

Orange County Public Schools

Universal Education Center 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Universal Education Center

1000 UNIVERSAL STUDIOS PLZ, Orlando, FL 32819

[no web address on file]

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
Tovine, William	Principal	The principal is the head of the administrative team within a school and is responsible for overseeing the daily operations of the institution. The responsibilities of the principal include: coordinate staff schedules, oversee the development of curriculum and enforce school policies relating to discipline, safety and mental health. The principal also coordinates staff training days and works directly with students who need help meeting or setting goals. The principal also serves as the direct liaison between the school and the school board and is responsible for ensuring that the school operates according to school board protocols.
Rebholz, Amy	Assistant Principal	The role of the assistant principal is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. The responsibilities include: leading, directing, counseling, and supervising a variety of personnel and programs; creating effective parent, teacher, and child communications; supporting, encouraging, mentoring, and evaluating staff; fostering teamwork between teachers and among staff and parents; and managing discipline, safety, mental health and budget items. The assistant principal acts in the capacity of the principal during the principal's absence from the school.

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 school improvement plan is reviewed during a school advisory council meeting, which consists of school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students and families, and business or community leaders. Their input was used in the SIP development process.

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))

SIP plans will be monitored regularly by the school leadership team, curriculum team, and the SAC committee. Any revisions will be based on progress monitoring data.

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)	High School 10-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	8%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: COMMENDABLE
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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*		49	50		49	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		34	38		36	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		66	64		31	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		66	66	60	43	48			
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	100	87	89		62	61			
College and Career Acceleration	9	65	65		70	67			
ELP Progress		45	45						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	109

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	60
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	100
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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										100	9	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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								60				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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.

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

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	63%	1%

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.

Universal Education Center had 100% (5/5) of students in grades 11-12 score a level 1 or 2 on the Florida Standards Assessment in Algebra 1 and 0% (0/5) of students score a level 3 or higher. In grades 11-12, students showed the lowest performance in exponential functions, quadratic modeling, and statistics and probability.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year on the FSA, Algebra 1 was in Statistics and the number system where 100% (5/5) students scored a level 1. Juniors and Seniors are not enrolled in algebra 1. They are enrolled in Math for College Algebra and Financial Literacy instruction which are not aligned with the Algebra 1 standards which are tested on the Algebra 1 retake.

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.

During the 2023 school year, the state average for Math achievement was 53%. According to UEC's FSA data, 0% (0/5) students scored a level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 EOC retake assessment. This component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The students prior knowledge of the mathematical components was lacking in all areas. One of the trends that impacted the scores was the students inability to navigate statistical probability and number sense.

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

According to the data, the component that showed the most improvement was the FSA ELA assessment. 21% percent, (3/14), students passed the assessment. Administrators and coaches were provided with instructional strategies to share with teachers to promote standards-based instruction and best practices. In addition, classroom walkthroughs were conducted and feedback was provided to teachers to enhance student learning. This year, we will continue to use progress monitoring assessment data and common assessment data to create intervention groups for additional test preparation, review and remediation. In addition, reading coaches will create intervention groups to prepare students for the retake assessment.

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

After reviewing the EWS data, our two main areas of concern are ELA and Math.

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

1. Increase student proficiency in ELA and Math
2. Narrowing the achievement gap
3. Increase learning gains

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

The percentage of students in 2022-2023 making learning gains in math was 0%. Based on 2022-2023 school data, 100% (5/5) of the students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored below proficiency (level 3 or above). Additional support is needed to increase proficiency in this area. Improving math achievement will improve student attendance, graduation, and learning gains on the common assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, the percent of students showing proficiency in Math will increase by 3%. (From 0% to 3%).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs and observations, coaching logs, data discussions with students, professional development trainings through professional learning communities, progress monitoring of assessment data, and bi-weekly site-based data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Tovine (william.tovine@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.)

1. Summarizing and note taking- Teachers will model summarization techniques and use quick writes, graphic organizers, column notes, affinity diagrams.
2. Project-Based Learning- Teachers will integrate content and language through group engagement.
3. Activating Prior Knowledge- Teachers will help students make connections between new information and information they already know.
4. Identifying Critical Content- Teacher will help students identify what content is important and what is not important.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The leadership team and coaches will attend professional learning community trainings to assist teachers with evidence-based strategies and interventions to enhance instruction across curricula content. Administrators and coaches will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs, provide actionable feedback to teachers and monitor student learning strengths and weaknesses. Teachers will address areas of concern utilizing progress monitoring and common assessment data.

The following strategies will be implemented to improve student performance:

- Build a culture of collaboration and encourage self-growth/self-reflection between professionals to increase student success.
- Activate or build background knowledge.
- Use Concept Maps and Graphic Organizers.

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.

1. Monitor quarterly progress monitoring assessments and common assessments.
2. Academic data will be collected and reviewed during weekly site meetings.
3. Collaboration with guidance counselors to monitor the course failure rate.
4. Intervention groups will provide remediation and targeted interventions with math coaches.

Person Responsible: William Tovine (william.tovine@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

#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 percentage of students for 2022-2023 making learning gains in ELA was 21%. Based on the 2022-2023 school data, 21% (3/14) students scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA assessment. Additional support is needed to increase proficiency in this area. Improving ELA achievement will improve student attendance, graduation, and learning gains on the common assessment.

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, the percent of students making learning gains in ELA/Reading on the 2023-24 FSA ELA/FAST PM3 in order to improve student postsecondary readiness will increase by 3% (From 21% to 24%).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs and observations, coaching logs, data discussions with students, professional development trainings through professional learning communities, progress monitoring of assessment data with action steps for Tiered intervention groups and bi-weekly site-based data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Tovine (william.tovine@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.)

1. Summarizing and note taking-Teachers will model summarization techniques and use quick writes, graphic organizers, column notes, affinity diagrams.
2. Project-Based Learning- Teachers will integrate content and language through group engagement.
3. Activating Prior Knowledge- Teachers will help students make connections between new information and information they already know.
4. Identifying Critical Content- Teacher will help students identify what content is important and what is not important.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The leadership team and coaches will attend professional learning community trainings to assist teachers with evidence-based strategies and interventions to enhance instruction across curricula content. Administrators and coaches will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs, provide actionable feedback to teachers and monitor student learning strengths and weaknesses. Teachers will address areas of concern utilizing progress monitoring and common assessment data.

The following strategies will be implemented to improve student performance:

- Build a culture of collaboration and encourage self-growth/self-reflection between professionals to increase student success.
- Activate or build background knowledge.
- Use Concept Maps and Graphic Organizers.

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.

1. Increase proficiency in reading through increasing silent sustained reading.
2. Monitor and track the progress of students' assessments.
3. Collect and review academic data during bi-weekly data meetings and a strategic plan will be created to improve targeted outcomes.
4. Provide remediation and targeted interventions for students by reading coaches and teachers.

Person Responsible: William Tovine (william.tovine@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024