

Orange County Public Schools

Whispering Oak 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://whisperingoakes.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 to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montgomery, Lee	Principal	School-based budgeting, personnel management, classroom observation, school culture, and stakeholder satisfaction.
Gary, Constance	Assistant Principal	Classroom observations, student discipline, scheduling, data analysis, drive instruction.
Henry-Louis, Marie	Reading Coach	Reading coach, ELL monitor, reading strategist, assist coaching teachers, ELL support.
Moore, Cathy	Instructional Coach	Testing coordinator, instructional coaching, support common planning, deliver professional development.
Chotai, Nimisha	Instructional Media	Media specialist, technology representative, support literacy and uses of technology and literacy.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is our school-based group that represents the school, community members, and those persons closest to the students who share responsibility for supporting our school's continuous improvement. The SAC is responsible for final decision-making at the school relating to the annual implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The Whispering Oak SAC is composed of

the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students, parents, other business leaders, and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Certain members are elected by their peers, business and community members are appointed by the SAC and the principal automatically serves.

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 reviewed at each monthly SAC meeting as well as after various data points (tests, assessments, progress monitoring). Based on student data, the SIP goals will be reviewed and adjusted as student needs dictate. Progress monitoring meetings will occur monthly as will SAC meetings. Stakeholder discussions will occur among teachers and SAC members in order to maintain focus on SIP goals and monitor progress being made towards those goals. Monitoring will involve both instructional and resource elements applied toward student achievement.

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	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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	21	11	11	23	32	27	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	4	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	10

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	11	10	15	18	3	11	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	8	10	0	0	0	32
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

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	3	8	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	11	10	15	18	3	11	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	8	10	0	0	0	32
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

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	3	8	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	84	57	53	85	56	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				80			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			56		
Math Achievement*	90	60	59	89	46	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				90			73		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77			67		
Science Achievement*	94	63	54	83	61	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	59	59	70			63		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	639
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	61			
ELL	79			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	82			
HSP	81			
MUL	91			
PAC				
WHT	89			

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	79			

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	58			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	82			
HSP	77			
MUL	91			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	77			

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	84			90			94					59
SWD	57			62							3	
ELL	74			88			93				4	59
AMI												
ASN	86			96							2	
BLK	79			74			93				4	
HSP	82			91			97				5	58
MUL	89			94							3	

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	86			91			93				4	
FRL	75			80			86				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	85	80	65	89	90	77	83					70
SWD	51	65	58	61	71	53	47					
ELL	75	78	64	80	83	60	79					70
AMI												
ASN	89	81		91	92		88					
BLK	78	68		84	90	92	82					
HSP	84	78	64	82	85	68	77					77
MUL	89	100		83	90							
PAC												
WHT	87	81	67	93	91	81	88					
FRL	83	83	72	79	83	67	72					

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	83	68	56	80	73	67	74					63
SWD	54	60	50	54	80	75	14					
ELL	65	75		63	67		43					63
AMI												
ASN	81	60		76	50		64					50
BLK	76			73								
HSP	78	62		71	73		71					69
MUL	89			79								
PAC												
WHT	86	73	62	85	77	74	75					
FRL	74	58		62	62		53					47

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	87%	54%	33%	54%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	60%	28%	58%	30%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	52%	31%	50%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	92%	59%	33%	59%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	62%	24%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	94%	55%	39%	55%	39%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	93%	59%	34%	51%	42%

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.

Third-grade reading scores remained stagnant at 83%. The curriculum shift from FSA to FAST content contributed partially to the stagnant score. The third-grade class as a whole was overall lower performance-wise coming in than the previous year's class. Instructors had to make adjustments in intervention and assessments to accommodate students along with adjusting to the shift in curriculum. The main trend that stood out upon data analysis, was that the lower-performing students grew, while the higher-performing students remained at a plateau. There needed to be more enrichment to move the higher students.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was fourth-grade math. The overall score declined from 93% on or above grade level in '22 to 86% on or above grade level in '23. Some factors contributing to the decline included a new math curriculum and new testing formats. shift in instructional model from departmentalization to stand-alone instruction, a need for more math centers and intervention structures.

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 were above the state average in every academic category. Our academic performance was influenced by having clear academic goals and encouraging students to stay motivated to achieve them, a supportive home environment that includes necessary access to resources, quality of instruction including monitoring data, and utilizing common planning to create strategic standards-based lessons applicable to student needs.

