

Orange County Public Schools

# Dillard Street Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Dillard Street Elementary

311 N DILLARD ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://dillardstreetes.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
Smid, Tiffany	Principal	Instructional leader of the school Manage budget, staff evaluation, facilities, safety, student enrollment
Austing, Andrea	Instructional Coach	Testing coordinator Manages student data
Cowan, Tonya	School Counselor	Supports social/emotional needs of students Title IX coordinator Threat Assessment Team Lead PBIS coordinator
Fiallo, Lauren	Behavior Specialist	Supports behavior needs of students in special needs units.
Metova, Dinara	Graduation Coach	Supports ELL students and families Manages MTSS data and coordinated tier 2 and tier 3 meetings
Rawls, Rebecca	Staffing Specialist	Maintains and updates student Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) Supports families and teachers of students with special needs
Smith, Felicia	Assistant Principal	Supervises and evaluates employees Manages facilities operations Coordinates safety protocols Builds master schedule Oversees ESE department PTA

**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 leadership team reviews a variety of information including student assessment, attendance, and behavior data as well as stakeholder survey results. After discussion of the various forms of school information, the team develops and discusses plans to address identified goals. The School Advisory Council meets monthly to discuss progress of school improvement goals and offers suggestions and feedback for continually updating the plan.

**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 leadership team meets weekly to review a variety of data sources to continually monitor the outlined plans and progression towards goal targets.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	62%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	91%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C

	2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	12	19	16	10	12	16	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
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	3	22	15	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	32	18	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	23	19	22	0	0	0	0	75

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	5	5	8	25	14	0	0	0	57

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	21	16	16	17	20	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	5	3	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	16	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	20	15	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	13	16	0	0	0	38

**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	0	7	15	15	0	0	0	37

**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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	7	21	16	16	17	20	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	5	3	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	16	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	20	15	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	13	16	0	0	0	38

**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	0	7	15	15	0	0	0	37

**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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	49	57	53	47	56	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				59			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			33		
Math Achievement*	44	60	59	48	46	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				56			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			50		
Science Achievement*	49	63	54	37	61	59	41		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	56	59	59	47			48		

\* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			

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	41			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	44			

**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	49			44			49					56
SWD	24			17			15				4	
ELL	26			30			27				5	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			35			38				4	
HSP	37			41			38				5	54
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	65			55			81				4	
FRL	37			38			36				5	63

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	47	59	59	48	56	39	37					47
SWD	23	43	44	33	54	17	19					
ELL	28	52	53	32	57	47	25					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	52	71	32	42	36	18					
HSP	38	55	53	47	60	50	28					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	73		65	68		67					
FRL	38	53	62	39	47	29	31					49

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	45	33	33	46	39	50	41					48
SWD	13	21		23	29	36	18					
ELL	31	41		34	53		27					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	21		31	21		0					
HSP	39	42		46	52		38					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58	25		58	29		59					
FRL	34	33	33	41	33	47	35					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	47%	54%	-7%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	30%	59%	-29%	59%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	59%	-14%	51%	-6%

**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.**

The data component showing the lowest performance was math with a proficiency of 47% which was a decrease of 1% from the previous year. Contributing factors included a reduction in minutes for daily mathematics instruction, introduction of new state standards, and staff deficiencies with instruction.

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

The data component with the greatest decline was also math with a 1% decrease. Contributing factors included a reduction in minutes for daily mathematics instruction, introduction of new state standards, and staff deficiencies with instruction.

**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.**

The data component with the greatest gap would also be mathematics.

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

Science showed the most improvement with an increase of 14% from 37% to 51%. Teachers focused on strengthening science instruction with more lab-based inquiry lessons. Bubble students were invited to a science morning lab, two times a week before school. As a school, each grade level coordinated quarterly full day science labs to address low performance on identified standards.

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

The greatest concern from the EWS data is student attendance. Ninety-seven of our current students were absent ten percent or more of the school days last year.

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

1. Increase math proficiency
2. Increase ELA proficiency with ESE students.
3. Decrease student absenteeism
4. Build teacher capacity with delivery of instruction
5. Strengthen teacher observation feedback to support instruction and student growth

### **Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

This positive culture and environment goal specifically related to the early warning system will focus on student attendance. Last year ninety-seven of our students missed ten percent or more of the regular school days.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The goal is to reduce from 97 to less than 50 students missing ten percent or more of the regular school days.

**Monitoring:**

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

A school based team, which includes the registrar, guidance counselor, social worker, and principal will meet weekly to review student attendance issues and ensure appropriate interventions are in place.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tonya Cowan (tonya.cowan@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.)

Interventions will include parent phone calls, mailed letters (five, ten, and fifteen days), guidance counselor referrals, child study meetings, warning conferences, and home visits.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Interventions to reach out to the parent or guardian consistently will ensure support to the family and clear expectations for attending school.

**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.

School-based team will meet weekly to review student attendance issues.

The team will follow a flowchart for putting interventions in place to support the family. Interventions will include parent phone calls, mailed letters (five, ten, and fifteen days), guidance counselor referrals, child study meetings, warning conferences, and home visits.

**Person Responsible:** Tiffany Smid (tiffany.smid@ocps.net)

**By When:** Weekly throughout school year

Student incentives for perfect attendance with only excused absences will be provided every three weeks through out the school year. Students will also be recognized at quarterly award ceremonies.



**Person Responsible:** Tonya Cowan (tonya.cowan@ocps.net)

**By When:** Every three weeks, throughout the school year

## #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.

According to ESSA data, the students with disabilities subgroup scored at 33% which is below the 41% required threshold.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is for ELA performance of our students with disabilities to increase 8% which will result in 41% proficiency.

