

Orange County Public Schools

Azalea Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Azalea Park Elementary

1 CAROL AVE, Orlando, FL 32807

<https://azaleaparkes.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
Rosa, Brad	Principal	Responsible for all school operations, decision-making, and areas of instruction.
Burger, Marilyn	Assistant Principal	Responsible for supporting all school operations, decision-making, and areas of instruction.
Fangue, Ashlyn	Instructional Coach	Instructional focus, coaching cycles, PLC support, instructional leader.
Paul, Yvesmahri	School Counselor	Member of the threat assessment team, supports student and family needs, health initiatives, and counsels students in groups and individually.
Pressly, Amber	Staffing Specialist	Staffing specialist works with MTSS coach to serve and support struggling students.
Cintron, Marybelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Compliance, MTSS Coach, coaching cycles, PLC support, instructional leader.

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.

Azalea Park Elementary's School Advisory Council participates in the development of the SIP. The school goals are reviewed, discussed, and approved.

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))

Our School Improvement Plan will be monitored to make sure we are achieving our stated goals through monitoring student data on a regular basis, with a major focus on our students with disabilities because this is where our largest achievement gap was last year. Team and individual teacher data meetings will be held with the administration and our instructional support team to determine the next steps for our students, as well as any modifications that may be needed in our SIP. The SIP is reviewed with our SAC committee during our meetings. The stakeholders involved in the review include staff members, parents and members of the community.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	11	19	22	25	20	19	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	12	
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	8	15	14	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	15	15	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	15	30	15	0	0	0	0	72	

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	7	10	16	20	14	0	0	0	67

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	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) 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	10	28	22	31	20	19	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	4	5	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	8	14	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	13	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	11	10	13	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	10	28	22	31	20	19	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	4	5	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	8	14	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	13	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	11	10	13	0	0	0	34

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	

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*	51	57	53	54	56	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				69			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			7		
Math Achievement*	54	60	59	58	46	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				74			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			14		
Science Achievement*	60	63	54	51	61	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	59	59	38			50		

** 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	271
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
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	34	Yes	4	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	56			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	51			54			60					55
SWD	28			23							4	50
ELL	42			54			50				5	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	69			46							2	
HSP	49			55			62				5	54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52			50							4	64
FRL	48			50			61				5	55

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	54	69	52	58	74	67	51					38
SWD	11	50	57	11	56	58	14					30
ELL	44	70	52	51	77	70	44					38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			50	80							
HSP	54	71	57	58	73	64	49					37
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45	40		55	70		50					
FRL	52	66	48	56	74	62	47					44

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	51	37	7	53	39	14	45					50
SWD	5	6	8	12	13	18	7					48
ELL	44	42		43	28		26					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			30								
HSP	49	39	0	51	38	0	42					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56			61								
FRL	48	39	9	50	40		41					45

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	57%	60%	-3%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	52%	-5%	50%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	51%	2%

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 2022-2023 school-based data that showed the lowest performance was our students with disabilities. They are performing below all other subgroups in both ELA and Math proficiency. In ELA, 27% of our students with disabilities performed at proficiency level. This is a decrease of 9% from the previous school year which showed 36% proficiency for students with disabilities. The students indicated as SWD have been placed in the ESE program due to low proficiency in Reading/Math or behavior. Some contributing factors that cause this need for improvement in our students with disabilities are about half of our students with disabilities are also deficient in the acquisition of the English language. With the lack of language acquisition and a diagnosed learning disability, our students are beginning behind their peers and needing support.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 was also the students with disabilities. SWD proficiency in ELA decreased 9% from 36% proficiency in the 2021-2022 to 27% proficiency in the 2022-2023 school year. A factor that contributed to the decline

was a new state assessment. Another contributing factor is that the new assessment was digital compared to paper/pencil from the previous school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

While looking at our various grade level comparison proficiency rates to the states, the data that had the greatest gap was our 3rd-grade math proficiency. The state average was 59%, while Azalea Park came in 5% lower at 54%. One major factor for this gap was this group of students was one of the last to be impacted by learning from home during the pandemic. Having math gaps was a direct result of learning number sense, addition, and subtraction strategies from home without the ability to use concrete manipulatives to support student learning.

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

The data component for the 2022-2023 school year that showed the most improvement based on progress monitoring and new state assessments was our black student subgroup. Proficiency for this subgroup increased from 60% proficiency in the 2021-2022 school year to 69% proficiency in the 2022-2023 school year. Azalea Park Elementary has implemented a Multi-Tiered System of Support which includes a strategic focus on our data tracking system and our intervention block. The additional support of six extra ESSER-funded positions has been extremely helpful toward the academic progress of our students. These positions were utilized to support classroom instruction and provide targeted instruction in smaller groups to impact students' acquisition of foundational skills.

