Avalon Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Avalon Elementary

13500 TANJA KING BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://avalones.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.

The mission of Orange County Public Schools is, 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.

The vision of Orange County Public Schools is 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
Swain, Jessica	Principal	Oversee implementation of the school improvement plan to include professional development and monitoring of school data. Oversees common planning and data analysis during PLC meetings K-5.
Popovich, Tara	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in the implementation and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan. Oversees implementation of PLC common planning and data analysis for grades K-2
Edmondson, Natacha	Other	Facilitates professional development tied to our School Improvement Plan. Maintains school-wide data and facilitates monthly data meetings through which we identify next steps for our students that receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Facilitates PLC common planning and data analysis meetings for grades K-2.
Ingoglia, Jessica	School Counselor	Provides resiliency lessons for our students and supports promote an overall positive school culture.
Bryant, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Facilitates professional development tied to school improvement plan. Facilitates PLC common planning and data analysis meetings for grades 3-5.

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.

Teachers, staff, students, and parents were given the opportunity to provide stakeholder input in the spring of 2023. That input and analysis of school data 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))

The SIP goals and progress monitoring data are reviewed monthly with our teachers and the School Advisory Council. The plan will be revised with teacher and SAC input on a monthly basis to ensure there is continuous improvement. By looking at our progress monitoring data and SBUA's regularly and sharing that with our stakeholders, we will be able to quickly identify next steps and any revisions that need to be made to the plan.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
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: A

	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	1	12	10	14	9	14	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	2	6	0	0	0	15
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	1	9	12	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	11	14	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	9	14	9	0	0	0	0	38

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	2	3	5	11	13	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	0	1	7	3	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	10
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	2	0	1	7	7	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	0	1	7	3	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	10
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	2	0	1	7	7	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	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*	74	57	53	79	56	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				64			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			40		
Math Achievement*	75	60	59	83	46	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				75			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75			48		
Science Achievement*	84	63	54	73	61	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	37	59	59	57			56		

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	556
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	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	87			
HSP	64			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	78			

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	56			

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	39	Yes	3	
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	80			
HSP	66			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	55			

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	74			75			84					37
SWD	29			33							3	
ELL	54			61			70				4	37
AMI												
ASN	90			95							2	
BLK	93			76							3	
HSP	65			68			83				5	36
MUL	64			71							2	

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	77			78			84				4	
FRL	61			63			81				5	10

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	79	64	50	83	75	75	73					57
SWD	25	43	42	37	50	55	18					
ELL	65	58		71	75	79	57					57
AMI												
ASN	81	69		85	94		90					
BLK	88	57		96	79		82					
HSP	73	53	35	79	78	81	65					60
MUL	67			67								
PAC												
WHT	81	73	61	85	69	67	72					
FRL	62	54	21	74	66	63	48					

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	81	56	40	78	55	48	74					56
SWD	30			40								
ELL	52	40		39	53	36	40					56
AMI												
ASN	74			74								
BLK	87			83								
HSP	78	47	31	71	51	38	64					
MUL	73			64								
PAC												
WHT	83	60	27	84	53	55	83					
FRL	70	50		65	52	53	58					55

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	74%	54%	20%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	60%	18%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	62%	24%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	83%	59%	24%	51%	32%

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.

Our lowest area of performance was Kindergarten and First Grade end of year proficiency / growth in both ELA and Math. The contributing factor to the lack of growth and low proficiency rate was the system for collaborative planning and data analysis that was established was very new for these two grade levels, and individual teachers often reverted to facilitating lessons that were familiar to them rather than what was agreed upon during planning. They were not used to common planning as this was not the expectation of the prior administration. We found that these two grade levels had the most difficult time transitioning to a common planning structure, but they were more comfortable with discussing the data of struggling learners. As an SBLT (school-based leadership team) we didn't dig as deep as we should have with deconstructing the new BEST standards with these teachers and instead focused more on

discussing data, so we (SBLT) did not get to the root cause of the problem and this led to less than stellar proficiency rates for our Kindergarteners and First graders. As we embark on year two of our common planning and data analysis journey, we are confident that the SBLT will be able to provide more targeted support to all our PLCs.

Our Students With Disabilities (SWD) as a whole continue to struggle to demonstrate proficiency on state assessments. On the 2023 Spring ELA FAST, 33% of our 3rd-5th grade SWDs scored at Level 3 or above. On the 2023 Spring Math FAST, 38% of our 3rd-5th grade SWDs scored at Level 3 or above. Finally, on the 2023 Science Standards Assessment, 33% of our 5th grader SWDs scored at Level 3 or above. The contributing factor to our SWDs low performance is the lack of time to be able to provide the foundational reading and math support the students needed while teaching the grade level standards. The students have gaps, and it is a challenge to fill the gaps within the time allotted when the teachers are responsible for teaching the grade level standards.

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

When analyzing our end of year FAST data for grades 3-5 we found that our ELA proficiency rate dropped by 1% and our Math proficiency rate dropped by 4% when compared to the end of the year 2022 FSA data. Although the tests were different, we were not pleased with any drop in proficiency. We believe that contributing factors to this drop were adjusting to the new BEST benchmarks and adjusting to the new testing platforms for both our teachers and students. As we revise our common planning structure and dig deep into analyzing the students' SBUA results during our weekly PLC meeting, we are looking to see an increase in our end of year proficiency rates for all grade levels.

