

Orange County Public Schools

Clay Springs 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Clay Springs Elementary

555 N WEKIWA SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://clayspringses.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.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

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
McDaid, Rebecca	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems - Oversee instruction and serves as the curriculum leader of the school
Starrett, Jessica	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal - Serves as an instructional and curricular leader
Naughton, Christina	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides resiliency learning support to students - Provides resiliency instruction to students PK-5
Rock, Patrick	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversees the MTSS process; focusing on implementing and monitoring intervention for the Lowest 25%, provides student support to Tier 3 students, and provides support to Data Leads of each grade level to ensure understanding of data collection and use - Responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing ELA and instruction
Proudfoot, Hope	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversees media and technology implementation for the school - Oversees book selection, library catalog, digital citizenship, and inventory

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.

School staff identified the needs of the school through data analysis. Goals were shared with the School Advisory Council which is made up of teachers, staff, parents, community members, and administration.

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))

Data will be reviewed weekly during school leadership meetings and monthly at PLC meetings. SAC will receive updates during the 4 established meetings throughout the school year.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	13	29	32	30	13	18	0	0	0	135	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in 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	20	27	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	37	32	0	0	0	70	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	21	24	0	0	0	46

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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	13	29	32	30	13	18	0	0	0	135	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in 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	20	27	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	37	32	0	0	0	70	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	21	24	0	0	0	46

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	48	57	53	53	56	56	48		
ELA Learning Gains				63			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			38		
Math Achievement*	45	60	59	55	46	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				54			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			32		
Science Achievement*	52	63	54	53	61	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	59	59	64			44		

** 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	254
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	27	Yes	4	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	45			

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	3	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	53			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	53			

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	48			45			52					50
SWD	26			25			9				5	32
ELL	37			40			32				5	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34			26			41				4	
HSP	45			40			52				5	50
MUL	58			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	60			63			64				4	
FRL	40			37			42				5	53

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	53	63	43	55	54	42	53					64
SWD	22	38	33	24	38	33	19					57
ELL	35	52	47	44	47	38	41					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	70		41	48		43					
HSP	48	59	48	53	57	46	48					64
MUL	56	70		67	70							
PAC												
WHT	65	67		64	50	30	72					
FRL	48	59	46	49	56	48	52					62

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	48	39	38	55	45	32	31					44
SWD	10	29	42	26	33	31	12					43
ELL	33	32	18	47	46	25	21					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	35		38	20		19					
HSP	44	40	33	55	50	36	27					44
MUL	50			50								
PAC												
WHT	66	37		67	53		45					
FRL	40	37	33	50	45	35	25					40

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	47%	54%	-7%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	60%	-14%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	55%	-27%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	51%	-4%

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.

3rd grade was the highest in reading for overall proficiency at 55%, 4th and 5th grade were 46% and 47% proficient. Math overall 3rd grade was 56%. 4th was 55%, 5th was 28%. ESE students were less proficient overall, with 3rd grade the highest amount at 43%, and 4-5 at 22% and 32% proficiency. Math was 36%, 29%, and 25% respectively. The ELL students were up overall 8% points (63 students). 3rd was at 17% proficiency and 4th at 8% proficiency. Math was higher at 34% and 25% proficiency. There is a gap between our overall proficiency and our subgroups. In science 47% of students were proficient.

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

The reading levels need to improve overall so that the majority of our students are proficient. Science also needs to improve (it is only assessed in 5th). The teaching of science through more hands-on learning experiences in order to make the content more meaningful to students and eliminate or correct misconceptions. We have made adjustments to make sure students are given those opportunities by opening more time in the science lab and communicating with teachers about the need to incorporate hands-on science into lessons. Teachers also need to communicate with students the critical content

that they need to know and understand in order to be successful in the SSA by the end of the year. Last, the students need to use the Study Island digital platform to practice science content.

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.

Our ESE students' results indicated a substantial gap. An increased focus on instruction aligned to grade-level standards and an increased focus on ESE students testing with fidelity are 2 areas of need that caused barriers in the previous year.