### Monitoring:

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

Multiple forms of assessments will be monitored including FAST, Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), as well as foundational and fluency data checks. When appropriate, students will receive tier 2 and tier 3 supports with appropriate daily instruction and frequent monitoring checks.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Felicia Smith (felicia.smith2@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.)

Students with disabilities will be part of the least restrictive environment (LRE) whenever possible which will allow them to be part of the core, grade-level instruction daily with their grade-level peers. Accommodations will be in place to support specific student learning needs of the grade level standards. In addition, during reading intervention block, students will work on specific skill deficiencies to strengthen reading fluency and comprehension.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LRE will help the children reach their full potential and give them the opportunity to learn along with their peers.

### 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.

Students will receive core, grade-level instruction daily with peers. Instruction will include student accommodations identified in the students' Individual Education Plan (IEP).

**Person Responsible:** Felicia Smith (felicia.smith2@ocps.net)

**By When:** This will begin at the start of school.

Teachers will provide appropriate scaffolds to support student learning.

**Person Responsible:** Felicia Smith (felicia.smith2@ocps.net)

**By When:** This will begin at the start of school.

Students will receive reading intervention, daily, for specific skill deficiencies to strengthen reading fluency and comprehension.

**Person Responsible:** Dinara Metova (dinara.metova@ocps.net)

**By When:** Reading intervention will begin 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).

Dillard Street Elementary has been identified as ATSI based on the federal index point of our Students with Disabilities subgroup which is currently at 33 percent. There has been growth with this index point over the past 3 years from 13 percent in 2021 to 23 percent in 2022 to 33 percent in 2023.

In past years, it has been challenging to hire staff personnel to support the varying needs of our students in the ASD units. To fully support the subgroup of students with disabilities, three ASD units are needed but due to a lack of applicants only two certified teachers were hired last year. The majority of our students in the units follow general education standards however the students require targeted, specific scaffolds to support their academic and behavioral needs to move towards and reach proficiency. This year, Dillard Street was able to fund and secure one additional teacher for an ASD unit. We are also able to secure an additional half-time teacher for support facilitation, however, general funding did not support this position after the ten-day count and it had to be eliminated.

As mentioned already, our school improvement funds are dependent on the academic and behavioral supports that our students need in subgroups and others. The use of the funds are decided upon by staff via expressed needs and also through our School Advisory Committee. If more materials are needed for the district supported intervention programs initial purchases or we need materials for enrichment or tutoring endeavors, the teachers are the main source of input. If school wide initiatives are explored or extra student experiences such as field trips are requested, SAC joins in the discussions.

### **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**

More than fifty percent of our students in grades K-2 were on track to score a level 3 or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment.

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

According to the end-of-yea FAST assessments, 57 percent of our current third-grade students and 51 percent of fifth-grade students scored below the proficiency level in English Language Arts (ELA). In addition, according to ESSA reporting our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup scored at 33 percent proficiency which does not meet the required 41 percent federal index score. To help students increase their proficiency, structured instruction will be collaboratively planned, implemented, and monitored, using research-based resources. Daily, all students receive core tier 1 reading instruction for an uninterrupted 90 minutes block, with frequent checks for understanding. Teachers will implement differentiated small group centers and teacher-led small groups. In addition, students in our SWD subgroup will receive differentiated instruction, using scaffolds of supports provided by an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher.

**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**

The expected outcome for proficiency on the statewide assessment is 54 percent for students in kindergarten-second grades. An additional expected outcome is for students in our SWD subgroup will score at least 41 percent proficiency.

## Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The expected outcome for proficiency on the statewide assessment is 54 percent for students in third-fifth grades. An additional expected outcome is for students in our SWD subgroup will score at least 41 percent proficiency.

### 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.

Several layers of progress monitoring will occur on an ongoing basis. Teachers will monitor whole group instruction, with progress checks throughout the week, and adjust small group activities accordingly. Intervention teachers will monitor bubble students and deliver acceleration lessons on a weekly basis. Grade-level teams, with the support of instructional coaches, will monitor data from unit standards-based unit assessments every three weeks to plan the implementation of reteaching lessons.

#### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@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?

Teachers will use differentiated learning tasks during centers and teacher-led small group instruction. Using Being a Reader in small group will provide support in foundational skills for students in the lower grades and the usage of SIPPS will provide foundation support for the intermediate students. Additionally, faculty will participate in academic professional developments for foundational skills, interventions, and tier 1 instructional trainings (IMPACT) presented by the district support team.

#### 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?

This strategy was selected because differentiated instruction allows teachers to maximize the growth of all students by meeting them where they are regardless of their abilities, strengths, and weaknesses. Also, this supports the students gaining proficiency level in grade level standards.

**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
<p>Content area coaches will facilitate bi-weekly common planning sessions to ensure standards-based instruction with embedded opportunities for scaffolding and support is evident. Differentiated centers will be purposely planned to meet the needs of the focus subgroups.</p>	<p>Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@ocps.net</p>
<p>Administration will participate in ILI trainings provided by district leadership team to strengthen foundational skills in grades K-2. Academic coaches and teacher leaders will attend district trainings on implementation of instructional Tier 1 materials.</p>	<p>Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@ocps.net</p>
<p>Data meetings will be held after every unit assessment (SBUA), progress monitoring tools (STAR and FAST), and other assessments will be used in the meetings. Tier 1, 2, and 3 as well as ELL, ESE, and EWS (Early Warning System) data will be examined as well quarterly.</p>	<p>Smid, Tiffany, tiffany.smid@ocps.net</p>