Princeton Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Princeton Elementary

311 W PRINCETON ST, Orlando, FL 32804

https://princetones.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.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

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
Elkins, Kimberly	Principal	The Principal will be responsible for cultivating, shaping, and ensuring rigorous academic goals for all staff and students. The Principal will problem-solve, coach, and build capacity in staff to create a positive and effective school culture. The Principal will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support in order to ensure the school's mission and vision are achieved. The Principal monitors the school budget and funds.
Boyd, Katharine	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP, implementation of intervention support, and documentation. The AP will assist with all discipline and MTSS B plans. As an instructional leader, the AP will ensure instruction is rigorous, relevant, and standards-based. She will conduct observations, common planning, and assist with the ESE department. Member of the Threat Assessment Team.
Cristello, Megan	Behavior Specialist	Our behavior specialist will confer with teachers to provide interventions, preventions, and behavior modifications that will allow all students to achieve success and participate in rigorous instruction. She will create and follow individual student's behavior plans and will help create teachers with classroom management techniques.
Paulson, Rebecca	ELL Compliance Specialist	The Guidance Counselor will maintain an understanding of all communication skills, decision-making, relationship skills, conflict resolution, and goal-setting to ensure students receive support and reduce all barriers to their academic success. The Guidance Counselor will meet with students in groups and individually with a focus on SEL. The ELL Compliance Specialist ensures all ELL students are receiving the services they are eligible for while making sure paperwork is in compliance with guidelines.
Wells, Haley	Curriculum Resource Teacher	As the CRT, Mrs. Wells will provide materials and knowledge of content to assure equity among all students and classrooms. She will support the math instructional coach and reading instructional coach in monitoring the teacher and student use of the curriculum. She will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful in all academic areas as well as be a resource for all teachers on a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of all student learners. Mrs. Wells will organize and monitor all school-based, state, and district testing.
Gundacker, Stefani	Reading Coach	As the Reading Coach/Specialist, Mrs. Travis will maintain a knowledge of curriculum and instruction to develop staff and build capacity. As the MTSS coach, Mrs. Travis will manage, monitor, and ensure the fidelity of the MTSS system throughout the school. She will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful in all academic areas as well

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		as be a resource for all teachers on a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of all student learners. She will pull intervention groups as well.
Kinzie, Lauren	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Kinzie oversees the ESE department. She works with the MTSS coach to ensure that all students who require support are receiving the needed support and interventions. Mrs. Kinzie works with our school-based team to ensure students are being screened, tested, and staffed into programs they are found to be eligible for. She holds consent meetings, eligibility meetings, and yearly review meetings for students eligible for an IEP or 504. Mrs. Kinzie also oversees all gifted consent and eligibility meetings.

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.

Stakeholders (parents, SAC, school leadership team) met and discussed EOY data from last school year. As a team, we looked at all pieces of data and discussed what academics need to be the main focus this school year and how we will ensure the SIP is communicated to school staff and the community.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be discussed at each SAC meeting and will be data will be monitored weekly or as new data is received. Professional development and instructional shifts will be made as we look at the 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)	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	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
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)* 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: 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	1	9	8	5	3	6	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	5	9	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	9	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	16	8	5	0	0	0	0	33

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	4	3	7	8	0	0	0	25

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	2	9	12	8	11	6	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	5	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	7	0	0	0	13
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	1	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	10

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) 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	2	9	12	8	11	6	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	5	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	7	0	0	0	13
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	1	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	10

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	

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*	73	57	53	77	56	56	76		
ELA Learning Gains				66			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			57		
Math Achievement*	67	60	59	69	46	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				55			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			60		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	76	63	54	73	61	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59						

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	68			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	61			

	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	35	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	72			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	56			

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	73			67			76					
SWD	21			25			30				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56			44			60				3	
HSP	70			68			83				4	
MUL	55			55							2	
PAC												
WHT	79			73			80				4	
FRL	60			54			68				4	

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	77	66	57	69	55	39	73					
SWD	32	44	36	23	40	36						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56	50		48	56							
HSP	82	64		71	62		82					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	71	63	74	53	35	70					
FRL	63	62	59	52	54	41	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	76	70	57	77	69	60	75					
SWD	41	73		43	55							
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58			67								
HSP	75	62		72	69		67					
MUL	58			64								
PAC												
WHT	82	71		82	74		80					
FRL	56	68	50	52	44	60	52					

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	70%	54%	16%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	60%	17%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	50%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	62%	15%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	51%	22%

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.

Across the school, we are noticing gaps in mathematical knowledge. In the Spring of 2023, our EOY data showed Math Achievement was at 69% compared to 2022 when Math Achievement was at 77%. Some of the contributing factors were a lack of understanding of the new BEST Standards for Grades 3-5, no opportunities for discussing unit assessment data in PLCs, and a lack of remediation of missed standards.

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

The greatest area in need of improvement is math achievement. Based on the 2021-22 statewide assessment data, math proficiency was 69%. This was an 8% drop in proficiency from the 2020-21 statewide assessment data. Main gains in the lowest 25% dropped to 39% from 60% the previous year. In the Spring of 2023, our EOY data showed Math Achievement was at 69% compared to 2022 when Math Achievement was at 77%. Factors that contributed to the decline are scheduling and preparation for math instruction. Princeton departmentalization in 5th grade did not create the best instructional model for students to learn. Math was taught by a single teacher and time was not sufficient to get all the standards taught and successful mastery of standards. For two years we have seen a decline in math proficiency in 5th grade.

