



---

## 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>20</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>20</b>

# Northlake Park Community Elementary

9055 NORTHLAKE PKWY, Orlando, FL 32827

<https://northlakees.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 exciting and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure that every student has a promising and successful future.

Objectives:

- High Expectations for Student Learning
- Student Social and Emotional Well-Being
- Dedicated and High-Quality Team
- Positive Climate and Safe Environment
- Efficient Operations
- Engaged and Invested Community

### 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
Archie, Emily	Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the principal are to ensure all areas of the school improvement plan are implemented with fidelity. Oversee all school operations, assist with discipline, evaluations/observations, support teachers with lesson planning, progress monitoring, and assessment. Develop with the school team our school improvement plan and Safe School plan. Attend PLCs and support common planning for grade-level teams. Ensure the budget and funding resources are appropriately allocated to support the areas of focus and action steps within the action plan items.
Fulbright, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	The job duties of responsibilities of the assistant principal include supporting the principal to ensure that all areas of the School Improvement Plan are implemented promptly. In addition, the assistant principal ensures that the right progress monitoring tools are in place and functioning so teachers have the information needed to drive instruction and impact student achievement.
Hanrahan, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The job duties and responsibilities for Mrs. Hanrahan include the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Testing Coordinator, PD Points, and Textbook Coordinator. She will support teachers during PLC meetings and common planning,
Caballero, Janet	ELL Compliance Specialist	The job duties and responsibilities include assisting teachers with meeting the needs of our ELL students. The ELL Compliance Specialist collects ELL-specific data. This teacher holds ELL Parent/Teacher Meetings and Multilingual Parent Leadership Council Meetings. The ELL Compliance Specialist serves as the IPT and WIDA contact and test administrator. She also assists teachers with collecting and reviewing MTSS data and providing teacher support as needed.
Miski, Elia	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor assists with the Character Education and Social Emotional Support (student resiliency). The Guidance Counselor serves as the Threat Assessment Contact provides small group interventions, and assists with individual student behavior plans.
Tomlinson, Jennifer	Dean	Mrs. Tomlinson helps with behavior support for all students. She is also our Title IX coordinator. She works with teachers within PLCs.

**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.

Here at NLP, we have a very involved SAC committee. We meet monthly and our members include parents, businesses, teachers, classified personnel as well as our leadership team. This committee

reviews the SIP plan regularly along with state assessments and district progress monitoring. During our meetings, we share the results of assessments as well as seek innovative ways to address the various concerns. The SAC then provides for some of the strategies and monies that will support implementation. We then report back to SAC the results from teachers and students. We continue this process throughout the school year. This year we will begin meetings in August to prepare for the coming changes needed for 2023 - 2024.

**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))

We will begin reviewing the SIP plans with teachers and the SAC committee in August. We will revisit the SIP as data points are provided. We can then adjust what is needed to better support our students. Our focus is on K-2 reading in hopes of further build foundational skills for our students. We will also focus on achievement gaps for our ESE and ESOL students,

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	67%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	30%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	





Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	17	13	18	17	20	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	20	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	7	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	13	20	0	0	0	33

**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	0	9	8	0	0	0	17

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) 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	0	17	13	18	17	20	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	20	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	7	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	13	20	0	0	0	33

**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	0	9	8	0	0	0	17

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	73	57	53	77	56	56	78		
ELA Learning Gains				69			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			63		
Math Achievement*	80	60	59	85	46	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				81			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			32		
Science Achievement*	80	63	54	80	61	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	59	59	76			85		

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	1	
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	60			
HSP	73			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	83			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	64			

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	47			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	76			
HSP	71			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	71			

**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	73			80			80					74
SWD	21			34							3	
ELL	60			71			57				5	74
AMI												
ASN	86			94							2	
BLK	56			64							2	
HSP	69			73			68				5	72
MUL	91			73							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	76			89			88				4	
FRL	59			61			69				5	67

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	77	69	56	85	81	70	80					76
SWD	31	44	29	45	67	67						
ELL	59	60	45	72	85	83	67					76
AMI												
ASN	87	89		95	89							
BLK	67	73		81	82							
HSP	67	66	56	78	78	73	75					74
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	70	62	92	83	73	85					
FRL	65	68	55	79	82	74	71					74

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	78	60	63	78	53	32	56					85
SWD	32			44								
ELL	60	62	65	62	31	36	23					85
AMI												
ASN	92			96								
BLK	86			79								
HSP	69	62	60	70	44	25	43					85
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	56		86	67		68					
FRL	65	55	62	65	43	28	33					80

**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	67%	54%	13%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	60%	9%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	52%	24%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	59%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	62%	10%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	51%	24%

**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 lowest performance was ELA overall for the school. Our fifth-grade students were our lowest performers with only 69% with achievement levels 3 and above. A large component within our fifth grade was our low performers within ESE. There were 28 students in third, fourth, and fifth grade with disabilities and only 5 had achieved the level of 3, 4, or 5 during testing- this was one of the contributing factors. These students had an 18% pass rate.

