Michael Mccoy Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Michael Mccoy Elementary

5225 S SEMORAN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32822

https://mccoyes.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
Unger, Eric	Principal	The Principal will provide the vision and direction for the school through shared leadership, discussions, and collaboration with our Professional Learning Communities. The Principal will communicate the school wide expectations for instruction in core subjects and support implementation of effective instructional strategies by observing, providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers, ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels, ensuring the use of common language for implementing the effective leadership habits, and communicating with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Mihelich, Tracy	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach/Reading Coach will provide guidance of effective instructional strategies through professional developments (Close Reading, etc.), observing instructional delivery, providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers. She will facilitate data collection, and assist with data analysis for Tier I, II, and III. She will assist in ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels and communicate with parents regarding school based MTSS plans. She will work directly with the lowest 25% students in intermediate grades during interventions.
Gomez, Julie	Reading Coach	Instructional Support will provide guidance of effective instructional strategies through professional development, observing instructional delivery, and providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers. She will facilitate data collection, and assist with data analysis for Tier I, II, and III. She will work directly with the struggling students in intermediate grades during interventions.
Lattin, Callie	Math Coach	Instructional Support will provide guidance of effective instructional strategies through professional development, observing instructional delivery, and providing actionable feedback and coaching to teachers. She will facilitate data collection, and assist with data analysis for Tier I, II, and III. She will work directly with the struggling students in intermediate grades during intervention.
Hernandez, Brenda	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will provide support to students and staff concerning mental health issues. She will monitor the early warning signs of all students and assist with monthly meetings to discuss students at risk. She will communicate with parents of students on the EWS list to increase student attendance and encourage positive behaviors.
Rumph, Pamela	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to provide the vision and direction for the school through shared leadership, discussions, and collaboration with our Professional Learning Communities. The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to communicate the school wide expectations for instruction in core subjects and support implementation of effective instructional strategies by observing, providing actionable feedback

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and coaching to teachers, ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels, ensuring the use of common language for implementing the effective leadership habits, and communicating with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Betancourt Diaz, Janet	ELL Compliance Specialist	The CCT/ESE Support will provide guidance of effective ELL instructional strategies through professional development, observing instructional delivery, and providing actionable feedback, monitoring compliance, and coaching.

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.

McCoy leadership team meets to review and discuss SIP from previous years. This is done as a team to create the 23-24 school year SIP goals that will increase student achievement and teacher efficacy. The team uses current and historical data to identify the main areas of focus for the new school year.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The 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 Florida Department of Education 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. The school will monitor the plan during leadership team meetings quarterly and during the mid-year SIP reflection. Classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, common planning minutes, staff feedback through surveys, parental and community input during SAC/PTO meetings. Data is shared weekly in grade level PLCs, monthly in MTSS & Grade Level Data Meetings. The Leadership Team makes adjustments organically each and every time new and additional data is collected.

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	90%
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	22	27	20	21	19	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	9
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	20	13	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	16	13	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	23	24	20	0	0	0	0	81
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	12	15	22	12	0	0	0	68

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	8	0	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	6	31	25	47	15	30	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	6	38	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	5	30	0	0	0	46
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	15	5	32	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	2	14	1	0	0	0	0	21
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	6	31	25	47	15	30	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	6	38	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	5	30	0	0	0	46
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	15	5	32	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	2	14	1	0	0	0	0	21
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*	45	57	53	42	56	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				59			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			44		
Math Achievement*	55	60	59	54	46	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				76			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				83			67		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	49	63	54	49	61	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	56	59	59	60			49		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	252
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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
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	25	Yes	2	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	57			

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	45			55			49					56
SWD	13			17							4	50
ELL	38			43			50				5	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			48			45				4	
HSP	41			54			49				5	54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62			71							2	
FRL	44			55			47				5	56

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	42	59	56	54	76	83	49					60
SWD	6	32	27	19	81	83	19					47
ELL	31	55	58	45	75	83	21					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	44		41	80							
HSP	39	60	58	54	77	82	46					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	73		68	64							
FRL	38	55	55	50	72	82	43					58

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	37	45	44	41	61	67	29					49
SWD	10	36		13	36							22
ELL	28	32	40	35	69	73	20					49

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			36								
HSP	36	44	44	41	59	65	31					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40			27								
FRL	35	42		39	57	62	30					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	40%	54%	-14%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	59%	-5%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	62%	7%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA and Science proficiency both were at 49%. Contributing factors were: high ELL population, language barriers, new computer-based assessment, high ESE population in 5th grade, and new benchmarks. No previously retained students in 3rd grade due to Covid. Two trends included- ELA proficiency increasing for a second straight year and Science proficiency remaining at 49% and up 17% from 2020-2021.

