

Orange County Public Schools

Discovery Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Discovery Middle

601 WOODBURY RD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://discoveryms.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 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, 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
Aldridge, Jeffrey	Principal	Accountable for Discovery Middle School programs, operations, and facilities; Oversee schoolwide testing; Responsible for Instructional and Classified Personnel; Oversee ESOL; Oversee school-based budget development and implementation; Monitor Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Participate in Push-in; Oversee Awards Program; Oversee Attendance, Oversee clinic and health supervision; Oversee field trips approval; Oversee the development of the master schedule; School community and media spokesperson; Oversee staff development; Articulation, coordination, orientation, and registration with feed elementary and high schools, School Supervision
Kusner, Esther	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction; Develop and Oversee Master Schedule; Oversee FTE Process; Oversee ESE department; 7th Grade Administrator oversees grade level discipline and all 7th-grade operations; Oversee Guidance Department
Navarro, Yamilett	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Technology, Transportation, Supervision, 6th grade administrator
Staley, Kimberly	ELL Compliance Specialist	Testing coordinator/ ESOL compliance
Duncan, Lirisa	School Counselor	Lead Counselor/504 Coordinator

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.

The leadership team assists in creating the SIP. It is then presented to the SAC community for input and approval. The first SAC meeting is in September 2023 when we will have names of the SAC members.

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))

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs, review of progress monitoring data, and data chats with professional learning communities.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	77	49	173	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	52	33	92	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	80	47	177	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	42	28	140	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	77	48	172	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	68	41	157

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	47	71	182	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	40	59	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	20	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	76	176	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	49	53	164	
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	0	0	0	50	52	79	181

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	47	71	182	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	40	59	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	20	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	76	176	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	49	53	164	
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	0	0	0	50	52	79	181

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

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*	56	48	49	52	49	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				50			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			31		
Math Achievement*	69	57	56	65	36	36	63		
Math Learning Gains				64			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			51		
Science Achievement*	65	53	49	61	55	53	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	64	68	79	61	58	72		
Middle School Acceleration	78	77	73	75	52	49	74		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	47	43	40	37	79	76	29		

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	25	Yes	3	2
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	69			
HSP	61			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	75			

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%
FRL	58			

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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	46			
HSP	54			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	48			

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	56			69			65	80	78			47
SWD	20			26			24	30			4	
ELL	30			43			29	58	57		6	47
AMI												
ASN	87			90				100	100		4	
BLK	55			62			56	91	81		5	
HSP	47			63			59	72	72		6	50
MUL	63			85			85	90	83		5	

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
PAC												
WHT	66			76			70	82	81		5	
FRL	45			59			56	72	69		6	46

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	52	50	36	65	64	49	61	79	75			37
SWD	16	33	28	24	39	29	18	50				
ELL	33	46	33	50	58	46	29	63	84			37
AMI												
ASN	79	69		92	80		73		88			
BLK	39	31	22	50	55	52	58	60				
HSP	45	48	36	59	63	47	50	78	72			45
MUL	47	57		74	68			83				
PAC												
WHT	64	56	39	73	65	47	80	84	77			
FRL	42	43	32	54	59	44	48	74	73			13

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	57	53	31	63	55	51	64	72	74			29
SWD	18	28	17	28	47	43	17	28				
ELL	30	42	28	41	51	46	17	49				29
AMI												
ASN	82	77		86	50			92	91			
BLK	51	43	22	44	42	56	42	67	62			
HSP	50	50	34	58	53	46	57	65	66			21
MUL	56	54		56	50		70					
PAC												
WHT	67	57	21	73	63	62	78	80	83			
FRL	44	44	27	48	51	49	48	59	60			31

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
07	2023 - Spring	52%	45%	7%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	47%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	30%	38%	-8%	48%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	63%	50%	13%	44%	19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	47%	43%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	45%	53%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	66%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The lowest component was ELA. Overall Achievement was 52% but it was the lowest overall performance schoolwide. Student attendance is a factor that affects student achievement. Inconsistent attendance leads to teachers reteaching content and consistently trying to catch up with a student in their class. Lack of engagement and processing was a factor that led to the lowest increase in proficiency. Students need to learn how to interact with text, draw inferences, and use evidence-based arguments to help increase their achievement. This year, we have a concentrated focus on school-wide engagement through the use of collaborative group work and revision of lesson plans.

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

The greatest decline was in English Language Learners (ELL) Reading and Math proficiency. In ELA, they went from 33.3% to 24% proficiency. In Math, they went from 50.4% to 46% proficiency. ELL students receive help from their paraprofessional in science and social studies. This is a factor that leads to low proficiency through pullouts. We need to ensure they are receiving more support in ELA and Math through push-ins. Our ELL population has difficulties with academic vocabulary. They need more exposure seeing the vocabulary in context.

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 greatest gap compared to the state is 7th-grade mathematics. The state has an overall of 48% pass rate and the school has an overall of 25%. The change in the math progression and 7th-grade accelerated math taking the 8th-grade test has led to a drop in the overall 7th-grade score.

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

The most improvement was in math achievement. It went from 65% to 72%. There was a strong focus on improving formative assessments and engagement strategies in the math classes. Teachers utilized support facilitators, interventionists, and tutors to help improve students learning through either small group or one on one instruction.

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

An area of concern is absences with a total of 173 students that were absent 10 percent or more of the school year. In addition, ELA assessment shows that 203 students scored a level 1 on the FAST.