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

Our greatest academic growth area was in science. The school took a more streamlined approach to utilize the science curriculum during ELA so that students were exposed to content during reading, followed by hands-on applications during science block. The fifth-grade science teachers created a rotational system that allowed students to rotate into appropriate groups that focused on particular science skills.

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

While the percentages of students failing coursework in ELA and Math went down, the percentage of students absent 10% or more days rose.

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

Our highest priorities for the 2023-2024 school year will be to focus on increasing our third-grade ELA proficiency, and improving our fourth-grade math proficiency.

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.

In Spring 2023 on the Panorama survey, 77% of staff indicated satisfaction in the area of school climate. While this was a positive increase of 4% from the previous year, only 64% of staff responded favorably towards the overall working environment of the school. Due to the views shared by staff, we need to create more positive.

work experiences via our school culture. A positive work environment is an atmosphere where employees enjoy performing their jobs and feel supported. Creating a positive environment in our school will involve implementing activities that make staff feel engaged, valued, and empowered. Understanding this concept is crucial because it enhances team building, increases the sense of belonging, and improves instruction, as employees enjoy working.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome we wish to see is an increase of 5% growth in the areas of climate and overall working environment.

Monitoring:

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

Assessing the current culture: Using existing data to assess the current culture of the school.

Identifying points for change: Performing a gap analysis based on observational and survey input relating to culture.

Setting targets and goals: Identifying priorities and setting measurable goals for implementing the vision

Review, revise, and reset: As the culture develops, recognize and celebrate areas where progress is made, and identify areas where further work is required or where priorities have changed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@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.)

One evidence-based strategy for measuring climate is through the use of surveys and assessments specifically designed to collect data on various aspects of school climate. Our focus will be on student-teacher relationships, peer interactions, and academic support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using, generating, and sharing evidence gives stakeholders an important tool to accelerate their cultural involvement thereby positively affecting them.

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.

Improvement relies on perceptions that are captured on surveys distributed to students, staff, parents, and other stakeholders. Once needs are identified, data from school climate assessments can be used to set goals and priorities and choose programmatic interventions. Data also can identify areas where students, staff, and parents view climate in similar or dissimilar ways.

Person Responsible: Constance Gary (constance.gary@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 -May 2024.

Round table conversations with staff (teams, team leaders, classified personnel) concerning: Once needs are identified, data from school climate discussions can be used to set goals and priorities and choose programmatic interventions. Data also can identify areas where students, staff, and parents view climate in similar or dissimilar ways.

Person Responsible: Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly (Parent Advisory Council. Team meetings, PTO, common planning).

#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.

The area of focus needs to be on our Students with Disabilities subgroup. (SWD) While this group made some marginal gains, there is room for improvement in bolstering this subgroup's performance. The rationale that determined the critical need was a look at data comparisons among the SWD subgroup in the ELA and Math subject areas. The data reflected that 58% of students were at grade level or above in ELA and 64% were on or above grade level in math. This is an extreme gap considering the 83% and 85% scored by non-SWD peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, we will increase the proficiency levels of our SWD subgroup by 5% in both ELA and math.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored via classroom walkthroughs and discussions of SWD data points during common planning meetings (strategic instructional strategies for SWD) and data meetings (looking at data points to determine MTSS/enrichment opportunities. Every nine weeks we will continually monitor progress towards grade-level proficiency targets through examination of data combined with strategic planning for targeted instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Constance Gary (constance.gary@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 monitor our SWD progress based on their performance on Success Maker for math and Exact Path for ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Success Maker and Exact Path provide students with their own individualized plan that allows us to track them in real time and provides more targeted instruction as needed.

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.

We will provide teachers with instructional support through PLC and progress monitoring focusing on the needs of SWD.

Person Responsible: Marie Henry-Louis (marie.henry-louis@ocps.net)

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

SWD students will receive support from both our ESE teachers as well as our interventionists pushing into their classrooms. Monitoring will be conducted via classroom observations, data analysis of Success Maker and Exact Path, and grade-level common planning meetings. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on observations of standards-based instruction in relation to the activities and student evidence used to work with the SWD students.

Person Responsible: Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

By When: This area of focus will be monitored via our Staffing Specialist, data will be monitored via the MTSS process, and instruction adjusted to meet student needs throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

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