

Orange County Public Schools

Andover Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Andover Elementary

3100 SANCTUARY POINT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32825

<https://andoveres.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
Duncan, Kevin	Principal	<p>The principal provides oversight and support for the instructional leadership team and supports meetings to discuss instructional practices across campus.</p> <p>The Principal collaborates with the instructional leadership team, grade-level teams, and individual teachers to monitor student progress and recommend instructional changes. Classroom walk-throughs are conducted to ensure instructional practices are aligned with the Florida standards</p>
Glenn, Michael	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal collaborates with the instructional leadership team to identify and monitor instructional practices across campus. Weekly, the assistant principal meets with teams during PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned with the standards and best practices are utilized.</p> <p>The assistant principal conducts classroom walkthroughs and provides actionable feedback to individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes.</p>
Murray, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>The curriculum resource teacher collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met related to school-wide goals, provides guidance with K-5 resources for all content areas, assists in data analysis, supports professional development, and assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.</p>
Kleinwort, Tracy	Math Coach	<p>The math and MTSS coach collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met related to school-wide goals, supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. supports PLCs, collaborates with grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress, makes recommendations for instructional changes related to math and MTSS, support grade level team in the analysis of common assessments and data-driven instruction, and assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.</p>
Johnson, Jillian	Science Coach	<p>The science and STEM coach facilitates all STEM initiatives and supports the implementation of STEM-embedded lessons in all content areas, supports PLCs. collaborates with grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes related to Science/STEM, supports grade-level teams in the analysis of common assessments and data-driven instruction, and assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.</p>
Koza, Kimberly	Reading Coach	<p>The reading coach collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met related to school-wide goals, supports PLCs, collaborates with grade-level</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress, makes recommendations for instructional changes related to ELA/Early Literacy, supports grade-level teams in the analysis of common assessments and data-driven instruction, and assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.</p>
Goodheim Borjas, Goldie	School Counselor	<p>The guidance counselor collaborates with the behavior specialist, and MTSS coach to work together to support scholars with their behaviors as well as academics in most instances. They not only support the scholars but also work closely with teachers by providing them guidance and support on effective strategies and interventions they can implement to support their scholars.</p> <p>She also monitors our students who are eligible for services through the McKinney-Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support for these families identified as homeless. Some of these services include transportation, gas cards, food, clothing, school supplies, and resources for shelter.</p>
Levy, Melissa	Behavior Specialist	<p>The behavior specialist will provide services to students whose behaviors impede their learning. In addition, she will assist in the following: development of Behavior Intervention Plans, conducting observations, record reviews, and interviews, providing staff development on various behavior topics, and model for staff and teachers specific behavior interventions. In collaboration with the MTSS Coach, she provides classroom consultation services for staff who request it. This is a collaborative process that involves observations, recommendations, modeling of behavior intervention strategies, planning sessions, and follow-up support.</p>
Salmons, Blair	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met related to school-wide goals, supports PLCs, collaborates with grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress, and makes recommendations for instructional changes related to ELA/Early Literacy. He supports grade-level teams in the analysis of common assessments and data-driven instruction, assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning, and utilizes the coaching cycle and partners with teachers to analyze the current reality, set goals, identify and explain teaching strategies to hit the goals, and provide support until the goals are met.</p>

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 are an essential component of the learning community and provide feedback towards the School Improvement Process (SIP). Their input is provided through the School Advisory Council (SAC) where components of the SIP are shared along with data to support the decisions made for continuous improvement. During the SAC meetings, teachers, parents, students, and community business partners vote upon the components of the SIP and come to a consensus on additional action steps needed to support student achievement.

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 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, by engaging in an ongoing data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade-level meetings, data chats, faculty meetings, and SAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan will be revised by analyzing what the areas of concern are and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus.

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
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) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	0	0	11	8	0	0	0	21	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	8	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	13	

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	2	0	1	8	8	8	0	0	0	27

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	0	2	0	0	11	8	0	0	0	21	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	8	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	13	

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	2	0	1	8	8	8	0	0	0	27

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*	58	57	53	60	56	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				67			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			35		
Math Achievement*	62	60	59	66	46	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				80			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78			41		
Science Achievement*	67	63	54	64	61	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	32	59	59	46			53		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	2	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	42			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			

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	50			

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	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	53			
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
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	58			62			67					32
SWD	21			18			21				5	18
ELL	39			47			68				5	32
AMI												
ASN	69			72			67				3	
BLK	41			44							3	
HSP	55			60			66				5	33
MUL												

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	71			72			86				4	
FRL	49			53			64				5	34

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	60	67	58	66	80	78	64					46
SWD	20	39	42	23	57	80	21					31
ELL	43	56	52	52	68	71	42					46
AMI												
ASN	74	78		70	89							
BLK	39	59		41	69		56					
HSP	56	63	56	64	80	79	61					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	81		84	83		76					
FRL	50	61	50	55	75	70	46					40

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	61	61	35	61	59	41	70					53
SWD	17			24								42
ELL	48	54	36	52	42	30	58					53
AMI												
ASN	73	64		73	82		82					
BLK	43			45								
HSP	58	55	43	56	46	42	58					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	74	69		72	77		93					
FRL	57	55	40	57	58	50	65					49

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	64%	54%	10%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	62%	6%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	51%	16%

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.

In 2023, 56%, 64 out of 115, of all 3rd-grade students at Andover Elementary School, scored a 3 or above on the ELA Florida state assessment and 27%, 31 out of 115, of all 3rd-grade students at Andover Elementary School scored a level 1 on the ELA Florida state assessment resulting in possible retention. Contributing factors include success rates of SWD students whose peers performed twice as proficient. Additionally, SWD students Level 1 percentages are double that of their peers.