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

Students with more than 10% absenteeism during the school year is one potential area of concern. Another area of concern based on the EWS data would be the number of students with a Level 1 on the state assessment for third-grade students.

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

1. We will have a continued high-priority focus on student data tracking to inform instructional decisions.
2. We will focus on increasing proficiency in ELA for our subgroup of students with disabilities.
3. Focused small group instruction that is based on the data collection system.
4. Building foundational skills in reading and math for our K-2 students is a major focus this year.

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our first area of focus is to continue to build a positive school culture and environment by building positive and trusting relationships with students, parents, staff, and the community. With the support of our Parent Engagement Liaison, teachers, and staff our families will become more involved in the education process of their child and therefore have a direct correlation with student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On our Annual Stakeholders Survey, we will expect to see an increase in positive responses in the area of School Barriers.

Monitoring:

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

As a school, we are focused on being friendly and welcoming to students, parents, and the community. We have scheduled events at the school to bring students and families to the school in an effort to continue to build positive and trusting relationships between teachers, students, and families. We have sign-in sheets at school events to record and monitor attendance. The final determination of our success in this area will be the Annual Stakeholders Survey which will be held in the spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

One of our evidence-based interventions school-wide is the Caring Schools Program in which students learn to treat others with courtesy and respect and to have a positive attitude. We also stress the monthly character traits which are through OCPS. Our guidance counselor posts the trait outside his room, shares lesson plans with the teachers, and staff helps identify students demonstrating the monthly trait.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs are being used because they have been proven to support positive interactions among students and to help build a more positive and trusting school environment.

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.

Administrators will be highly visible on campus/in the classrooms throughout the day, as well as at all school events to present a positive, friendly, and welcoming presence.

We will have sign in sheets at all school events to record and monitor attendance.

Person Responsible: Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year.

Teachers will take time to reach out to families to introduce themselves before school begins. All staff is encouraged to fill out Positive Discipline Referrals. When a child receives a positive behavior referral, the parent will be contacted, the child will be recognized on the school news, and be given the positive referral as well as a "Positive Panther" bracelet.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Burger (marilyn.burger@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing 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.

Our second area of focus is closing the achievement gap with our students with disabilities. This subgroup showed a 9% decline in achievement based on the 2022-2023 FAST ELA data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see our students with disabilities show a 9% increase in achievement and learning gains for the 2023-2024 school year based on FAST ELA data.

Monitoring:

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

With the support of our interventionists and small group teachers, and our focus on building and filling in the gaps in foundational skills, we expect to see an increase in achievement. This will be monitored on a weekly or biweekly basis, based on the needs of the student. We will use data from classroom assessments, and the materials used for interventions - SIPPS, Wonders, Being a Reader, Exact Path, and Success Maker. The data will be reviewed by our teachers and instructional support personnel weekly or bi-weekly. We will have more formal data reviews of all students, which include administration, every quarter. Modifications and changes will be made based on individual student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@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 being used are SIPPS, Wonders, Being a Reader, Exact Path, and Success Maker. The intervention that is implemented will be based on the data and the needs of our individual students. We also have an additional ESE teacher to help provide support to our ESE students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are using district-approved, research-based interventions to support learning with all of our students. Through MTSS, a monitoring system is in place in order for us to document student progress, and to help us determine the next steps.

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.

The input of academic data on a weekly or bi-weekly basis by our interventionists/small group teachers/classroom teachers for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

The input of academic data for our Tier 1 students every 3 - 4 weeks, based on unit assessments and

data from interventions (SIPPS, Wonders, Being a Reader, Exact Path, and Success Maker.)

We will have weekly and bi-weekly data meetings to review intervention data, and Formal data reviews with administration of all student data each quarter. Modifications and changes will be made based on individual student data.

Person Responsible: Marybelle Cintron (marybelle.cintron@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**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.

Another area of focus will be on small group instruction based on the data collection system. Through classroom observations, we determined that most teachers were doing well with whole group instruction. We feel that by focusing on small group instruction and providing teacher the support they need with reading and understanding data and designing appropriate standards-based tasks and activities for their centers, we will be better able to fill in the gaps of our students and improve overall student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see at least a year's growth/academic improvement from the BOY Reading and Math FAST data to the EOY Reading and Math FAST data in all students for the 2023-2024 school year. We expect to see at least a 3% increase in proficiency in reading and math EOY FAST data from 2023 to 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored on a weekly basis for Tier 3 students by their teachers and intervention teachers. Tier 2 students will be monitored bi-weekly by their teacher and intervention teachers. Tier 1 students will be monitored about every 3 weeks, or when unit assessments are given in class. Data will be input on the school's Data Chart. All teachers at all grade levels will enter their data. The data will be reviewed in PLCs, quarterly team data meetings, and individual teacher data meetings which will be held around mid-year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marybelle Cintron (marybelle.cintron@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.)