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.

Princeton has always (except for the years 2020-2021) had very large gaps in math. A lack of structure in planning and intervention has contributed to this gap over the years.

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

ELA proficiency showed a very slight improvement when compared to last school year as well as the state average. In the Spring of 2023, our EOY data showed ELA Achievement was at 76% compared to 2022 when ELA Achievement was at 75%. Last school year we tracked fluency not just comprehension and conducted ELA tutoring from October until March.

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

An area of concern after reflecting on the EWS data is the amount of 2nd graders who are showing a reading deficiency. According to our EOY data, 26% of our 2nd graders going into 3rd grade were considered reading deficient. At Princeton, that is only 16 students but with such a small enrollment, it is a concern. We are also targeting attendance to include consistently late students and absences. We have noticed that our students who do not live within the 2-mile radius and are on a capacity transfer are late to school consistently.

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

Create structures for PLC meetings and hold data meetings the second and fourth week of each month.
Conduct walk-throughs focused on discussions from PLC meetings.
Vertical alignment meetings.
Structured and fluid intervention groups that are held daily and conducted with fidelity.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall school climate decreased with student climate results dropping from 62% in 2022 to 54% in 2023 and school climate results dropping from 83% in 2022 to 67% in 2023. This decrease was attributed to feedback stating lessons were not motivating, lack of enjoyment at school, and the school environment did not help students learn. We notice that there was a correlation between our survey results decreasing and our proficiency scores decreasing to 69% in math and 76% in reading.

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

At Princeton, we plan to create a school climate and culture that is focused on student SEL and our stakeholders. We plan to achieve this by using surveys and focus group meetings. Both will help us assess social-emotional learning. Surveys and focus groups will give students and teachers a way to express how they are feeling and their own perceptions and experiences. We will then be able to measure the effectiveness
of our use of Sanford Harmony and other SEL-approved programs. In the end, student proficiency in grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase by 5% in all subject areas as students feel connected and more engaged at school.

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through anonymous surveys for teachers and students. From this data, we can monitor enjoyment at school, lesson engagement, and student support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Elkins (kimberly.elkins@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.)

The evidence-based interventions being implemented for this Area of Focus are Sanford Harmony and Child Safety Matters lessons. Guidance Counselor visits on Child Safety Matters lessons and teacher daily SEL lessons will be conducted to support the desired outcome.

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

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to build a collaborative welcoming classroom where students feel supported in the learning environment and enjoy coming to schools. These engaging lessons will support student social-emotional learning. This will result in increased student performance in all subject areas.

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.

Review Spring 2023 Panorama Survey Data to identify areas of need and determine a plan.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Elkins (kimberly.elkins@ocps.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Child Safety Matters Lessons are completed in classrooms by the Guidance Counselor and teachers use the Sanford Harmony lessons daily with students in classes

Person Responsible: Rebecca Paulson (rebecca.paulson@ocps.net)

By When: Implemented in all classrooms by September 30, 2023

Teacher and student surveys completed through a Google form to assess the school climate with social-emotional learning in the classrooms

Person Responsible: Kimberly Elkins (kimberly.elkins@ocps.net)

By When: Created and completed by October 31, 2023

Review teacher and student survey data from the completed Google forms to identify necessary changes and successes with the plan

Person Responsible: Katharine Boyd (katharine.boyd@ocps.net)

By When: December 22, 2023

#2. 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.

One area of focus is our SWD subgroup. Based on data from 2022-2023, our SWD subgroup had a 32% proficiency rate in ELA and a 23% proficiency rate in Math. This is the second year the SWD subgroup has been below 41% proficient.

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

Our school plan is to increase our SWD subgroup proficiency in both ELA and Math. Our goal is to increase our ELA SWD subgroup proficiency to 42%, and our Math SWD subgroup proficiency to 41%.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through weekly structured PLC meetings where ELA Instruction is a focus during week 1 of the month, ELA Data is a focus during week 2, Math instruction is a focus during week 3, and Math data is a focus during week 4 of the month. The administration will complete walk-throughs to ensure standards are being taught with fidelity and small group instruction occurs daily during reading and math. We will have structured data meetings to identify areas of remediation to support student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kimberly Elkins (kimberly.elkins@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.)

The evidence-based interventions being used for this Area of Focus are FCRR activities and Great Leaps for our students being pulled into a separate class for services and Successmaker and Exact Path for all students within the regular education setting.

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

All of the programs that we plan to utilized have proven to decrease the foundational gaps in both reading and math to help students be more successful in grade-level content.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Review EOY data from 2023 and create fluid groups with action plans for increasing the proficiency of our SWD.

Person Responsible: Stefani Gundacker (stefani.gundacker@ocps.net)

By When: All data will be analyzed by August 31, 2023.

Review BOY data and create action plans for increasing the proficiency of our SWD.

Person Responsible: Katharine Boyd (katharine.boyd@ocps.net)

By When: Data will be reviewed and analyzed by September 30, 2023.

On-going training for reading and math resources for teachers and staff.

Person Responsible: Stefani Gundacker (stefani.gundacker@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the through the 2023-2024 school year.

The administration will monitor growth (data PLC) and instruction through walk-throughs.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Elkins (kimberly.elkins@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the through the 2023-2024 school year.

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).

Funding will be used to supply our Varying Exceptionalities Resource teacher materials she needs to be able to differentiate the instruction she provides to our SWD. We will take data on the programs purchased to ensure their effectiveness and student growth.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

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

No