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

The greatest decline was in math. Last year Math 3+ was 83% - this year it was 77%. This was the first year with BEST standards. Our teachers were learning a new curriculum along with new standards. Our teachers worked to learn the standards and the assessment component for this year. We had additional planning days in which to review standards and establish the best strategies for teaching. This practice will need to continue as teachers learn to master the standards and learn additional strategies.

**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.**

Northlake Park scored above the state average in ELA and Math for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. The area that showed the least amount of overages in both ELA and math was 4th grade. 4th grade Math was 9 points above the state average and ELA was 7 points above the state average. This was due to teacher turnover within the grade level. The grade level also had two teachers new to the grade level. Both were provide ongoing support and coaching throughout the year.

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

All of our scores went down this year.

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

We noticed that 10% of our students have 10 or more absences. This is a concern. Within our community, many families take breaks with their students throughout the school year. We share with families the importance of students being in school and maintaining learning. The next concern was that 5% of students have Level 1's in Math and ELA. We have to work on better strategies for supporting these students.

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

Focus on learning standards to improve ELA achievement levels.  
Focus on writing that will now factor in for our 4th and 5th graders  
Focus on third grade as this is its category within our school grade this year.  
Focus on student resiliency to support our school.

### **Area of Focus**

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



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

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

In our Panorama data it showed that only 46% of our students are able to talk about their feelings. 54% of our students shared that they were able to remain calm even when someone is bothering them. Also 35% of students were favorable when asked how much does the behavior of other students hurt or help their learning. We know that we need to Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for student resiliency, we will address the following needs:

Learning gains in ELA for our bottom 25%

Increasing performance proficiency in ELA for our Students with Disabilities

Build family and home relationships by strengthening a culture for social and emotional learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By focusing on this area, we would like to see a correlation between the implementation of SEL work impact on our ELA and Math proficiency scores as measured on the FAST. Our goal is to see the scores increase by three to five percentile points. In addition to our school-wide FAST scores increasing, we would like to see our bottom 25 percentile make learning gains in ELA and our SWD students increase three to five percentile points to put them on a trajectory to match other subgroups.

**Monitoring:**

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

In addition, we will focus on the goal, plan and implement intentionally structured opportunities for adults to integrate and monitor resources and strategies to grow every student academically, socially and emotionally. We will begin the process by collecting baseline data on student SEL needs and determining program resources and implementing a plan for continuous school improvement. In addition to collecting SEL baseline data, we will collect academic baseline data and develop an understanding of the 2021-2022 school year data. Data chats, PLC meetings SELL sessions 1-3, and Action Planning Document forms will be completed as our monitoring tool throughout the school year. The progress monitoring form includes trend data from classroom walkthroughs, culture & climate data, and qualitative data from stakeholders.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Emily Archie (emily.archie@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.)

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies and deliberate school supports for families.

Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school support necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

**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.

Roll out Zones of Regulation curriculum to all grade levels

**Person Responsible:** Elia Miski (elia.miski@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

PLC monthly student concern meetings

**Person Responsible:** Emily Archie (emily.archie@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

### 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.

With over 5% of students in grades 3-5 scoring a Level 1 in Math or ELA, our area of focus this year will be on Student Engagement. When students are cognitively engaged in tasks and instruction that are appropriate and aligned, student comprehension and proficiency increase. This directly correlates with teachers' instructional practice. We have started working on creating a positive school culture and climate. This year we are using HOUSES as a way of unifying our school for increased student and family involvement, we are recognizing student success. By highlighting students positive behavior, our continued focus is their behavior within the classroom and their attention to their academics. Focusing on student engagement with increased intentionality by teachers for exciting and interesting instructional strategies will begin to increase student engagement which will effect an increase in student learning.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase in ELA achievement in grades 3-5 from 74% to 78%.

### Monitoring:

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

As the Curriculum and Instruction Team conduct classroom visits, student engagement will be monitored and tracked. School wide data trends will be compiled and used to drive professional development for teachers throughout the school year. We will have monthly data meetings with each grade level. During these meetings we are looking at student data, instructional strategies - asking questions what is working and what is not working. Increased attention towards our students who are struggling - all of our Tier 1 and Tier 2 students will be addressed during these meetings.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Archie (emily.archie@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.)

Use distributive leadership to implement a continuous improvement plan for student engagement focused on planning instruction that is engaging and aligned to state standards, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies and deliberate school supports for staff and students.

Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of walkthrough data, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When all stakeholders are engaged in the planning and implementation of the plan, buy-in, and engagement increase. Utilizing a continuous improvement cycle ensures that the school focus can be fluid and adapt to the needs of the school as supported by current data.

### 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.

Weekly PLC meetings dedicated to math and ELA instruction

**Person Responsible:** Kathleen Fulbright (kathleen.fulbright@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Implementation of Houses through the Ron Clark Academy

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Tomlinson (jennifer.tomlinson@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

**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).

**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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Approval**

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

No