture a school culture and climate that promotes high expectations for academic achievement and student accountability. To build academic expertise in all students, we will encourage students to be their best selves, through the use of an incentive and recognition program we have created and named, Project Cardinal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, we will reduce the number of students exhibiting the Early Warning indicators.

Monitoring:

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

Student Attendance and tardies will be monitored weekly.

Student data will be monitored after SBUAs and diagnostics.

Reports for electronic educational programs will be monitored weekly (i.e. Accelerated Reading, Exact Path, Success Maker, and Study Island).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Spooney (danielle.spooney@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.)

We will build a culture of high expectations through Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Early Warning System data indicates students and teachers will benefit from an increased focus on high expectations and social and emotional learning. Academic learning is enhanced when students have the opportunity to show ownership for their learning as well as receive recognition for their achievements.

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 Attendance meetings with Student Services team to monitor students with excessive absences and/or tardies.

Person Responsible: Aislinn Candelario (aislinn.candelario@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing (August 2023-May 2024)

Data meetings after Student Based Unit Assessments to monitor and discuss students' academic progress.

Person Responsible: Danielle Spooney (danielle.spooney@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing (August 2023-May 2024)

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)).

Engelwood collaborated with stakeholders to review allocations. Extra-hour reading instruction will continue to be implemented this school year in an effort to close the achievement gap with our students. The extra-hour reading block and reading intervention block will mirror each other. Thus, providing our students two opportunities each day to receive reading instruction that is designed to meet their needs and increase their abilities. All of our resources are approved by the district.

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 instructional practice specifically relating to ELA that will be the area of focus for grades K-2 is foundational skills. Foundational skills are the building blocks of reading. The goal is to help students comprehend the texts they read. Students must develop proficiency with print concepts, phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency skills; which will help them better understand text. Our 2022-23 EOY STAR data revealed 36% proficiency.

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

The instructional practices specifically relating to ELA that will be the area of focus for grades 3-5 are whole group differentiated instruction. The Tier 1 instruction and tasks that are implemented must align with the benchmarks. Additionally, instruction during teacher-led small groups, reading intervention, and the extra hour of reading must meet the needs of the student and address deficiencies. Our 2022-23 F.A.S.T. EOY results revealed 31% proficiency in ELA, whereas our 2021-2022 revealed 35% proficiency.

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

By June 2024, we expect to see 50% of K-2 students meeting grade level proficiency in ELA as evidenced on the End-of-Year, Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T) progress monitoring tool.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, we expect to see 50% of 3-5 students meeting grade level proficiency in ELA as evidenced on the End-of Year, Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.).

By June 2024, learning gains for all 3-5 students will meet or exceed 60% in ELA. We will also expect our students in the lowest quartile to meet or exceed 60% learning gains as evidenced on the F.A.S.T.

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.

School-based leadership team members, in collaboration with district specialists, will conduct classroom observations to determine if instruction and tasks meet the full intent of the Florida B.E.S.T. Benchmarks. Effective implementation will be measured utilizing progress monitoring data from diagnostics, F.A.S.T., and Standards-Based Unit Assessments. Additionally, teachers will be provided immediate actionable feedback via conferences, email, and iObservations.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Spooney, Danielle, danielle.spooney@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?

The evidence-based practices and programs that will be implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes include, the use of district approved core and supplemental programs and intervention materials, an increased focus on foundation skills in K-2 ELA, targeted small group instruction, professional development based on observation trends and student academic data, modeling, co-teaching, and weekly common planning.

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 rationale for selecting the practices and programs was based on observation data and student academic data. We will use research-based instructional strategies, and the Florida B.E.S.T. Benchmarks to collaboratively plan, deliver, and monitor lessons for all tiers of instruction to increase student proficiency on state assessments. Teacher collaboration and modeling with support from school-based and/or district specialists, will strengthen teachers' understanding and instructional delivery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Benchmarks.

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</p> <p>Select members of the faculty will attend IMPACT trainings facilitated by district coaches to receive support and guidance regarding the B.E.S.T. Standards and unit requirements. They will be responsible for support teachers in their grade level and content areas.</p> <p>Teachers will continue to complete AIM courses.</p> | Spooney, Danielle, danielle.spooney@ocps.net |
| <p>Literacy Coaching</p> <p>Observation Data will be used to tier teachers. An observation calendar will be developed to ensure teachers who are in need of support are serviced (coaching, modeling, co-teaching)</p> | Spooney, Danielle, danielle.spooney@ocps.net |
| <p>Assessment</p> <p>Standards-Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) data will be used to determine next steps such as, re-teaching, remediation, and targeted small group instruction. Data meetings will be held after each SBUA.</p> | Spooney, Danielle, danielle.spooney@ocps.net |
| <p>Professional Learning</p> <p>A professional development calendar has been created to denote the topics being offered to teachers. The topics are determined by observation trends.</p> | Candelario, Aislinn, aislinn.candelario@ocps.net |

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 SIP information is disseminated orally during the Annual Title I meeting. During each SAC meeting, the SIP goals and the progress towards the goal are discussed. A copy of the SIP is located on the school website. A condensed version of the SIP is disseminated to parents as well.

Website Address - <https://engelwoodes.ocps.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))

Engelwood builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by maintaining open two-way communication. We communicate with stakeholders through flyers, letters, marquee messages, emails, phone calls, ClassDojo messages, school-wide newsletters and parent-teacher conferences.

We encourage parents to contact their child's teacher or administrators at any time discuss their child's progress. Parent-Teacher Conferences are held throughout the year, but school-wide conference nights are held twice a year to keep parents informed of their child's progress.

Family engagement nights are held throughout the year to model the teaching that occurs within our classrooms and to provide families strategies on how to support their child at home.

Progress Reports and Report cards are sent home to keep parents informed as well.

Website Address - <https://engelwoodes.ocps.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)

All minutes on campus are meaningful and instructional time is protected. Teachers teach from bell-to-bell. During plans to strengthen the academic program in the school by providing regular, relevant, and timely professional development to teachers. Data will continue to be used to make decisions and drive instruction.

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))

This plan was developed within the guidelines that have been put into place by the Florida Department of Education and Orange County Public Schools System.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our student services team consists of our school counselor, ALPHA counselor, and behavior specialist. They work to ensure our students receive the necessary services. Families are referred to outside agencies when necessary through the use of SEDNET forms.

Our MTSS coach facilitates "Kid Chats" three times a year to allow teachers the opportunity to meet with her and the team individually to discuss the whole child - academics, behavior, and all other matters of the child.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We are not a secondary school. However, we are introducing our students to colleges and careers through our Project Cardinal initiative and "house" system.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our school-wide behavior model is modeled after CHAMPS. We provide students clear directions and expectations. Students are awarded points through ClassDojo for adherence to rules. Students who struggle with behavior are identified and monitored closely through our MTSS process. Interventions are put into place and at times daily behavior charts may be used. Data is collected to determine the need for Tier 2 or Tier 3 support. Referral for an evaluation is made when students are not successful with Tier 3 interventions.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional learning is provided for our faculty and staff throughout the school year. Teachers attend professional developments that are based on observation trends and student academic data. Paraprofessionals attend district facilitated PD during the school year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our school participates in the Jumpstart to Kindergarten program during the summer. This gives incoming kindergarten students the opportunity to attend our school before the official start of the school year. They become acquainted with our school facility and start learning some the academic content in advance.