

Orange County Public Schools

# Baldwin Park 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>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>22</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

## 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 55%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 40%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A<br>2019-20: A  |



|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
|  | 2018-19: A<br>2017-18: A |
| <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   | 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**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL                  | 52                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| 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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| 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.