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

All data components increased or remained the same. Our ESSA sub-group for ESE stayed the same.

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.

ELA Proficiency 22-23 was 49%. The state average was 50% a decrease by 1%. The state average for Science was 51%, while McCoy's proficiency was 49%. A 2% decrease. Contributing factors were: high ELL population, language barriers, new computer-based assessment, high ESE population, and new benchmarks. ELA and science proficiency scores have been closely aligned.

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

ELA proficiency increased 7% from the 21-22 FAST to the 22-23 FAST. Coach created lesson plans to address specific student learning deficiencies. Additionally, each grade level participated in ESSER planning days during the summer and throughout the school year. Interventions were tightly structured and monitored frequently for adjustments.

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

Students who were absent 10% or more in grades Kg-5th. On average 20 students per grade level were absent more than 10%.

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

1. ELA Proficiency (with an emphasis on third grade)
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency

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

#1. 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 ESSA ESE Sub-Group did not meet the 41% threshold from the 22-23 FAST State Assessment.This was the first year not making that percent.

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

The school's specific measurable outcome for our ESSA ESE sub-group will increase to 45%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the following:
1.MTSS Meetings
2. Professional Learning Communities
3. Grade Level Data Meetings
4. Classroom Walkthroughs
5. ESE Department Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Unger (eric.unger@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.)

Evidence based interventions for our ESE Sub-Group include:
1. SIPPS - Will focus of foundational skills.
2. Being a Reader - Will focus on vocabulary and comprehension skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building and reinforcing early literacy. These programs were selected because they focus on foundation skills that allow students to become successful readers. Research supports that these programs will increase vocabulary and comprehension skills in reading. Our ESE students have gaps in foundational skills. These programs will allow us to fill the gaps to increase student achievement.

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.

1.Teachers will participate in professional development for Being a Reader, SIPPS, and Multi-Sensory Reading Instruction.
2.Teachers will engage in data analysis of standard based unit assessments with an intense focus on ESE

students to monitor progress and develop adjustments required to meet the needs of our students within this subgroup.

Person Responsible: Julie Gomez (julie.gomez2@ocps.net)

By When: 1. September 30th 2.September 30 and on-going progress monitoring

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

There are multiple teachers that have already expressed that at the conclusion of the 23-24 school they will be moving and or retiring leaving a number of teaching vacancies.

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

Our goal is to have 85% teacher retention as we conclude the 23-24 school year and begin the 24-25 school year.

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

Staff feedback surveys
Intent to Return Forms
One on One goal setting meetings with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Unger (eric.unger@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.)

Panorama Survey
Site created survey
One on One goal setting meetings with administration
Instructional Rounds
Survey data, classroom walk throughs, and observations will allow us to identify the needs of teachers, identify professional development offerings to promote advancement, and monitor teacher well being.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These specific strategies were selected in order to maintain and increase teacher morale, recruitment, and retention.
Monthly recognition of teacher achievement
Ensuring teachers are supported by providing all new teachers a mentor teacher

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.

Leadership Team will develop a Site Created Survey to obtain feedback from teachers. Feedback will be reviewed and reported back to staff with a response and/or plan for implementation. Principal and Assistant Principal will meet one-on-one with teachers to build relationships and develop individual goals

to help teachers achieve their career goals and greater success. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Coaches will complete instructional rounds to identify teacher areas of strength and need. Teachers will be matched with strong peers to observe in their identified areas of need in order to build capacity and invest in teacher growth. Principal will recognize high achieving teachers monthly. These strategies will over time promote positive work environment and draw long term employees to the school.

Person Responsible: Eric Unger (eric.unger@ocps.net)

By When: By May 2024.

Retaining and keeping the school fully staffed.

Person Responsible: Eric Unger (eric.unger@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

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).

As a team we analyze data and identify areas of need. All school improvement funding will be used to support our our ESSA subgroups, relating to ELL and ESE and Positive Culture and Environment related to retention. Funding will be used to provide specific resources for teachers to use to scaffold instruction and provide targeted instruction to help with reading deficiencies. Funds will also be used to provide after school tutoring for identified students in reading to help close gaps and frontload instruction.
Planning days will be provided for teachers and covered by substitutes to increase opportunities for collaboration and planning.
The principal will review the allocation and funding with the School Advisory Committee (SAC) and update the committee on progress being made.