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.

We performed above the state average in every category. All of the K-5 teachers at Avalon Elementary have more than 5 years of experience in the classroom. They don't have issues with classroom management which allows them to maximize instructional time. In addition, the majority of our teachers understand the standards and are able to use creative, fun, and engaging ways to teach the standards so that the majority of our students reach mastery. For those students who needed additional support, our MTSS Coach provided guidance to teachers so that they could provide differentiated Tier 2 instruction. Tier 3 support was provided to students who needed more intensive support outside of the classroom. Last year, we focused on analyzing our common assessment and PMA data during common planning days that were held during each of the first three quarters. Analyzing this data allowed our teachers to fine-tune instruction of the trailing standards and to provide an intensive, targeted review right before testing for ELA, Math, and Science (5th grade only). Our teachers' expertise coupled with our Multi-tiered System of Support and our common assessment data analysis contributed to our trends.

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

Our area of most improvement was 5th grade Science. At the end of the year, 85% of our 5th graders scored at Level 3 or above on the SSA. The new actions that we took were to analyze the PMA data with the 5th grade Science PLC a week after administration. We also provided substitute teachers so this PLC could plan their upcoming units at the beginning of the 2nd and 3rd quarters, after analyzing the data. We also monitored Study Island and the teachers used the district-provided Science consumables at the end of the year for review.

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

In looking at our EWS data, our biggest area of concern is the number of discipline referrals that were generated last year. Teachers expressed to the new administration that discipline was an issue. Discipline training was provided to teachers and a system for Positive Behavior Intervention Support and a discipline flowchart was created with teacher input. Teachers were empowered to write referrals when students violated the OCPS Code of Student Conduct. This led to an increase in the number of students who received discipline. Our goal is to reduce the number of disciplinary offenses.

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

1. Strengthen our system to monitor the school-wide instructional vision and increase school-wide awareness of predominant instructional practices.
2. Strengthen our system for weekly collaborative planning (PLCs) to increase the percentage of teachers delivering explicit benchmark-aligned instruction.
3. Align our coaching supports to accelerate teacher practice.
4. Reduce the number of discipline referrals by ensuring our PBIS initiative becomes culturally embedded.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

We identified our area of focus to be "Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction". In grades 3-5 we have between 19% and 26% of our students performing below grade level in state-wide assessments. In grades K-2 the percentage of students performing below grade level is higher, ranging between 13% and 40%. In addition, conducting structured, common planning PLC meetings was not a common practice for most grade levels for the seven years prior to school year 22-23. This is an area of growth for most of our teachers and their PLCs. As a result of strengthening our system for common planning PLC meetings, student proficiency will increase on state assessments.

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

Walkthrough data will demonstrate that 75% of our teachers are delivering explicit, benchmark-aligned instruction at mid-year and 100% at end of year. FAST (3-5) and STAR (K-2) data will reflect a minimum of 82% of students proficient in all content areas by the end of the year.

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

SBLT will meet with teachers in PLCs weekly prior to instruction delivery. School coaches will be present in common planning to support the development of explicit, intentional instruction that is aligned. SBLT will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning. SBLT will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Swain (jessica.swain@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.)

Our evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). When working as PLCs, teachers collaborate to improve student outcomes. The focus is on learning for both the students and the adults in the building.

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

Working as PLCs provides better learning opportunities through collaboration and teamwork. Everyone associated with the school works together to create opportunities for growth that would be unachievable through individual work. PLCs are based on shared vision, values, and goals.

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.

Instructional coaches with administration will facilitate weekly grade level PLC planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark-aligned lessons.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bryant (kelly.bryant@ocps.net)

By When: August 16 - Weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

Provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bryant (kelly.bryant@ocps.net)

By When: August 16 - Weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

Coaches will model implementation of instructional framework, instructional practices, and utilization of student tasks aligned to benchmarks during planning.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bryant (kelly.bryant@ocps.net)

By When: August 16 - Weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

School leadership team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning.

Person Responsible: Jessica Swain (jessica.swain@ocps.net)

By When: August 21 - Weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

SBLT will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible: Jessica Swain (jessica.swain@ocps.net)

By When: August 22 - Weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

Each grade level PLC will have a whole day common planning meeting at the end of each of the first three quarters. The SBLT and administration will facilitate the meeting.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bryant (kelly.bryant@ocps.net)

By When: October 13, 2023 - 1st quarter December 20, 2023 - 2nd quarter March 14, 2024 - 3rd quarter

#2. 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.

During the '22-'23 school year, we processed 164 discipline referrals ranging in OCPS Code of Conduct offenses from level 1 to level 4 (threats). Our students participated in the Panorama stakeholder survey and 37% of them reported feeling that the behavior of other students hurt their learning.

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 discipline referrals by 10% and we will reduce the percentage of students reporting they feel the behavior of other students hurt their learning by 3%.