Wonders Resources, SIPPS, Being a Reader, Success Maker, and Envision resources will be used based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Specific evidence-based interventions will be used with specific students based on the data and areas of need for each individual student. We will be using evidence-based interventions because they have proven to be successful in helping students improve academically.

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 be put into small groups based on data provided from FAST Assessments, DIBELS, and classroom data throughout the school year. Data will be monitored and modifications and adjustments will be made to the groups based on the needs of the students.

Person Responsible: Marybelle Cintron (marybelle.cintron@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year.

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).

Plans are made for school improvements based on the needs of the school, and reviewed with our SAC. Funding for some resources comes from Title 1.

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

Our focus for K-2 will be on foundational skills and teaching students academic language skills, including phonemic awareness, letter-sound correspondence, decoding words, blending and segmenting words, and encoding and recognizing words. Students will also be working on inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge. As students gain knowledge, they will begin to focus on fluency and comprehension.

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

In 3rd grade, students will continue to work on decoding words, analyzing word parts, recognizing words, and analyzing word parts and vocabulary. Students who do not have sound foundational skills will work in small groups and intervention time to fill in any gaps as they continue to build reading skills. For the students who are ready for the next skill, there will be a stronger focus on fluency, comprehension, and writing. As students become more proficient readers in 3rd through 5th grade, they will continue to build

decoding skills to support reading multisyllabic words. Students will be provided with more purposeful fluency-building activities so they will become more efficient readers. There will be more focus on comprehension-building activities and practices so students will gain a better understanding of the text. Students will also be taught a routine for determining the main idea or gist of a short section of text. This will be done by helping students build their background and word knowledge, providing opportunities to ask and answer questions, teaching reading strategies, and helping students monitor their comprehension as they read. Students will be provided the opportunity to stretch or extend their thinking by reading more challenging text and questions that will expose them to more complex ideas and information.

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

22-23

Early Lit/STAR

Below 40th %tile

KG 33/67 (49%)

1st 24/64 (38%)

2nd 43/83 (52%)

This year we anticipate lowering our percent below the state threshold for passing by 5% in each grade level. By implementing an additional PreK classroom our Kindergarten students will be more equipped to enter the rigors of Kindergarten and have a stronger foundation for at least half of our students. Additionally, our instructional focus on foundational reading strategies will have a slow and steady increase in our student's reading at first and will increase as the school years continue.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

22-23

FAST Below L3

3rd 35/71 (49%)

4th 20/52 (38%)

5th 29/64 (45%)

The students at Azalea Park continue to struggle with foundational reading. This lack of foundational skills impacts their ability to comprehend the text complexity for state assessments. Instructionally, we are focusing on building that foundational support and providing them with the tools to become lifelong readers. We hope to see a decrease of 3 percentage points among our students who are below level 3 on the state FAST assessment at the end of the school year.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs will take place in all classrooms at least weekly to monitor progress in the classroom. Monthly team data meetings will be held throughout the school year as well as individual data meetings during which individual student progress will be discussed with the classroom teachers and administration. Data, monitoring of progress, student progress, and adjustments/modifications in teaching strategies are discussed and implemented.

There will be monthly data meetings by area which will include MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Care leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rosa, Brad, brad.rosa@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?

The evidence-based practices/programs we will be implementing to achieve measurable outcomes are those recommended and backed by Orange County Public Schools. We will be using Wonders Resources, SIPPS, Being a Reader, Success Maker, and Envision resources based on student needs. These evidence-based programs do align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and they align with the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

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?

Heggerty is used to help our younger (and older if needed) students develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

By using the foundational pieces of the CRM slides daily, students will learn the foundational reading

skills needed at their grade level and will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

By using the CRM comprehension slides daily, students will routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help them make sense of the text.

SIPPS is used to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Building decoding skills helps students read complex multisyllabic words.

Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum helps students develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. This teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. By building decoding skills through this program, students will be able to read complex multisyllabic words which will improve fluency and comprehension. Students will be provided with fluency-building activities to help them read better as they use comprehension-building practices to help them make sense of the text.

OCPS Multisensory Kits will be used to help students develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Students will be taught to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Exact Path may be used to help students develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Students will be taught to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. By building decoding skills to enable students to read multisyllabic words, students will become more fluent readers through the use of fluency-building activities. Students will also be taught to use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text being read.

