

Orange County Public Schools

Palm Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Palm Lake Elementary

8000 PIN OAK DR, Orlando, FL 32819

<https://pallmlakees.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
Weis, James	Principal	Mr. Weis oversees all instructional leadership duties, including but not limited to: using best practices in classroom instruction, structuring and monitoring the Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS), providing interventions, completing teacher evaluations and using data from all of these areas to create job-embedded professional development for the classroom teachers. Mr. Weis leads shared decision-making among leadership team members and other school leaders. He engages stakeholders through SAC, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and Partners in Education (PIEs). He oversees the safety and well-being of the school.
Galvin-Prepetit, Roseanne	Assistant Principal	Ms. Galvin-Prepetit supports the principal with key decisions regarding instruction, teacher development, student progress, and overall safety of the school.
Pignolet, Michelle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Pignolet coordinates all school-wide state and district assessments. She participates in data collection, progress monitoring, as well as data meetings to monitor student assessment results.
Akesson, Lauren	School Counselor	Lauren Akesson supports all students with guidance lessons throughout the school year. She coordinates other supports for students who have specific needs such as small group lessons, behavior plans, foster care support, homeless student support and many other specific needs. Ms. Akesson coordinates our "Kids Who Care" program.
Baer, Marlene	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Baer is the ELL Compliance Specialist. She supports all ELL students with proper placement and testing. She supports teachers with instruction to support ELL students achieve success. Marlene is the 504 plan coordinator, too.
Puglisi, Gigi	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Puglisi is the Behavior Specialist. She develops, monitors, and supervises the implementation of behavioral programs for students.
Wilson, Neena	Administrative Support	Ms. Wilson is the secretary and bookkeeper. She is in charge of our social media, website, and coordinates information for our quarterly parent newsletter, The Bobcat Blast.
Outland, Tiffany	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Outland is the Staffing Specialist. She assists in decision-making for intervention/enrichment and leads MTSS Problem Solving meetings, eligibility and IEP team meetings to ensure students have a plan in place for their success.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mann, Katie	Instructional Media	Ms. Mann provides support to staff and students on district curriculum technology learning. She leads media instruction with students and is the school news coordinator.

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 school leadership team, team leaders, and Student Services Resilience Team were involved in the SIP development process. The Panorama Survey was used to inform this process as well. Groups met individually and shared information with administration which synthesized this information into this plan.

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 School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored by classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, staff feedback, and parental and community support.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
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	21	25	28	18	15	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	
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	0	14	12	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	14	22	14	0	0	0	0	66	

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	5	5	10	18	10	0	0	0	48

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	26	23	17	16	22	0	0	0	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	18	23	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	22	0	0	0	37	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	18	23	0	0	0	42	

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	1	12	20	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	26	23	17	16	22	0	0	0	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	18	23	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	22	0	0	0	37	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	18	23	0	0	0	42	

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	1	12	20	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
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*	67	57	53	64	56	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				72			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			59		
Math Achievement*	68	60	59	68	46	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				76			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			46		
Science Achievement*	78	63	54	71	61	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	67			61		

* 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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	537
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	3	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	55			
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	82			

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	63			

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	40	Yes	2	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	54			
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	58			

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	67			68			78					64
SWD	27			37			30				4	
ELL	55			60			71				5	64
AMI												
ASN	68			74							2	
BLK	53			42			73				4	
HSP	60			61			68				5	63
MUL												

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	77			81			89				5	82
FRL	59			58			73				5	65

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	64	72	64	68	76	55	71					67
SWD	22	41	41	39	58	28	33					58
ELL	48	65	63	56	70	54	52					67
AMI												
ASN	72	73		71	82							
BLK	41	70		50	61	45	56					
HSP	54	69	63	61	74	61	69					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	75	62	77	79	50	79					71
FRL	49	64	64	53	68	53	50					60

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	61	67	59	61	66	46	71					61
SWD	24	69	73	24	38		27					56
ELL	34	55		39	45		20					61
AMI												
ASN	57			52								
BLK	43	50		37	42		47					
HSP	47	68		51	61		69					64
MUL	67			100								
PAC												
WHT	76	69		72	80		79					53
FRL	49	62	45	47	51	36	66					64

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	68%	54%	14%	54%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	60%	14%	58%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	59%	15%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	51%	25%

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.