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

The SBLT will review discipline data and behavior calls to the office during the weekly leadership team and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Popovich (tara.popovich@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will continue to utilize a school-wide approach to build a positive school culture and learning environment. Mariners SAIL to Success expectations will be the foundation for our Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) system.

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

Positive Behavior Intervention Support systems have been proven to reduce the number of discipline referrals in schools while increasing students' positive perceptions about their learning environment.

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.

Assistant Principal and School Counselor will facilitate teacher training about our discipline system and our PBIS system.

Person Responsible: Tara Popovich (tara.popovich@ocps.net)

By When: August 9, 2023

Students are reminded of our SAIL to Success expectations and voice levels in the classroom and on morning announcements.

Person Responsible: Jessica Swain (jessica.swain@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023 and weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

Students earn Mariner Bucks and are able to redeem their Mariner bucks at the Friday popup cart or each month via special experiences they can pay for.

Person Responsible: Jessica Ingoglia (jessica.ingoglia@ocps.net)

By When: August 18, 2023 and weekly ongoing until the end of they year.

SBLT discuss discipline data at weekly leadership team meeting and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible: Tara Popovich (tara.popovich@ocps.net)

By When: August 22, 2023 and weekly ongoing until the end of the year.

#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.

Our Students With Disabilities (SWD) as a whole continue to struggle to demonstrate proficiency on state assessments. On the 2023 Spring ELA FAST, 33% of our 3rd-5th grade SWDs scored at Level 3 or above. On the 2023 Spring Math FAST, 38% of our 3rd-5th grade SWDs scored at Level 3 or above. Finally, on the 2023 Science Standards Assessment, 33% of our 5th grader SWDs scored at Level 3 or above. The contributing factor to our SWDs low performance is the lack of time to be able to provide the foundational reading and math support the students needed while teaching the grade level standards. The students have gaps, and it is a challenge to fill the gaps within the time allotted when the teachers are responsible for teaching the grade level standards.

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

Our 3rd - 5th grade Students With Disabilities will earn 41% of the ESSA Federal Points Index during the 2024 Spring administration of the FAST.

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

We will analyze FAST data after PM1 and PM2 administration. We will monitor progress towards the desired outcome by analyzing the Standards-based Unit Assessment data (SBUAs) after the completion of each unit. This will allow us to consistently identify the grade level standards our SWDs need additional support with.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natacha Edmondson (natacha.edmondson@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.)

Our SWDs will receive small group instruction at the Tier 1 level using the Scholastic Library (ELA) and Number Worlds (Math) to focus on the trailing standards that need to be retaught for each subject. This support will be targeted based on the individual needs of the student after analyzing the SBUA data. These students will also use Edmentum's Exactpath and Savvas' Successmaker for additional targeted support in ELA and Math.

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

The resources we've identified to provide targeted support for our SWDs are research-based and approved by OCPS. These resources will allow our general education teacher and our ESE teacher to provide focused instruction for our SWDs based on timely data from the SBUA's.

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.

Share schedule of monitoring meetings with our ESE team to include: Principal, Assistant Principal, MTSS Coach, Staffing Specialist, School Counselor, ESE Teacher, ESE Program Monitor.

Person Responsible: Jessica Swain (jessica.swain@ocps.net)

By When: September 22, 2023

Meet bi-monthly as an ESE team to discuss current SBUA data and identify next steps for each student.

Person Responsible: Natacha Edmondson (natacha.edmondson@ocps.net)

By When: Bi-weekly meetings: October 11, 2023 October 25, 2023 November 8, 2023 November 29, 2023 December 13, 2023 January 24, 2024 February 7, 2024 February 21, 2024 March 6, 2024 March 27, 2024 April 10, 2024 April 24, 2024

After re-teaching each trailing standard, our ESE teacher will administer a brief standards-based formative assessment and enter the data in the re-teach data tracker. We have identified a resource in Wonders that we will use for these brief assessments.

Person Responsible: Tara Popovich (tara.popovich@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly as the trailing standards are reviewed by the ESE teacher. April 26, 2024

Our MTSS Coach will share the data for our SWDs at the monthly data meetings to update the general education teachers on the progress of the students, and identify next steps for small group instruction within the Tier 1 block for these students.

Person Responsible: Natacha Edmondson (natacha.edmondson@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly meetings: October 18, 2023 November 29, 2023 January 17, 2024 February 7, 2024 March 6, 2024 April 10, 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Our school has a Budget Review Committee made up of 3-5 teachers voted on by the teachers. In addition, our school improvement funding is also reviewed with our School Advisory Council. The principal shares the budget with these two groups and explains the needs of the school. These two groups are able to share recommendations. The final budget is shared with the entire staff.

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0222 - Avalon Elementary	General Fund		$6,000.00

			Notes: Substitute dollars will be used to pay for our teachers to have one half day common planning time at the end of the first, second, and third quarter of the school year.			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System**				**$600.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0222 - Avalon Elementary	Other		$600.00
			Notes: We utilize Facility Rental funds to purchase small toys and healthy snacks that our students purchase from the Mariner Bucks Popup Rewards cart every Friday.			
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$6,600.00**

Budget Approval

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

No