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

Students who are designated ELL made improvements in the area of ELA of 8% from the previous year. The implementation of the intervention Language for Learning program supported ELL students in gaining language skills which in turn resulted in gains. Increased fidelity to the MTSS process and intervention problem-solving were most likely a factor in the improvement. Those students were given explicit instruction in foundational areas. Also, an increased focus on Professional Development in effective ESOL instruction was a factor. Teachers were given several sessions with experts in that area, and the Leadership team walked classrooms to monitor the usage of ESOL scaffolds.

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

There are 46 students with 2 or more indicators. These students have scored Level 1 in Reading and/or Math and also have attendance concerns.

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

- Increased focus on math intervention to support math proficiency.
- Increased focus on science proficiency of 5th-grade students.
- Increase the sense of belonging of staff and students as measured by fostering a school culture based on respect, inclusion, and acceptance.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Increase sense of belonging of staff and students by fostering a school culture based on respect, inclusion, acceptance, and celebration.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5% increase from the previous year in the sense of belonging for staff and teachers on the Panorama survey. 10% increase in staff attendance and retention as compared to the previous year. 10% decrease in student discipline referrals as compared to the previous year.

Monitoring:

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

Outcomes will be monitored through staff, teacher, and student engagement at events at extra activities. Staff and teachers will be surveyed once each quarter until spring panorama. Attendance and discipline referrals will be reviewed and monitored monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Naughton (christina.naughton@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.)

PBIS for teachers, staff, and students. Ron Clark Academy House System

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data reviewed indicated a need for more celebration of success, for more positive behavior modification and reinforcers. Data also indicated a need for a school-wide sense of family with the opportunity to get together and connect with peers and coworkers across grade levels.

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.

Create a committee to address areas of concerns and to build a template for "The Black Bear Way". This template lays out expectations for all students and staff to create an environment that is positive, accepting, and conducive to high academic success. In addition to The Black Bear Way, implement opportunities for positivity and success to be recognized through Brownie Points, Black Bear of the Month, Staff Spotlight, Family Friday, Black Bear Bonus, and Black Bear spirit events/team building.

Person Responsible: Christina Naughton (christina.naughton@ocps.net)

By When: Fall 2023 and throughout the school year

Identify a group of 6 instructional staff to attend professional development at the Ron Clark Academy's House Mania and implement the house system to deepen our sense of community, belonging, celebration, and success. Provide "train the trainer" professional development for the remainder of the staff upon return.

Person Responsible: Christina Naughton (christina.naughton@ocps.net)

By When: Ron Clark PD- September 2023 PD for staff- October 2023 Implementation of House System- By October 2023

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

Based on a data review of 2022 and 2023 data, it was determined that an increase on critical content and hands-on instruction is essential to increase Science achievement data. A specific emphasis will focus on supporting ESE students in access to comprehensible Science content and hands-on opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Fifth-grade students will achieve an 18% increase (from 47% to 65%) in NGSSS proficiency scores in Science by May 2023 through an increased focus on critical content, hands-on instruction, and increased opportunities for practice and assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Science PMA data will be monitored for increases in student comprehension and achievement as well as growth from PMA 1 to PMA 2 to the summative PMA 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@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.)

The teaching of science through more hands-on learning experiences in order to make the content more meaningful to students and eliminate or correct misconceptions. We have made adjustments to make sure students are given those opportunities by opening more time in the science lab and communicating with teachers about the need to incorporate hands-on science into lessons. Teachers also need to communicate with students the critical content that they need to know and understand in order to be successful in the SSA by the end of the year. Last, the students need to use the Study Island digital platform to practice science content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hands-on instruction in conjunction with inquiry opportunities is essential to increase understanding of content.

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 additional professional development and support to Science teachers.

Person Responsible: Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly in PLC meetings

Increased teacher and student focus on critical content document for science instruction. Teachers will utilize the OCPS critical content notetaker to support student understanding of the science Big Ideas.

Person Responsible: Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

By When: Implement during each Big Idea per the Scope and Sequence. To be fully implemented by PMA 3.

Increase opportunities for hands-on science instruction and experiences for all 5th-grade students.

Person Responsible: Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

By When: Per each Big Idea by PMA 3

Implementation of technology practice opportunities focused on science content.

Person Responsible: Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

By When: Per each Big Idea by PMA

#3. 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.

