Camelot Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Camelot Elementary

14501 WATERFORD CHASE PKWY, Orlando, FL 32828

https://camelotes.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
Gordon, Melissa	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, differentiated and rigorous instruction, monitors iObservation, partners master teachers with teachers in need of improvement, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity. The Principal runs data meetings, participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision-making, and monitors teachers' data spreadsheets as well as the appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of instruction.
Mills, Elease	Assistant Principal	Helps to run data meetings and monitors teachers' data spreadsheets, supervises the appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of instruction, supervises teachers regarding data interpretation, participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision-making, provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS, trains teachers in graphing procedures and how to problem solve, monitor the size of each group that is participating in MTSS and monitors Tier 3 meetings to ensure completion of all paperwork.
Brinzo, Kristen	Instructional Media	Provides literary support in our media center by supplying and helping students choose the correct lexile-level book. Ensures our textbook, library book, and technology inventory is in compliance. Supports writing intervention and acceleration opportunities through small groups.
Castillo, Justina	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides teachers with appropriate and grade level-specific data and monitors appropriate use of intervention materials. Testing coordinator for all school-wide test events. Meets once a week as a Leadership PLC focusing on effective teaching strategies, coaching opportunities, and both schoolwide and individual student data.
Reyes, Jessica	Dean	Provides support for behavioral MTSS decision-making processes, helps to organize and assist in proper documentation and compliance, monitors discipline and implements BIPs as well as facilitates reward systems, expedites PLC meetings, reviews ELL data to ensure the students are being provided rigorous and differentiated instruction, and ensures all paperwork is in compliance with the District and the State. Monitors the fidelity and implementation of the curriculum within the classroom to ensure accommodations and modifications for ELL students, and follow roles and duties for the instructional coach.
Parris, Erica	Instructional Coach	Provides support to teachers in progress monitoring of each classroom and student data. Meets once a week as a Leadership PLC focusing on effective teaching strategies, coaching opportunities, and both schoolwide and individual student data. Works with the teachers in the classroom, provides coaching, and leads common planning in the areas of their expertise. Meet with the lowest 30% of students in math to provide additional academic support. Monitors teachers' data spreadsheets, supervises that the appropriate use of intervention materials and quality of

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instruction occurs, monitors teachers regarding data interpretation, and participates in any Tier 3 meeting and decision making. Provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS.
Poffenberger, Rebecca	Staffing Specialist	Provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS, helps to organize and assist in Tier 3 paperwork and compliance, monitors the implementation of IEPs and 504 plans, and collaborates with teachers to ensure SWD are receiving differentiated rigorous instruction.
Vetter, Candy	ELL Compliance Specialist	Provides support to teachers when participating in MTSS, helps to organize and assist in Tier 3 paperwork and compliance, monitors the implementation of IEPs and 504 plans, and collaborates with teachers to ensure SWD are receiving differentiated rigorous instruction.

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.

Our School Advisory Council which includes a makeup of all stakeholders reviews Panorama survey data at the beginning and the end of the year. The feedback provided is included in developing our SIP goals. Additionally, end-of-year student performance on state testing is shared with our School Advisory Council and the discussion around performance is used to create our SIP goals.

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))

At each School Advisory Council meeting, which is held monthly, our goals are reviewed for our SIP. After the beginning of the year assessment (BOY) data and middle of the year assessments (MOY) are completed, a review of data is completed in relation to our SIP goals and progress towards meeting the goals.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	9	28	19	20	23	12	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
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	4	16	24	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	21	22	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	16	17	16	0	0	0	0	63

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	9	7	10	25	21	0	0	0	72

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	11
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	2	0	7	8	0	0	0	17

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	11
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	2	0	7	8	0	0	0	17

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60	57	53	58	56	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				61			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			35		
Math Achievement*	58	60	59	60	46	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				56			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27			14		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	63	63	54	49	61	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	59	59	62			37		

* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	310
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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
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	21	Yes	2	2
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	70			
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	51			

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	20	Yes	1	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	48			
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	47			

