
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Baldwin Park Elementary

1750 COMMON WAY RD, Orlando, FL 32814

<https://baldwinparkes.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
Schwartz, Andrew	Principal	The principal, Andrew Schwartz, sets the vision, mission and expectations for the school; provides supervision of all instruction and accelerates the momentum by setting high expectations for the use and success of the MTSS process. He provides ongoing support to staff and students and is an advocate for our school. Mr. Hay motivates and encourages staff, parents, and students to work collaboratively to achieve academic excellence His primary goal is to create a safe and positive learning environment that leads all students to success.
Brancato, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Danielle Brancato is the assistant principal and works as an instructional leader while ensuring that operational functions of the school are at the highest level at all times to guarantee that students have the best learning environment possible. She assists in coordinating schedules, works closely with teachers through the PLC process, and monitors data to target areas needed for growth throughout the school year. She also evaluates teachers and provides specific feedback in areas of growth using the OCPS Instructional Framework.
Cervi, Audra	Reading Coach	As Reading Coach, Audra Cervi provides guidance on K-5 reading and intervention plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based decisions, and supports tiered intervention plans. She provides coaching and training to colleagues on MTSS implementation. She supports teachers in identifying student needs and provides appropriate interventions as needed.
Edwards, Rhea	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor, Rhea Edwards, provides services to students on social and emotional goals and conducts group and individual counseling sessions to assist students. She completes assessments and tests as needed, analyzes results and provides appropriate plans for students. She also is on the Threat Assessment team.
Genovese, Sherry	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist, Sherry Genovese, oversees the Accelerated Reader program. She provides incentives to increase the amount books and time students spend reading. She also coordinates inventory of textbooks and student devices.
Welsh, Samantha	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher, Samantha Welsh, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and facilitates 504 meeting. She coordinates school-wide professional development and peer-to-peer teacher observations to increase professional growth. She keeps an inventory of core curriculum and intervention materials, as well as coordinates testing for the school.

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.

Through our School Advisory Council key stakeholders are involved in the school improvement process. Pertinent and valuable information is shared and discussions had regarding the operations and functions of the school.

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))

Through weekly leadership team meetings as well as data meetings the school will analyze current data to determine if the plans for improvement are being effective. The team will revisit goals and action steps established and revise as needed to ensure a high level of 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	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	26	23	18	22	17	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	0	5	0	0	0	11
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	12	20	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	10	19	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	9	12	18	12	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	8	4	7	14	16	0	0	0	51

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	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
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	9	31	25	27	27	18	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	14	12	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	17	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	10	9	15	3	0	0	0	46

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	4	11	15	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	1	5	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	9	31	25	27	27	18	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	14	12	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	17	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	10	9	15	3	0	0	0	46

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	4	11	15	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	72	57	53	79	56	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				74			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			31		
Math Achievement*	77	60	59	79	46	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				73			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			25		
Science Achievement*	79	63	54	77	61	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	59	59	57			58		

* 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	63			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	88			

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	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	3	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	56			
HSP	60			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	54			

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	72			77			79					47
SWD	26			35			36				5	24
ELL	49			77							4	47
AMI												
ASN	92			88			100				4	
BLK	37			30			36				3	
HSP	60			69			81				5	44
MUL	71			64							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	84			91			86				4	
FRL	49			54			63				5	41

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	79	74	52	79	73	52	77					57
SWD	38	48	44	38	34	18	29					59
ELL	58	68	36	62	56	40	56					57
AMI												
ASN	89	84		96	95		100					
BLK	55	50		50	63	60						
HSP	66	67	52	62	66	50	59					54
MUL	72	60		69	67							
PAC												
WHT	89	82	59	91	76	47	85					
FRL	55	62	50	52	61	56	45					52

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	73	65	31	74	56	25	72					58
SWD	30	32	29	31	32	27	32					53
ELL	49	21	10	49	36		33					58
AMI												
ASN	83	62		79	54		86					
BLK	46			52								
HSP	65	59	23	63	38	15	56					48
MUL	76			81								
PAC												
WHT	79	67	40	81	69	36	79					
FRL	56	54	25	52	30	18	51					48

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	72%	54%	18%	54%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	60%	13%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	51%	28%

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 area of ELA showed the lowest performance at 75%. Contributing factors include new state standards and assessment programs as well as attendance rates. There was also a lack of differentiated instruction as well.

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

The area of greater decline was ELA with a decline of 4%. Contributing factors include new state standards and assessment programs as well as attendance rates. There was also a lack of differentiated instruction as well.