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

In 2022, 14% of SWD scored a level 1; in 2023, 40% of SWD students scored a level 1 showing a 26% decline in SWD scoring a 2 or above. Contributing factors include fidelity in tracking and utilizing appropriate accommodations and a lack of robust intervention execution.

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.

While all of the grade levels were above the state average as it relates to proficiency, 3rd grade ELA was the area that was closest to the state's proficiency average. The school's proficiency was 56% with the state's proficiency at 50%. The current trend is that our 3rd-grade data is narrowing compared to the state average in comparison to grades 4 and 5 and generally perform at a substantially higher rate than the state. Contributing factors could be a lack of common planning structures and effective feedback that increase student achievement.

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

The 4th-grade math data component showed the greatest improvement performing at 68% proficiency, increasing 5% from 63% proficiency in 2022. Actions taken included a structured PLC focused on best practices and data analysis as well as a formalized and quality MTSS intervention

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

The EWS data shows a need to improve the overall attendance percentage, focusing on students with 12-15 absences. The 2022-2023 data indicates that 14% of students were absent 12-15 times throughout the school year.

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

1. 3rd grade proficiency
2. Students with Disabilities performance on state assessments
3. Students with Disabilities support and monitoring systems

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Andover Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic engagement strategies. There is a need to differentiate small group instruction to support Tier II and Tier III MTSS students. According to the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. PM3, 56% of 3rd-grade students were proficient in ELA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors connected to 3rd-grade students scoring a level 1, a focus will be on supporting overall grade 3 instruction as well as working toward increasing teacher capacity related to creating an inclusive classroom that meets the needs of students

with disabilities. A continuum of Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to vigorously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing our staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces proper data collection, progress monitoring, and data analysis, we ensure that students' individual needs are met.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the ELA proficiency in grade 3 at least 3 percentage points on the FAST PM3 from 56% to 59% and decrease the percentage of students scoring a level 1 from 27% to 20%.

Monitoring:

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

The school's leadership team will be active participants in all common planning meetings for each content area. Feedback on instructional trends in each content area will be provided during the common planning sessions. The school's leadership team will also attend weekly data meetings, which will focus on analyzing data from common assessments and district progress monitoring assessments to determine trends and needs for changes to instruction. Implementation of any shifts made to lessons will be monitored by the school's leadership by conducting daily classroom walkthroughs. Upon completion of daily walkthroughs, individual feedback will be provided to instructional and support staff via the instructional framework, progress monitoring tools, and the coaching teacher support log.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Glenn (michael.glenn@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 intervention being implemented for this area of focus is ensuring that students have exposure to foundational skills needed for comprehension through SIPPS, Being a Reader, and Orton-Gillingham approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are progress monitored frequently in order to be placed in appropriate target groupings that are fluid based on student data. These instructional groupings will support students in making learning gains, while closing the achievement gap.

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.

Design a common planning framework that focuses on disaggregating formative and summative data, standards-based instruction, and engaging instructional delivery.

Person Responsible: Blair Salmons (blair.salmons@ocps.net)

By When: First 3 weeks of school and ongoing by assessment periods and unit plans.

The leadership team will maintain an intense focus on Tier I instruction and also provide resources to enhance Tier II and Tier III instruction to support small groupings as we work to close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible: Michael Glenn (michael.glenn@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will analyze summative and formative data in all academic areas to adjust differentiation to student needs. Data will be continuously collected and analyzed for all students to ensure alignment and effectiveness of instruction for students receiving Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III supports.

Person Responsible: Blair Salmons (blair.salmons@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Teachers will attend professional learning opportunities during PLCs and school-wide staff trainings that focus on MTSS identification, progress monitoring, data collection, and appropriate implementation of tiered resources.

Person Responsible: Tracy Kleinwort (tracy.kleinwort@ocps.net)

By When: Start date Sep. 18th

#2. 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.

The 2023 Panorama Andover Elementary Survey results revealed a significant decrease in Feedback and Coaching reporting a 13% difference between Andover's percentage compared to other elementary schools.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Build a culture of inclusion and belonging for all staff that focuses on empowering teachers through feedback and coaching that respects teacher autonomy resulting in a 12% increase in feedback and coaching based on 2024 Panorama Survey results.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom Walks tracking tool

Intentional and targeted staff community builders

Quarterly informal surveys

Timely and structured feedback on instructional practices and concerns

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Glenn (michael.glenn@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.)

Impact Cycle utilized for quality and constructive support

Walk-through feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the Impact Cycle provides quality feedback and validation for teachers' instructional practices, creating an equitable and professional atmosphere that values teachers and students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Creation of a coaching walkthrough schedule designed to provide positive feedback, that incorporates all instructional staff.

Person Responsible: Michael Glenn (michael.glenn@ocps.net)

By When: September 1st

Utilize ongoing coaching walkthroughs independent of the formal observation platform. All walkthroughs focus on positive and constructive feedback to provide a judgment-free tool for teachers to improve instructional practices and professional confidence.

Person Responsible: Blair Salmons (blair.salmons@ocps.net)

By When: On-going weekly, beginning first week in September.

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).

The school advisory committee (SAC), meeting monthly, will be presented with instructional leadership goals and recommended allocations and will vote on allocation approval based on the needs of the school stakeholders. Upon approval of the prior month's minutes, SAC members will be provided feedback on the execution of the funding allocation.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Duncan, Kevin, kevin.duncan@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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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**

N/A

Duncan, Kevin, kevin.duncan@ocps.net

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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