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	60			58			63					63
SWD	13			15			13				5	58
ELL	44			44			39				5	63
AMI												
ASN	85			80							2	
BLK	61			66			79				4	
HSP	52			43			52				5	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61			66			71				4	
FRL	48			43			51				5	51

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	58	61	44	60	56	27	49					62
SWD	15	26	22	14	19	5	20					42
ELL	43	58	44	46	48	13	45					62
AMI												
ASN	85	64		85	67							
BLK	53	64		53	45		27					
HSP	49	61	55	53	52	29	50					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	60	38	68	66		52					
FRL	49	61	43	47	47	25	40					61

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	59	52	35	55	32	14	46					37
SWD	21	10		21	10							36
ELL	51	68	50	47	31	10	42					37

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	94			67								
BLK	54	62		49	31		31					
HSP	54	47	20	50	22	0	46					33
MUL	55			55								
PAC												
WHT	64	56		66	44		39					
FRL	52	49	35	46	22	11	31					36

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	47%	54%	-7%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	51%	7%

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.

When comparing all of the components, our lowest performance was ELA Fifth Grade. Fifth grade ELA demonstrated a 53% proficiency. When comparing that data to Fourth Grade and Third Grade, Fifth Grade scored more than 10% below both Fourth and Third Grade. We had a teacher leave in December and the replacement teacher was frequently absent which led to a loss of instruction for one Fifth Grade classroom. Additionally, the grade level was not aligned on instruction a majority of the time which meant they were not hitting the depth of the standard required for students to demonstrate mastery.

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

When comparing our historical data, we did not experience a decline in grade-level data from the previous school year. However, math showed the smallest increase from the 21-22 school year at 60% proficiency to 62% in the 22-23 school year. The 22-23 school year was the first year of instruction in the MATH BEST standards. With the new standards our teachers were learning while providing instruction. Teachers did not exhibit confidence in determining student misconception as we planned for upcoming units of instruction. This created a barrier when developing structures for reteaching low performing standards.

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.

In review of the data we were higher than the state in all components. However, our 4th grade proficiency score showed 10 percentage points higher than the state. Our intentional focus on interventions and grade level standards helped to ensure we showed higher proficiency than the state.

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

When comparing all components, Fifth Grade Science showed the most improvement with a 14% point gain from 49% proficiency in the 21-22 school year compared to 63% proficiency in the 22-23 school year. During the 22-23 school year, all fourth and fifth-grade students attended science labs with our Gifted Teacher. This change ensured our students had opportunities to engage in science labs in addition to the instruction provided in their core science class. Our fifth-grade teachers planned science instruction together, analyzed student data, and created small group rotations within the grade level to address the lowest-performing standards. Additionally, tutoring was provided during the second semester to provide tier 2 instruction for our bubble students.

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

Absences of 10% or more for both Kindergarten and First Grade are concerning as this is a loss of foundational skills instruction. Additionally, Level 1 on statewide ELA and Math assessments in both Fourth and Fifth Grade is concerning.

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

1. Fifth Grade ELA proficiency
2. Grades 3-5 ELA proficiency
3. Grades 3-5 Math proficiency
4. Improvement in attendance by building on our sense of community

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 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.

Data from the Early Warning System indicated a high number of students with above 10% absences in particular grades. As a result, we need to focus on strengthening our sense of community in order to have students feel connected. By increasing student recognitions through positive behaviors, academic accomplishments, and overall mentorship students intrinsic motivation to be in school when increase.

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

We will reduce the number of students with less than 90% absences by 10% at the end of the 2023-24 School Year from 111 students to 100 or less.

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

In collaboration with our Registrar, who monitors attendance, the School Social Worker and Admin Team will review monthly attendance reports to identify students who are falling below the 90% threshold.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Gordon (melissa.gordon@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 student resiliency to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide PBIS system, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school support for families.

