

Orange County Public Schools

Pershing School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	18
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pershing School

1800 E PERSHING AVE, Orlando, FL 32806

<https://pershingk8.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
Brown, Sanjay	Principal	Admin Elementary 3-5 Curriculum and instruction Observe/Evaluate 3-5 and specials PTSO/SAC Budget Threat Assessment Team Member PLCs 3-5 SIP
Jeannides, Jorie	Assistant Principal	Admin Middle School 6-8 Budget Elementary Master Schedule Middle School Master Schedule Observations/Evaluations 6-8, MS Electives, ESE Athletics PTSO/SAC Threat Assessment Team Report CARds K-8 ESE School Services Team PLCs 6-8 Duty Schedules Classified SIP
Hale, Luz	Assistant Principal	Admin Elementary K-2 Budget ELL Department Lead Observe/Evaluate K-2 Discipline Team Lead Threat Assessment Team member Facilities Emergency Drills PLCs K-2 Safe Plan Inventory
Horning, Melissa	Instructional Media	AR Media Check out Textbooks News Crew Yearbook
Massie, Kate	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Support Units Behavior Data collection units FBA BIP Behavior support Gen Ed

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McClure, Kari	Math Coach	Elementary/Middle 504 Coordinator Elementary/Middle Gifted Coordinator Math Coach K-5 NEHS Sponsor - Elementary Testing Team PLCs K-5 Classroom observations K-5
Paxson, Cayci	Other	Behavior support/Data collection Safe Coordinator Threat Assessment Team member Testing team member PBIS team member Referrals for counseling Mental Health Designee
Slattery, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Classroom Observations Lead Mentor Data meetings K-5 ELA Designee K-5 Testing Coordinator K-8 Professional Development Lead REad to Succeed Liaison OG Lead
Vincent, Toni	Math Coach	Testing Team Math Coach 6-8 Field Trips Classroom Observations Science Coach 6-8 NJHS - Middle School Sponsor PLCs Middle School Math and Science
Hoevenberg, Jennifer	ELL Compliance Specialist	MTSS Coach Testing team ELA Coach 6-8 Classroom Observations ESOL Compliance IPT Testing WIDA Testing PLC Middle School ELA
Ayala-Padilla, Maria	Staffing Specialist	ESE Progress Monitoring FSAA Hospital Homebound lead Staffing/SSi

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		ESE Documentation/Data Collection ESE Department Lead
Hart, Randall	Dean	Discipline Lead PBIS Lead PASS supervisor Detention Coordinator Behavior Support Code of Conduct Review HOPE Scholarship
Vandegrift, Chelsea	School Counselor	ACCEL Middle School Social/emotional Groups Middle School Scheduling Testing Team Threat Assessment Team Child Safety Matters lead Transition to High School lead FLVS lead Transition to Middle School Lead

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.

The principal and assistant principal of instruction attend all School Advisory Council meetings. During these meetings information is shared with parents, students, staff and community members. The school leadership teams meets once a month to discuss updates on important information. The deputy superintendent memos are shared with the leadership team as well as the staff. There is a weekly message and newsletter sent out to parents through Connect Orange. Staff receive a newsletter weekly with information, strategies, and resources. Based on conversations with our SAC, our school was able to address the academic needs of students along with operational and structural changes to the campus. After reviewing our school data with SAC, our school adjusted personnel on campus to address areas of deficiency amongst ELL and ESE students.

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 goals will be regularly monitored for effective implementation during PLCs, data meetings, leadership team meetings, and SAC meetings.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	1	35	24	28	19	8	9	12	16	152	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	6	0	1	5	4	19	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	36	24	27	43	32	165	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	25	18	35	32	24	136	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	12	18	36	0	0	0	0	82	
	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	11	4	12	38	19	27	34	24	169

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	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	5
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	0	1	1	1	8	13	17	17	16	74	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	3	5	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	27	18	32	30	130	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	22	25	31	27	119	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	23	27	18	32	30	130	

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	1	1	1	9	17	0	19	21	69

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	1	1	8	13	17	17	16	74	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	3	5	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	27	18	32	30	130	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	22	25	31	27	119	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	23	27	18	32	30	130	

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	1	1	1	9	17	0	19	21	69	

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	54	56	53	56	57	55	56		
ELA Learning Gains				54			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			48		
Math Achievement*	55	59	55	56	41	42	61		
Math Learning Gains				40			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30			39		
Science Achievement*	57	56	52	55	57	54	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	68	68	78	63	59	66		
Middle School Acceleration	78	74	70	71	52	51	71		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	48	55	55	50	73	70	38		

** 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	16	Yes	3	1
ELL	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	57			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	53			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	46			

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	33	Yes	2	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	46			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	45			

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	54			55			57	60	78			48
SWD	15			20			19	13			5	
ELL	26			32			32	19			6	48
AMI												
ASN	53			60							2	
BLK	45			42			31				4	
HSP	43			47			51	47	82		7	49
MUL	50			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			62			65	68	81		6	
FRL	39			40			44	57	68		7	39

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	56	54	42	56	40	30	55	78	71			50
SWD	24	40	29	24	33	28	19	67				
ELL	29	48	39	29	36	25	33	40				50
AMI												
ASN	58			83								
BLK	35	42	27	39	26	25	16					
HSP	44	50	36	43	34	23	47	68	63			50
MUL	52	69		61	46							
PAC												
WHT	66	57	54	65	45	42	65	81	77			
FRL	40	46	35	41	35	26	41	68	59			55

