

Orange County Public Schools

# Ventura Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>22</b>

## Ventura Elementary

4400 WOODGATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32822

<https://venturaes.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
Gonzalez, Ana	Principal	Instructional leader in all aspects of accountability, monitoring, teacher PD, student interventions, student enrichment, vision, mission, outreach to parents, oversight of AP scheduling and discipline matters, parent contact, SAC/MPLC meetings, budget, hiring, capacity building of personnel, facilities, and overall site management.
Brown, Ranita	Assistant Principal	Discipline, PBIS, Facilities/initial contact, FTE corrections, Scheduling, Safe Schools plans & documentation, Threat Assessment team, assistant to the principal
Morrison, Lisa	Instructional Coach	PLCs, Math/Science Curriculum mapping and monitoring, MTSS coordinator, Summer School coordinator.
John, Lucillia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	PLCs, ELA/Writing Curriculum mapping and monitoring, Mentor Coordinator, Tutoring coordinator.
Noll, Robert	School Counselor	Resiliency Plans, MTSS committee, Parent outreach & support with PEL, PBIS with AP, Student & family support groups, Threat Assessment with AP, Safe Schools plan with AP.
Coggan, Susan	Staffing Specialist	Identification/Support/Placement/Updates to 504s & IEPs, Outreach & Support for ESE students and families, FTE ESE corrections, ESE compliance and training for staff.

**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 administrative team will set the tone for promoting a positive culture and safe learning environment at the school. Teachers will create a welcoming learning environment for the class family in the classroom. Support Staff will promote positive choices across the campus. Families and the community will encourage students and staff with continued positive support off-campus. Each team leader will attend and work alongside SAC members (school demographic representation) and our parents to share and communicate ongoing school-wide goals.

**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))

Ventura Elementary will be monitoring student growth by using beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through FAST as well as common assessments throughout the school year. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data from the Standards-based Unit Assessments and data gained from documented MTSS interventions-- provided to readers at the Tier II and Tier III levels through such programs as SIPPS, Heggerty, Fountas & Pinnell, leveled literacy intervention, Exact Path, Envision Intervention materials, Successmaker, Reflex Math, Study Island and PMAs for Science. Monthly data meetings will occur with teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made for student learning as well as formative checks to verify that students make gains in given content.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	91%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No

<p align="center"><b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<p align="center"><b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: B  2019-20: D  2018-19: D  2017-18: C
<p align="center"><b>School Improvement Rating History</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b></p>	

**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	20	40	31	20	43	13	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	13	0	0	0	16
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	2	41	45	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	46	27	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	18	16	27	41	0	0	0	0	102

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	10	6	11	47	25	0	0	0	99

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	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	10
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	20	48	32	56	30	51	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	39	36	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	29	30	0	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	57	54	48	35	46	0	0	0	253

**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	10	29	30	0	0	0	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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	20	48	32	56	30	51	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	39	36	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	29	30	0	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	57	54	48	35	46	0	0	0	253

**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	10	29	30	0	0	0	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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	7
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*	44	57	53	43	56	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				70			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			52		
Math Achievement*	44	60	59	52	46	50	28		
Math Learning Gains				73			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			48		
Science Achievement*	37	63	54	37	61	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	62			32		

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

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

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	217
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
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	17	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	61			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	42			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
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	44			44			37					48
SWD	11			14			0				5	47
ELL	40			41			36				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			40			21				4	
HSP	46			41			36				5	48

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60			65							3	
FRL	39			41			31				5	47

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	43	70	67	52	73	73	37					62
SWD	3	61	64	14	64	77	8					42
ELL	35	67	68	43	71	75	27					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	61		50	69							
HSP	44	70	74	53	74	76	38					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	82		50	64		45					
FRL	39	66	64	48	71	76	38					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	38	53	52	28	51	48	26					32
SWD	10	42		12	28		13					29
ELL	31	61	62	28	57	43	18					32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	29		18	31		25					
HSP	35	55	56	27	55	52	19					33
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61			59								

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
FRL	34	48	53	23	45	44	22					27

**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	42%	54%	-12%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	35%	52%	-17%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	35%	59%	-24%	51%	-16%

**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 components were science proficiency at 36% (one point lower than the previous year) and ELA/3rd grade proficiency at 36% (7 points lower than the previous year). Contributing factors: Science had some lack of consistent hands on activities to demonstrate challenging big ideas, while ELA/3rd grade had half of the team as new teachers to Ventura and a larger portion of students who needed to gain proficiency of the standards.