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 culture of student resiliency with families, istaff, and students, in addition to our PBIS initiative; 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 support 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 social, emotional, and academic development of every student. Additionally, our implementation of our Starfish Mentoring program allows students to connect with adults on campus to ensure they have an ally.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Implement a school-wide PBIS system. This will include ensuring that all staff receives training on the PBIS system from the school-based PBIS team.

Person Responsible: Jessica Reyes (jessica.reyes@ocps.net)

By When: End of School Year

Individual teacher data meetings will be held at report card times where academics and attendance concerns will be discussed. Students with attendance concerns will be provided with strategies to help increase attendance. This will also be a conversation during parent-teacher conferences.

Person Responsible: Melissa Gordon (melissa.gordon@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.

ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 demonstrated a 62%. Fifth Grade showed a 53% proficiency for our students. While this was a growth in overall proficiency of 4%, we still have 38% of our students or more reading below grade level in grades 3-5. Additionally, based on our 2019-20 proficiency SWD is also an area of focus. Student with Disabilities will be above the 41% federal index at the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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

The school plans to achieve an increase in proficiency from 62% to 70% (an increase of 8%) as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

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

A progress-monitoring tool will be used by all classroom teachers to track incremental data points and student progress. Within each progress monitoring window, the data will be analyzed and interventions will be provided based on students performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elease Mills (elease.mills@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.)

Based on the Science of Reading, students will be assessed utilizing a diagnostic tool. Analyzing student data, we will complete further assessments for students who are below grade level in comprehension to determine his/her reading deficit (fluency, phonics, phonological awareness). Students demonstrating more than one grade level deficit will be assessed on their phonological and phonemic awareness using SIPPS. Intervention groups will be created based the needs of each student.

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

Utilizing multiple data points will ensure the areas of greatest need are addressed in interventions to close achievement gaps. SIPPS is a research based program aligned to the Science of Reading to address reading deficits. The district decision tree outlines specific next steps dependent upon student data outcomes.

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.

Triangulation of student will occur at each state progress monitoring check points (BOY, MOY, and EOY) to determine student intervention and tutoring needs. Additionally, bi-monthly progress monitoring will occur for tier 2 and tier 3 students.

Person Responsible: Candy Vetter (candy.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Create intervention groups and schedule for weekly interventions

Person Responsible: Candy Vetter (candy.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Develop a system for tracking student progress and monitoring instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Candy Vetter (candy.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

#3. 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.

Math proficiency for grades 3-5 demonstrated a 62%. While this was a growth in overall proficiency of 2%, we still have 38% of our students or more performing below grade level in grades 3-5 in mathematics. Additionally, based on our 2019-20 proficiency SWD is also an area of focus. Student with Disabilities will be above the 41% federal index at the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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

The school plans to achieve an increase in proficiency from 62% to 70% (an increase of 8%) as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

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

A progress-monitoring tool will be used by all classroom teachers to track incremental data points and student progress. Within each progress monitoring window, the data will be analyzed and interventions will be provided based on students performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Based on the Florida Math Formula for Success students will be assessed with both a screener and diagnostic tool. Analyzing student data, we will complete further assessments for students who are below grade level in math skills and provide tier 2 or tier 3 interventions using both Success Maker and Number Worlds to narrow the achievement gap.

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

Through our data analysis we have identified foundational gaps in student math skills. In an effort to close these gaps students will receive tier 2 and tier 3 math interventions to support the area of greatest deficit. Ongoing progress monitoring will occur to measure the impact of our interventions, student growth and the determination of next steps. These decisions are based on the district math decision guides.

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.

Triangulating student data to determine student intervention and tutoring needs.

Person Responsible: Candy Vetter (candy.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Create instructional groups and schedule for interventions

Person Responsible: Candy Vetter (candy.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Create a tool for tracking student progress and monitoring instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Candy Vetter (candy.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

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).

With the loss of ESSER funding, we lost our Tier 1 Intervention Teachers. Those positions were critical in us being able to pull small groups and provide Tier 2/3 support. We have chosen to pay for one additional resource teacher but because we could only afford one from the school budget our focus will have to be on grades 3-5 and not schoolwide as we have done for the past two years.