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	56	58	48	61	49	39	53	66	71			38
SWD	30	41	38	28	27	7	23					
ELL	28	50	52	33	47	41	33					38
AMI												
ASN	69	67		77	42							
BLK	35	39		50	50		64					
HSP	45	55	46	48	49	37	42	62	67			37
MUL	62			62								
PAC												
WHT	66	63	55	70	50	41	56	69	67			
FRL	46	58	48	54	48	35	46	58	69			33

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	58%	54%	4%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	45%	4%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	47%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	58%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	29%	38%	-9%	48%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	62%	-5%	61%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	55%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	44%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	51%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	47%	44%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	45%	46%	48%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	66%	-9%

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 data component was 7th grade math with 29% proficiency. Last year Pershing was on the Open Capacity transfer list. Over the summer from May of 2022 to August of 2022, there was an increase of over 200 students K-8. Many of the student transfers were students who had not been performing at grade level at their previous school. The teachers had to spend time teaching prerequisites that the students did not previously have in order to understand the content for 7th grade math. However, the students made growth throughout the school year and are on their way towards proficiency in the 8th grade.

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

3rd grade math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. In 2022, 3rd grade had a proficiency level of 76% and in 2023, the proficiency level was 63%. This is a 13% decrease from 2022 to 2023. With the growth of the school there were several new 3rd grade teachers to both the grade level and the school. This was also the first year that the students were exposed to the new BEST standards. There were several concepts that were to be taught previously with the new standards that were not included in the prior years standards. Teacher had to spend time teaching concepts that the students were expect to have already mastered to be able to master the current 3rd grade standards.

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.

Pending state data release

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

8th grade math showed the greatest improvement, increasing from 27% students proficient in 2022 to 49% students proficient in 2023. For this area, the middle school math coach worked with the teacher on instructional strategies, classroom engagement, and student centered learning.

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

One area of potential concern in attendance. The number of students who are included in the warning data doubled from the previous school year.

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

1. Increase proficiency of ESE students in all grade levels and content areas
2. Increase proficiency of ELL students in all grade levels and content areas
3. Increase proficiency of 7th grade students on the Civics exam

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 Early Warning System**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.

Data supports that students who come to school in an positive environment are more motivated to participate therefore increasing their understanding of the content being taught. Students who attend school in a positive environment want to come to school and reduces student absences.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase of overall ELA proficiency by 5% on the FAST assessment in May.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, PLCs, and data meetings. Attendance will be monitored and meetings will be set up to address frequent absences early on.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cayci Paxson (cayci.paxson@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.)

Middle schools non proficient students that are struggling in reading will be in the intensive reading course. These students will receive interventions utilizing the SIPS program as well as READ 180. Elementary students that are struggling in reading will receive interventions in SIPS and vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The above mentioned reading intervention programs have a strong correlation with student success. When students attend school regularly, there should be an increase in students proficiency by utilizing these programs with fidelity.

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.

Perform classroom walkthroughs to observe and assess classroom climate and to monitor attendance in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Cayci Paxson (cayci.paxson@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Provide Teacher Professional Development throughout school year

Person Responsible: Cayci Paxson (cayci.paxson@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of April

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

The ELL students have fallen below the 41% index for the 2nd year in a row. These students need additional support in utilizing their acquired English language skills when reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ELL students will raise above the 41% federal index for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The school ESOL compliance teacher will meet with teacher to determine that the students are receiving the proper supports to be successful with integrating their English skills in the content areas. This will be done through PLCs, Classroom walkthroughs, and conferences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Middle school ELL students that are struggling in reading will be in the intensive reading course. These students will receive interventions utilizing the SIPPS program as well as READ 180. Elementary students that are struggling in reading will receive interventions in SIPPS and vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The SIPPS program allows for students to build foundational skills to assist them with reading and comprehending.

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.

Elementary teachers will meet weekly during PLCs to discuss strategies and implementation of the BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

Teacher will meet with the ECS to discuss their students' data and see if additional supports are needed.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Hoevenberg (jennifer.hoevenberg@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Middle school teachers will meet weekly during PLCs to discuss strategies and implementation of the BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Hoevenberg (jennifer.hoevenberg@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

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

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

For the 3rd year in a row, the Students with Disabilities subgroup has fallen below the federal index of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The over all Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase 5% to close the gap more and be closer to the federal index of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place through classroom walkthroughs, PLCs, and data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 that are being implemented are Raz Plus and SIPPS for elementary and Read 180 and SIPPS for middle school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies have moderate to strong evidence ratings. These strategies will help to close gaps for students by building upon foundational skills.

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.

Elementary teachers will meet weekly during PLCs to discuss strategies and implementation of the BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Middle School teachers will meet weekly during PLCs to discuss strategies and implementation of the BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Hoevenberg (jennifer.hoevenberg@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

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).

Based on data from the 2022-2023 school year, our ELL and ESE students continue to perform below 41%. During the budget allocation process, funds were allocated to hire personnel specializing in ESE interventions. Additionally, funds were allocated for an additional ELL para to help support ELL students. While no school improvement funding was allocated, adjustments were made to campus personnel and hiring to ensure these areas of need were adequately funded to support students.