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
Literacy Leadership Team - Monthly Leadership and Team data meetings will be held during which we will review and analyze data, monitor student progress, and determine necessary next steps to support students' progress. Teachers will participate in monthly meetings.	Rosa, Brad, brad.rosa@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching - Our instructional coach has been trained and continues to attend district coach meetings. She will attend ELA PLCs to plan with grades 3 - 5 and to provide support to all teachers. Through the use of data, our instructional coach and the leadership team will decide which teachers need additional support, such as classroom modeling or the implementation of coaching cycles.	Rosa, Brad, brad.rosa@ocps.net
<p>Assessments - The use of the following assessments and materials will be used for data to help guide instruction.</p> <p>FAST Assessments will be used for grouping and to monitor student progress</p> <p>Heggerty Assessments will be used in the lower grades to determine if students understand that spoken words are made up of individual sounds. Phonemic awareness is a great predictor of reading success.</p> <p>Standards-Based Unit Assessments will be used to drive instruction and monitor student progress</p> <p>DIBLES will be used to assess foundational reading skills in grades K-1</p> <p>Being a Reader Formative Data will be used in grades K-3 to monitor student progress</p> <p>SIPPS Formative Data will be used in grades 1-5 to monitor student progress</p> <p>The above programs will be used in whole groups, small groups, and as interventions, based on the needs of our students.</p>	Rosa, Brad, brad.rosa@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

Our SIP is shared during our SAC meetings and our PTA meetings, on our webpage, and through our school community newsletter. Our webpage address is: <https://azaleaparkes.ocps.net/>

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

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

At Azalea Park Elementary, we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by holding monthly events at the school which families and the community are invited to attend. Through newsletters and announcements, we are attempting to get more parents and teachers involved with our PTA and SAC committees. Additionally, we have parent-teacher conferences throughout the school year that inform families of the academic progress of their children.

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

We will have a large focus on foundational reading in grades K-2. While the time allotted for instructional teaching time is set by the state, we ensure that the time on task is discussed through our weekly professional learning communities (PLCs). In our PLCs, we discuss the benchmarks and how to best increase student engagement and support the students who need support through centers and small group instruction. Additionally, in our PLCs, we also discuss the students who have met proficiency and create learning opportunities for our students that meet the benchmarks to dive deeper and become more enriched in the content but challenging their thinking instead of just giving them more work to do.

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

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

At Azalea Park Elementary, we utilize a student referral form for teachers to complete on students that they are concerned about in academics, behavior, or mental health. Once the teacher fills in the Google form, our MTSS person routes the information to our school counselor or resource teacher that supports behavior and will meet with the teacher to help provide support to the student. Our school counselor has school-based mental health services meet with students identified as needing extra support. The school counselor also facilitates the use of character traits for each month to support students in character development and life skills. Azalea Park Elementary also utilizes The Caring Schools Curriculum to provide explicit instruction in life skills during the health block.

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

Teach-In, during the month of November, exposes students to a variety of careers and post-secondary opportunities. Students have the opportunity to listen to presentations and ask questions about the speaker's career, educational preparation, and benefits of their job.

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

At Azalea Park Elementary, Tier 1 behavior supports include our school-wide P.R.I.D.E. expectations, building classroom community through daily morning circle and weekly class meetings, interactive modeling of rules and procedures, individual classroom management plans, and calm down areas within the classroom. If a teacher suspects that a student is in need of more behavior support, they will complete a student service referral form with their concerns. Our MTSS support person will disseminate the information to the behavior resource teacher or the guidance counselor who will meet with the teacher to clarify the needs of the student. Tier 2 support can include a behavior contract, counseling services, conference with parent/guardian, and more targeted instruction in school-wide expectations. If a student continues to need more behavior support, the teacher, MTSS support person, behavior resource teacher, and guidance counselor will meet to discuss interventions that can be put in place and monitoring that will be needed for the specific student. Please see the behavior flow chart provided to teachers: <https://drive.google.com/drive/search?q=behavior%20flow%20chart>

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

Azalea Park Elementary uses grade-level professional learning communities to discuss student assessments and data and how this information steers instruction in the classroom. Professional development is provided for teachers based on the school focus and instructional needs observed in the classroom.

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

Azalea Park Elementary has two VPK units within our school. Pre-K students are exposed and supported in their transition to Kindergarten by participating in school procedures and interacting with our elementary students.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$77,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0611 - Azalea Park Elementary	General Fund		\$77,000.00
			Notes: Hired a second ESE teacher to support SWD			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$0.00
Total:						\$77,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No