Fifth grade's math proficiency showed the lowest performance. Two of the contributing factors to last year's low performance are the new standards and new resources.

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

Fifth grade math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Two factors that contributed to this decline include new standards and new resources.

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.

All of our scores were above the state average. Math showed the smallest gap over the state average indicating an area for growth. Two factors that contributed to this decline include new standards and new resources.

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

Science overall proficiency showed the most improvement. Our students in grades 3-5 used Study Island. Also, the district's science department created a resource for our students to use.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, substantial reading deficiency and absent 10% or more are our two areas of concern.

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

Our highest priorities include increasing math proficiency and reading proficiency.

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.

Build and establish a positive culture at our school with adults and students.

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and feel safe and secure on the campus and in their learning environment. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture, we will address the following school needs:

1. Closing achievement gap and increasing proficiency in Math for all students
2. Closing achievement gap and increasing proficiency for our English Language Learners
3. Closing achievement gap and increasing proficiency of SWD students

Measurable Outcome:

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

Continue to foster a positive culture and environment for learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture and learning environment, we will address the following school needs:

1. Closing achievement gap and increasing overall proficiency by 5% in Math for all students as reported on FAST PM3.
2. Closing achievement gap and increasing overall proficiency by 5% for our English Language Learners as reported on FAST PM3.
3. Closing achievement gap and increasing overall proficiency by 5% of SWD students as reported on FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Positive Culture and Environment will be monitored through:

1. Classroom Walkthrough trend data
2. Qualitative data from students, staff, and families
3. Evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data
4. Culture and Climate continuum data
5. Survey data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Weis (james.weis@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 strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data regarding the effects of classroom meetings and conscience discipline and its impact on positive school culture. Through instructional rounds, we will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs. We will form a Behavior Committee comprised of teachers, classified staff, and administration to establish a school-wide behavior plan. These committee members will be a liaison for the grade levels/teams to monitor behavior and academic relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a positive culture and learning with adults 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 team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive 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.

Teachers and staff will continue to learn about how a positive school culture is connected to instructional learning strategies through professional learning on classroom meetings and conscience discipline through faculty meetings and behavior committee meetings. The leadership team will conduct instructional rounds throughout the school year to monitor the impact of the professional learning.

Person Responsible: James Weis (james.weis@ocps.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

Behavior Committee comprised of teachers, classified staff, and administration will establish school-wide behavior plan. These committee members will be a liason for the grade levels/teams to monitor behavior and academic relationships.

Person Responsible: James Weis (james.weis@ocps.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

We would like to increase overall proficiency in Math. Even though our overall proficiency increased, we would like to focus on strategies that will help our lowest performing students and students with disabilities (SWD).

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023, based on FAST PM3, our Math proficiency was 71%. Our goal is to Increase overall proficiency in Math by five percent based on 2024 FAST PM3. In addition, we plan to increase our SWD overall proficiency from 40% in 2022 to 44% based on the 2024 FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring through the use of Standards Based Unit Assessments, FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments, SuccessMaker, and teacher-made common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Weis (james.weis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will focus on academic discourse and using math manipulatives to help students solidify math concepts. We will conduct a lesson study on the book The Guide to Academic Conversations. Teachers will use academic conversations and mathematical discourse to facilitate student engagement. Students will use SuccessMaker Math 40 minutes per week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that a focus on mathematical discourse, SuccessMaker, and using math manipulatives will strengthen our students' understanding and prepare them for future success.

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.

Provide teachers with the book, The Guide to Academic Conversations.

Provide professional development on using SuccessMaker.

Monitor students' progress using SuccessMaker.

Person Responsible: James Weis (james.weis@ocps.net)

By When: April 30, 2024

Professional development on using academic discourse and using math manipulatives in the classroom.

Person Responsible: James Weis (james.weis@ocps.net)

By When: April 30, 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).

The budget is reviewed monthly and allocated accordingly based on needs.

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: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$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.

Yes