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

The greatest data component decline for proficiency was at 4th grade math: 2022 FSA 4th grade math proficiency per FSA was at 62%, and this past school year's 2023 FAST 4th grade math proficiency was at 25%. Factors that affected these results would be adjusted standards and we had a larger percentage the previous year of students at 3rd who met good cause--which, in turn, meant they were two grades below and yet were assigned to 4th grade.

**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.**

3rd grade Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state was at 60% proficiency, and Ventura 3rd graders were at 16%, a 44 percentage point difference. The strongest factor was a lack of pro-active differentiated instruction by 3rd grade math teachers.

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

4th grade ELA showed the most improvement utilizing the new FAST standards. Consistent modeling of lessons by teachers and coaches of the hardest standards, collaborative brainstorming within PLC meetings, curriculum coach's direct teaching support in classrooms, along with teachers' closer attention to individual student growth made this positive change come to fruition.

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

For students performing at the bottom 10% in reading proficiency, teachers will place Tier 3 Intervention groups' progress monitoring data will be tracked weekly by teachers within the MTSS shared drive. Once a month data meetings will address intensifying and/or changing individual student's plans for success. For students who have 10% or more absences and are below grade level expectations in reading, MTSS meetings will be held with each family to review student success plans, attendance requirements, and incentives. These meetings are held with the attendance clerk, MTSS coordinator, administrator, and parent.

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

Prioritized focus elements for site-wide improvement/top 4-- #1) Consistent modeling of lessons by teachers and coaches of the hardest standards; #2) Curriculum coach's direct teaching support in classrooms; and #3) Teacher colleagues' classroom visitations and reflection sessions; and #4) Ongoing effective data analysis sessions, at least once a month in a dedicated PLC.

### **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.

In Ventura's EWS data, absenteeism 10% or more and number of students with a substantial reading deficiency were the two most prominent areas of need. To support improvement in these areas, a PBIS site-wide common language and behavior expectations have been implemented and will be monitored. In addition, a Literacy Committee will meet monthly to determine ongoing initiatives to increase individual student interest in self-selected books as well as to increase reading proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Measurable outcomes will include tracking total number of absences per month per grade level by the Attendance Initiative Committee, comprised of AP, Attendance Clerk, School Counselor, Social Worker and Principal. Literacy Committee, comprised of Media Specialist, PEL (Parent Engagement Liaison), ELA coach, elective teachers, ESE teachers and Instructional Resource Teacher, will gather totals for student recognition in regard to improved literacy initiatives. Ventura will reduce the number of students 10% or more absences from 237 to 200 or less by year's end.

**Monitoring:**

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

The two areas of focus will be monitored by the Extended Administrative Team by monthly updates provided by the two committees.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ana Gonzalez (ana.gonzalez2@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.)

Positive Action is a whole-school reform strategy designed to improve social-emotional, attendance, and achievement outcomes by building school climate, self-control, goal-setting, problem-solving, persistence, and other skills. Students learn these skills through structured discussions and activities, games, and role plays.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher and support team active collaboration has been the cornerstone to our success in the past, and we will add to this success by ongoing data discussions to meet the goal of reduced absenteeism.

**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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**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.



A PBIS site wide common language and behaviour expectations will be monitored for its effect on encouraging best behavior and consistent attendance in school.

**Person Responsible:** Ranita Brown (ranita.brown@ocps.net)

**By When:** Regular monthly reports will be shared by assistant principal, Dr. Brown, within the Extended Administrative Team meetings.

A Literacy Committee will create ongoing initiatives to increase individual student interest in self selected books as well as to increase reading proficiency for each grade level; the ELA coach will collaborate with the Media Specialist to provide check out totals for the Media Center and student data from Exact Path to monitor reading fluency and accuracy improvement.

**Person Responsible:** Lucillia John (lucillia.john@ocps.net)

**By When:** Regular monthly reports will be shared by ELA coach, Ms. John, within the Extended Administrative Team meetings.

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

**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.

K-5 reading proficiency levels will be positively impacted by implementing a K-5 Walk-to model (WIN-- "What I Need") for reading intervention during the FBS period at the start of the day. Teachers, ESOL paraprofessionals, Intervention teachers, and ESE support teachers will all have assigned groups to practice guided reading. Progress monitoring will be implemented by coaches to review individual student's progress in these strategic small groups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Proficiency scores on FAST reading will show a 10% increase per grade level with continued modified plans reviewed by teachers and coaches within monthly data meetings.