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 district has modified our 120 minute ELA block in order teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional model will be implemented at Camelot. Ongoing professional development through planning days, PLCs, and IMPACT participation will support our shift in instructional practice.

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

5th grade ELA is our area of focus for the 23-24 school year based on our 5th ELA proficiency of 49%. When comparing that data to Fourth Grade and Third Grade, Fifth Grade scored more than 10% below both Fourth and Third Grade.

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 use of the district intervention decision tree we will appropriately screen, monitor, and assess students to ensure that 70% of our students on grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grade 5 data from the 22-23 school year demonstrated a 49% proficiency in ELA. Our Grade 4 students demonstrated a 65% proficiency in ELA (current 5th graders). Our goal for our current 5th grade students to achieve 70% overall proficiency in the 23-24 school year. Our first step was to meet with the 5th-grade team to review our EOY data, reflect on the glows and growth, including the analysis of the number of proficient students that dropped within their proficiency band from the previous school year, and emphasize the importance of standards-aligned instruction. Secondly, we departmentalized our 5th-grade team. The teacher assignments are based on the EOY data outcomes to place teachers in the content area(s) of strength. In addition to the utilization of our master tracker for monitoring student progress and our Data PLCs, we will also be meeting with each teacher three additional times, to discuss student progress and areas of concern. Based on trends from the previous school year a full-year PD calendar has been developed to provide ongoing professional development to improve instructional practices and student outcomes with a focus on interventions, small-group instruction, and ELL strategies.

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.

5th grade ELA proficiency will be monitored through PLCs, classroom walkthroughs, observational data, common assessment data, progress monitoring data (FAST PM), and intervention outcomes. During PLCs, our discussion will encompass the alignment of the daily lesson plans to the depth of the standards. Following PLCs the leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the lesson plans and fidelity of instruction. After each unit, the common assessment data will be used to drive instruction for reteaching and small group instruction. Comparative data discussion will aid in the utilization of best practices for teaching. The state progress monitoring in conjunction with other data points (ORF and programmatic data) will assist in our decision-making process regarding students' needs for both intervention and enrichment.

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

Mills, Elease, elease.mills@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?

FAST ELA PM1 data will be used as our baseline to determine student needs. Based on student results, additional assessment data (Oral Reading Fluency, Phonics, and Phonemic Awareness Assessments) will be used to identify each student's greatest reading deficit. The outcomes of our triangulation of data points will used for grouping students. Utilizing ExactPath, SIPPS, Being a Reader and Dibels Fluency probes will assist us in narrowing student proficiency gaps

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 resources selected for intervening and narrowing the achievement gaps are all district-purchased materials aligned with the Science of Reading.

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
Professional Learning is an area of focus for us this school year. The team has developed a full-year professional development calendar based on the identified needs of our staff using both end-of-the-year data and trend data from the 22-23 school year. Each grade level has an ELA representative who attends the district IMPACT training. After each meeting, the representative brings the new learning back to the school and serves as the content expert during our ELA PLCs.	Mills, Elease, elease.mills@ocps.net
Assessment data will be used to drive our instructional decision-making process. FAST assessments, common assessment data, programmatic data, and intervention data will be used to improve instruction and adjust lesson plan development. During content PLCs, data PLCs, and individual data chats the focus will be on student outcomes and the next steps to increase overall student proficiency through standards-aligned instruction.	Mills, Elease, elease.mills@ocps.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$1,300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0217 - Camelot Elementary	General Fund	600.0	$500.00
			Notes: Incentives for PBIS system			
			0217 - Camelot Elementary	General Fund	600.0	$800.00
			Notes: House Shirts for all faculty and students			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0217 - Camelot Elementary	School Improvement Funds	600.0	$7,000.00
			Notes: Before school tutoring staff and materials.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0217 - Camelot Elementary	General Fund	600.0	$7,000.00
			Notes: Before school tutoring costs/ staff and materials			
					Total:	$15,300.00

Budget Approval

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

No

https://www.floridacims.org