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

This year we will focus on professional learning which includes using appropriate scaffolding in their lesson planning and focus on processing activities and engagement strategies to increase overall comprehension. Overall ELA achievement is a focus with a school-wide reading initiative to help promote reading across all content areas. 7th grade math achievement has a gap compared to the state and teachers will look at formative assessment data to adjust lessons and fill the gap. This year we will have a concentrated focus on student attendance (an early warning indicator) and monitoring student truancy. In addition, there will be a strong focus on ELL student comprehension and ESE comprehension since there is an achievement gap within these subgroups.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Student scores increased overall in our school but annual stakeholder data showed that there is a need to improve student sense of belonging on campus. A positive culture and learning environment helps improve students' learning and engagement. We need to integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a positive culture and environment to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By strengthening our school's culture we will help improve student attendance, reading and math comprehension, and close the gap on student achievement for our ESE and ELL subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, our goal is to see an increase in student attendance. Over the course of the school year, we'd like to see less than 20% of our students with less than 90% attendance. In the spring, our goal is to have at least 40% of our students respond that they felt a sense of belonging on the Panorama survey and for less than 88% of our parents to feel barriers to engagement.

Monitoring:

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

We will measure this data with Skyward attendance reports and the Panorama surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@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.)

Use distributive leadership and implement a continuous improvement plan for intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families. Our school will plan and implement professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data.

Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a positive culture and environment with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the academic development of every student.

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.

Integrating Aligned Instructional Strategies

Identify student needs to prepare for academic instruction

Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard

Interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

By When: End of School Year

Deliberate School Supports for Families

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:

Strengthening Communication

Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, cultural night)

Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources

Building Community

Establish a family resource center where families can access resources and information to support student and school success

Create a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected (staff greetings, office appeal)

Host events, workshops and opportunities that are relational, connected to family interests and culture, and are linked to learning

Creating Connections

Establish a family-friendly system with multiple ways to gather and respond to families' questions, suggestions and needs

Create flexible events and opportunities for families (e.g. different times throughout the day, face to face, virtual, pre-recorded sessions, multiple languages)

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

By When: End of School Year

Monitor, Measure, and Modify

Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts

Monitor, measure, and modify the processing and engagement strategies for continuous improvement in leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

By When: End of School Year

#2. 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.

The area of focus is ELA. For the 2021-2022 school year, we scored 52% in overall proficiency. For the 2022-2023 school year, we scored 54%. Teachers are still gaining experience with the Florida Standards, FAST exam, and lesson planning. We have learning gaps with our ELL and ESE students, more focus will go into assisting the teachers with differentiating instruction and building cohesion within the PLC.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, our ELA proficiency will increase to 59%. Teachers will increase proficiency in planning and delivering content. We will have a specific focus on remediation and enrichment through the use of ELL paras, tutors, and support facilitators.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through common formative assessments, district-created Standard Based Unit Assessment, and FAST data. Regular data chats within the Professional Learning Communities will be used to discuss standards and instructional strategies as well as remediation and enrichment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@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.)

Students interact in small groups and utilize effective cognitive skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge. A school-wide emphasis on processing strategies will be used to encourage academic discourse.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction and a rotational model in reading allow for differentiation of instruction along with a targeted focus for teachers to monitor student learning. Flexible grouping also provides a systematic structure for our teachers, tutors, and support facilitators to work with targeted students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The administrator and resource teacher will work with PLCs to design instruction around the curriculum resource materials and high-yield instructional strategies

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: May FAST 3 ELA Assessment Date

Classroom teachers and Support Facilitators will be utilizing collaborative learning stations in the classroom to provide targeted, differentiated instruction to best meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: May FAST 3 ELA Assessment Date

The PLCs will meet weekly during common planning time to discuss data, review the curriculum materials, and plan instruction; including processing, engagement, stations, remediation, and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: May FAST 3 ELA Assessment Date

#3. 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.

An area of focus is our students with disabilities who have an achievement gap. In 2021-2022 school year 16% met ELA proficiency and 24% met Math proficiency. In 2022-2023 school year, 27% met ELA proficiency and 26% in Math proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our school seeks to increase the learning gains of students with disabilities from 27% to 32% in ELA and 26% to 31% in math proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through common formative assessment data, district assessment data, FAST data, classroom observations, and PLC observations. Regular data chats within the Professional Learning Communities will be used to discuss standards and instructional strategies as well as remediation and enrichment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@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.)

This year we will focus on professional learning which includes using appropriate scaffolding in their lesson planning and differentiation. Teachers will plan and use frequent and effective formative assessments during instruction to monitor progress and make innovative, on-the-spot instructional adjustments. Students interact in small groups and utilize effective cognitive skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge. A school-wide emphasis on processing strategies will be used to encourage academic discourse.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction and a rotational model allow for differentiation of instruction along with a targeted focus for teachers to monitor student learning. Flexible grouping also provides a systematic structure for our support facilitators and tutors to work with targeted students.

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.

Provide support facilitation services and learning strategies course to students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: All School Year

Teachers professional development focused on implementing differentiation and small group and rotational model.

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: End of May

Classroom observations to follow up on strategies taught.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Aldridge (jeffrey.aldridge@ocps.net)

By When: End of May

Classroom and Support Facilitator teachers will be utilizing collaborative learning stations in the classroom to provide targeted, differentiated instruction to best meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: End of May

The PLCs will meet weekly during common planning time to discuss data, review the curriculum materials, and plan instruction; including stations, remediation, and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Esther Kusner (esther.kusner@ocps.net)

By When: End of May

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).

Our school has added a 3rd support facilitation position. We now have a support facilitator for each grade level and have added a learning strategies course new this year. There is an increase in the number of paraprofessionals to add support to our students with disabilities. In addition, there is an additional reading teacher at this time that has helped reduce the number of reading students in the courses to better provide instruction using a rotational model.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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