**Monitoring:**

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

Weekly progress monitoring according to the targeted skill in each small group will be tracked. A data review meeting will be held to analyze the response to intervention success rates for individual students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lucillia John (lucillia.john@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.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**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**

K-2 grade level teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. K-2 reading proficiency levels will be positively impacted by implementing a K-2 Walk-to model (WIN--"What I Need") for reading intervention during the FBS period at the start of the day. Teachers, ESOL paraprofessionals, Intervention teachers, and ESE support teachers will all have assigned groups to practice guided reading. Progress monitoring will be implemented by coaches to review individual student's progress in these strategic small groups. K-2 teachers will plan and model Morphology Mondays in their PLCs to teach these specific elements consistently.

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

3-5 grade level teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. 3-5 reading proficiency levels will be positively impacted by implementing a 3-5 Walk-to model (WIN--"What I Need") for reading intervention during the FBS period at the start of the day. Teachers, ESOL paraprofessionals, Intervention teachers, and ESE support teachers will all have assigned groups to practice guided reading. Progress monitoring will be implemented by coaches to review individual student's progress in these strategic small groups. 3-5 teachers will plan and model Morphology Mondays in their PLCs to teach these specific elements consistently.

**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**

Proficiency scores on FAST reading will show a 10% increase per grade level with continued modified plans reviewed by teachers and coaches within monthly data meetings. 67% of kindergarten students in

last year's FAST PM3 were at proficiency; this year's goals are for our 1st graders to reach 77% proficiency on the 2024 PM3. 41% of 1st grade students in last year's FAST PM3 were at proficiency; this year's goals are for our 2nd grade students to reach 51% proficiency on the 2024 PM3.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Proficiency scores on FAST reading will show a 10% increase per grade level with continued modified plans reviewed by teachers and coaches within monthly data meetings. 39% of 2nd grade students in last year's FAST PM3 were at proficiency; this year's goals are for our 3rd graders to reach 49% proficiency on the 2024 PM3. 36% of 3rd grade students in last year's FAST PM3 were at proficiency; this year's goals are for our 4th grade students to reach 46% proficiency on the 2024 PM3. 46% of 4th grade students in last year's FAST PM3 were at proficiency; this year's goals are for our 5th grade students to reach 56% proficiency on the 2024 PM3.

## 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.

Monthly data review meetings by grade level team and support personnel, including ESE teachers and Intervention coaches, will determine individual changes to the student groups based on benchmark focus results on item specs bi-weekly.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Ranita, ranita.brown@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?

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention. Data tracking sheets and the one-stop-shop data spreadsheet will be used to consolidate the positive trends identified for student needs in the monthly data meeting per grade levels.

**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?

The specific Data Monitoring monthly sessions will ensure that student successful and increased achievement levels are achieved and celebrated for individual students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching will be provided by coaches to continually review best practices of instructional delivery and monitoring pertinent to the WIN/FBS timeframe. Coaches will model the explicit and practice sections of lessons, as well as co-teach in classrooms that require additional instructional support.	Morrison, Lisa, lisa.morrison@ocps.net
Professional Learning will continue to be provided with additional planning sessions and guided lessons utilizing Kagan strategies for student interaction. Student work samples as well as classroom walkthroughs looking for collaborative environment trends will be tracked quantitatively each month. Reports indicating frequency and success rates per grade level will be shared with teachers monthly.	John, Lucillia, lucillia.john@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 PEL (Parent Engagement Liaison) will share a monthly newsletter, calendar of events and parent workshops, and work alongside the registrar to become familiar with the needs of our parents all throughout the school year. In addition, the school's main web page will provide a copy, a staff review of the SIP will take place in September as well as SAC will review the document/copy.

**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))

The PEL (Parent Engagement Liaison) will share a monthly newsletter, calendar of events and parent workshops, and work alongside the registrar to become familiar with the needs of our parents all throughout the school year. 'Talking Point,' the online platform for the principal to respond to immediate inquiries will assist parents. The principal will work with team leaders to designate each homeroom's Lead Parent to be invited to participate in feedback sessions within SAC.

**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)**

Two highly qualified academic coaches will work alongside teachers to plan, revise, analyze and strategize adjustments to curriculum delivery in each classroom. The ELA /Writing and the Math/Science coach will teach side by side frequently with teachers to ensure that there is real time feedback provided as to student engagement and student success.

**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))**

All additional services that families may need are provided to them by Staffing Specialist, School Counselor, AP, Principal, the MTSS team, and district personnel serving on campus. Furthermore, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework for learning will be utilized in planning and implementing instruction to optimize learning for students with disabilities. Routine checks with families to ensure services are up to date are checked by district support and Staffing Specialist.

**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: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Approval**

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

No