Based on data review, increase math proficiency through intensive math intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in third through fifth grades will increase Math Proficiency by 12% (from 46% to 58% as evidenced by the Math FAST PM3) through intensive math intervention.

Monitoring:

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

Monitor Standards Based Unit Assessment summative assessment data and re-assessment data for increases in proficiency. Data will be reviewed after each unit assessment in each content area based on the district Scope and Sequence.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@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.)

Implementation of intervention framework 4 times per week using a direct instruction program- (Tier 3) Number Worlds in conjunction with Successmaker (Tiers 1 & 2).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math Intervention should consist of the following: Review, Direct Instruction, Engagement with new concepts, Practice opportunities, and a quick check. The selected intervention materials align with these components.

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.

Engage in conversations focused on student data (formative and summative).

Person Responsible: Patrick Rock (patrick.rock@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly data conversations with teachers, 3 times per year Data Chats with admin & monthly teacher-student data chats to set goals & assess progress toward goals.

Implement a framework for math intervention.

Person Responsible: Rebecca McDaid (rebecca.mcdaid@ocps.net)

By When: Introduce in August 2023- during PLCs Monitor implementation during regular CWTs

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)).

Title II Funds have been secured to support school improvement efforts. The school budget does not have funding available for school improvement.

Title II Funds are being utilized for travel to the Ron Clark Academy for professional development focused on building culture and community. This aligns with our first goal of "Increase the sense of belonging of staff and students by fostering a school culture based on respect, inclusion, acceptance, and celebration".

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

Instruction for K-2 will focus on developing early literacy skills with an increased emphasis on the following areas:

- Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
- Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
- Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

The use of DIBELS to assess student areas of need at the beginning of the year will provide an accurate accounting of student strengths and needs. Increased focus using Heggerty, SIPPS, Be a Reader resource, and Multisensory Kit will be used in small groups and during differentiated intervention blocks to ensure focused and direct instruction. EasyCBM will be used as a formative fluency assessment to assess student growth.

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

Instruction for 3-5 for enhance student skills during the early grades to strength skills in the following area:

- Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
- Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.
- Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text
 - Part 3A. Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
 - Part 3B. Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read

Focused, direct instruction will support learners in developing foundational literacy skills during intervention block using SIPPS and during before school tutoring. Additional tutoring will focusing on increasing comprehension skills through asking and answering questions relating to text. Formative assessments including SIPPS assessments and standards-based Exit Tickets and unit assessments will be used to monitor comprehension growth.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students in grade K-2 showing proficiency on the STAR Early Literacy Assessment will increase as follows by the end of the year:

- Kindergarten: 34% to 50%
- First Grade: 49% to 60%
- Second Grade: 53% to 65%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students in grades 3-5 demonstrating proficiency on the FAST assessment will increase as follows by the end of the year:

- Third Grade: 44% to 60%
- Fourth Grade: 53% to 65%
- Fifth Grade: 50% to 62%

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.

Monitoring instruction and growth will include:

- Weekly reading walkthroughs by coach and administrators
- 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

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McDaid, Rebecca , rebecca.mcdaid@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?

- SIPPS
- Be a Reader
- Heggerty
- OCPS Multisensory Kit
- Wonders Resources
- ExactPath Resources
- Daily CRM Resource

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These programs have been selected because they:

- Build students’ world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
- Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read
- Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text
- Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

Rationale for selection of each program:

- Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily CRM slides: *Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
- Use of the comprehension pieces of the optional daily CRM slides: *Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text
- Heggerty: * Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters
- SIPPS: *Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
- Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum: *Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words;
 - * Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; * Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; * Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text
- OCPS Multisensory Kits: *Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
- Exact Path: * Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters;
 - *Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; *Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; *Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; *Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text

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
Facilitate monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	McDaid, Rebecca , rebecca.mcdaid@ocps.net
Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, and professional development to fit area(s) of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Rock, Patrick, patrick.rock@ocps.net
Provide support and monitor participation in district Professional Development for Teachers focused on Literacy: Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings, K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.	Rock, Patrick, patrick.rock@ocps.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0991 - Clay Springs Elementary	Title II		\$10,000.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
Total:						\$10,000.00

Budget Approval

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

No