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

Focus is on foundational skills beginning with phonemic awareness through the use of Heggerty. Students are exposed to grade level phonics during whole group instruction. Students are in fluid groupings in order to remediate or enrich phonics and/or comprehension during small group instruction. Center stations are vetted or given to teachers in order to achieve benchmark alignment. A veteran 1st grade teacher is working as a Tier 1 Interventionist and has 2 groups in 1st grade during small group instruction and 1 group in 2nd grade during FBS. All students are grouped according to needs for FBS. 2nd grade students have been identified and invited to participate in reading tutoring weekly.

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

Focus for students scoring a level 1 is on both foundational skills and comprehension. Students are exposed to grade level benchmarks during whole group instruction. Students are in fluid groupings in order to remediate or enrich phonics/morphology and comprehension during small group instruction. Center stations are vetted or given to teachers in order to achieve benchmark alignment. The Reading Coach is pulling all bubble students in 3rd and 4th for a comprehension focused 30 minute small group 3 days a week. A veteran intermediate teacher is working as a Tier 1 Interventionist and pushes into the lower level 5th grade group in the morning and the lower level 4th grade group in the afternoon. All students are grouped according to needs for FBS. 3rd grade through 5th grade students have been identified and invited to participate in reading tutoring weekly.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The student data for kindergarten and second grade for 2022-2023 was below 50%. Kindergarten was at 44% proficient and 2nd Grade was at 47% proficient. Our measurable outcome will be 50% or more for these two grade levels.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The student data for 3rd and 5th grade for 2022-2023 was below 50%. 3rd grade was at 48% proficient and 5th grade was at 44% proficient. Our measurable outcome will be 50% or more for these two grade levels.

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.

Admin and coaches will monitor the data through weekly data meetings focusing on reviewing SBUA's and MTSS data,and FAST Data. Admin and coaches will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor

instructional strategies being implemented and evidence of student learning. Through ongoing monitoring we will make adjustments as needed based on the data collected and observed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Unger, Eric, eric.unger@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?

Our focus is on foundational skills beginning with phonemic awareness through the use of Heggerty. SIPPS and Being a Reader is phonics, vocabulary and comprehension based. Magnetic and Wonders are being used to help students with vocabulary and comprehension. These are district approved programs that have been proven to significantly improve student progress in reading. Data points are taken weekly to monitor for the effectiveness of the program. Student progress will be discussed in data meetings with teachers, coaches, and administration and adjustments will be made as needed.

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?

These programs were selected because they target each of the domains for reading. These resources will help close the foundational gaps in the learning to read continuum and help students to make the transition to learn how to read and comprehend proficiently. These resources have been proven to meet the needs of students and effectively increase learning gains amongst targeted groups in reading.

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
Coaches will provide training on all programs and monitor closely to ensure the programs are implemented with fidelity. Assessments will be administered bi-weekly to see students progress.	Unger, Eric, eric.unger@ocps.net
Administration will complete class walk-throughs to monitor implementation of the programs.	Unger, Eric, eric.unger@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.

The SIP was disseminated during SAC & PTO meetings throughout the calendar year.

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))

Family Engagement Plan located on the school's website and in the front office.
Monthly Title I Family Events
SAC meetings
PTO meetings

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))

Tartedged small group instruction.
Targeted groups using six Tier I Intervention teachers
Targeted instruction identified in weekly PLCs, MTSS and Data Meetings.
Alignment of instruction to benchmarks in tutoring and Saturday school.
Building teacher capacity with classroom walkthroughs providing additional feedback on instruction.
Grade level planning days are built in during the year.

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))

McCoy follows all Federal, State, and County educational guidelines to meet the needs of all students.

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))

Devereaux (outside counseling agency) is on property and attends to student mental health needs 5 days a week and outside of the school setting.
The district provides the school a social worker once a week.
The district provides the school a school psychologist twice a week.
The school guidance counselor meets with students in small groups throughout the year for mental health training for our students.
The school staff has completed the state mandated Youth Mental Health Training.

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))

We are an elementary school, we do not have postsecondary opportunities. for our students.

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).

MTSS process to identify student's behaviors that are impacting their learning
The MTSS process includes both the school social worker and school psychologist.

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))

The school implements school professional development to build teacher capacity to increase student achievement and wellbeing. PD examples include: Behavior presentations by school psychologist, ESSESA sub-groups, SIPPS, Data Collection, ELA small group planning, etc..

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))

McCoy has the HeadStart program on its campus
McCoy has one VPK classroom on campus.
Both HeadStart and VPK students and parents are included in all before and after school events. This includes opportunities to learn about classroom instruction beginning in the student's first year of kindergarten.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No