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.

No data component was below the state average. All were above.

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

The area of science showed the most improvement. There was an increased focus on STEM as well as additional resources made available from a district level. There was also a stronger emphasis placed on professional development to provide teachers with a deeper understanding of standards and the expectations for our students.

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

An area of concern are students with 10% or higher absences. School climate and culture is essential for student learning and their desire to attend school regularly.

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

Increase SWD student proficiency, increase black/African American student proficiency, increase learning gains in the lowest quartile in both reading and math.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

On the 2023 FAST, Baldwin Park decreased overall proficiency in ELA from 79% to 75% (a 4% decrease when compared to the 2022). Students with Disabilities was the subgroup with the least amount of students meeting proficiency. On the 2023 FAST, Students with Disabilities had 28% proficiency in ELA, which was a 7% decrease from 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Baldwin Park's goal is to achieve 41% proficiency in ELA for the SWD subgroup on the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.). This correlates to a 12% increase in proficiency for the SWD subgroup in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through analyzing both common assessments and progress monitoring assessments during PLC data meetings, as well as through focus walks conducted by school-based coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Audra Cervi (3045@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.)

Teachers will effectively implement standards-aligned whole group instruction and small group instruction. Small group instruction will be focused on closing the achievement gaps for the Students with Disabilities and African Americans subgroups. We will also use SIPPS, Exact Path, and Orton Gillingham.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected to ensure student deficiencies are addressed during intervention and small group instruction to close the achievement gap of subgroups in ELA.

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.

Monitor and analyze subgroup data during monthly data meetings using common assessment and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Samantha Welsh (samantha.welsh@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Structure 'Level Up' or intervention/enrichment time and resources to strategically address achievement gaps.

Person Responsible: Danielle Brancato (danielle.brancato@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Teachers will utilize Orton Gillingham structures in their classrooms during the ELA and intervention blocks.

Person Responsible: Audra Cervi (3045@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Teachers and the leadership team will conduct student data chats.

Person Responsible: Andrew Schwartz (andrew.schwartz@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023

#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.

During the 2023 school year, there were 61 discipline referrals issued to 35 students. This shows a need to address the overall culture and environment of the school to create a positive learning environment in which all students feel safe and know how to use strategies to verbalize their needs appropriately and calm themselves.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Baldwin Park plans to reduce the amount of referrals to no more than 45.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be monitored during monthly behavioral meetings. In addition, early warning indicator reports will be monitored in order to determine which students might need behavioral intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Reese (michael.reese@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.)

Baldwin Park will implement a system for teaching appropriate social behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By developing a way to teach positive social behaviors we will be able to create a safe working environment where students and adults are seen, valued, and heard.

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.

Teachers will begin each day with greeting students at the door and by having a morning meeting

Person Responsible: Michael Reese (michael.reese@ocps.net)

By When:

Professional development on discipline procedures and classroom management strategies

Person Responsible: Michael Reese (michael.reese@ocps.net)

By When:

Implement Child Safety Matters curriculum and Conscious Discipline

Person Responsible: Michael Reese (michael.reese@ocps.net)

By When:

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

On the 2023 FAST, Baldwin Park decreased overall proficiency in ELA from 79% to 75% (a 4% decrease when compared to the 2022). Students with Disabilities was the subgroup with the least amount of students meeting proficiency. On the 2023 FAST, Students with Disabilities had 28% proficiency in ELA, which was a 7% decrease from 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Baldwin Park's goal is to achieve 41% proficiency in ELA for the SWD subgroup on the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.). This correlates to a 12% increase in proficiency for the SWD subgroup in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through analyzing both common assessments and progress monitoring assessments during PLC data meetings, as well as through focus walks conducted by school-based coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Audra Cervi (3045@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.)

Teachers will effectively implement standards-aligned whole group instruction and small group instruction. Small group instruction will be focused on closing the achievement gaps for the Students with Disabilities and African Americans subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected to ensure student deficiencies are addressed during intervention and small group instruction to close the achievement gap of subgroups in ELA.

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.

Increase collaboration between general education teachers and varying exceptionalities resource teachers.

Person Responsible: Danielle Brancato (danielle.brancato@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Monitor student performance data and have data chats with teachers.

Person Responsible: Samantha Welsh (samantha.welsh@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

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 Council will meet to review funding to determine that funds are being allocated appropriately based on the needs of the students within the school. It will be determined if any additional resources are needed to address the areas of need within sub-groups.