

Orange County Public Schools

Windy Ridge K 8 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Windy Ridge K 8

3900 BEECH TREE DR, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://windyridgek8.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 to 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
Chunoo, Karena	Principal	Windy Ridge K-8 is an International School of Innovation. As the leader of an International School of Innovation, the principal is responsible for setting the vision and leading the work of the four pillars of excellence; Language, Arts, STEM, and Citizenship. In addition, supporting the professional learning community model with on-going, data-driven collaboration focused on project based learning structures and standard based outcomes is paramount. For the principal, closing the achievement gap between our English Language Learners continues to be a high priority this year. Additionally, as a leader in the community she is the representative of the school in establishing and maintaining community based partners.
Herrera, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Herrera provides various resources to the staff and parents. She analyzes data with teachers and guides them in providing data-based instruction. She collaborates with the instructional coaches to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She participates in common planning to ensure that lessons coincide with state standards. She helps create the master schedule that complies with district and state mandates. She assists the principal in hiring, supervising, and evaluating faculty and staff members.
Lemieux, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Lemieux provides various resources to the staff and parents. She analyzes data with teachers and guides them in providing data-based instruction. She collaborates with the instructional coaches to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She participates in common planning to ensure that lessons coincide with state standards. She helps create the master schedule that complies with district and state mandates. She assists the principal in hiring, supervising, and evaluating faculty and staff members.
Velez, Juvi	Math Coach	Ms. Velez provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction in reading. She provides guidance on all math curriculum and intervention programs. She supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. She works with teachers to implement Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Additionally, she oversees and participates in common planning and helps create formative assessments.
MacElhiney, Siobhan	Other	Ms. MacElhiney designs, executes and assesses individualized programs based on the needs of our students. She works with the Math and Reading Coaches to ensure interventions are provided to support areas of weaknesses in all grade levels. Ms. MacElhiney leads our tutors as they work together with students to close learning gaps.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ly, Refman	Dean	Mr. Ly provides an educational atmosphere which promotes student learning, student achievement, and student discipline. He also implements School Board policies designed to maintain proper student discipline.

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 improvement goals were initially designed by the school leadership team. Feedback from all stakeholder groups including families and students were considered when creating goals. Subsequently they were presented to staffulty and the Student Government Association for feedback and presented to the SAC for final approval.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored quarterly by the leadership team, and the school advisory council.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	2	23	27	32	22	30	27	14	12	189	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	5	1	2	1	4	18	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	35	40	34	24	21	159	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	24	33	28	14	5	109	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	22	34	27	35	0	0	0	0	118	
	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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	10	14	36	33	19	11	9	139

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	3	27	23	31	26	33	15	12	20	190	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	9	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	5	4	2	0	1	19	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	36	31	22	21	3	115	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	20	23	17	6	92	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	26	17	16	17	6	83

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	3	27	23	31	26	33	15	12	20	190	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	9	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	5	4	2	0	1	19	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	36	31	22	21	3	115	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	20	23	17	6	92	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	26	17	16	17	6	83

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*	63	56	53	69	57	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				64			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63			64		
Math Achievement*	72	59	55	76	41	42	71		
Math Learning Gains				73			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			44		
Science Achievement*	69	56	52	76	57	54	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	68	68	93	63	59	80		
Middle School Acceleration	71	74	70	85	52	51	82		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	71	55	55	55	73	70	68		

** 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	720
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	65			
HSP	62			
MUL	71			
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	78			
FRL	64			

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	43			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	64			
HSP	68			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	68			

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	63			72			69	80	71			71
SWD	11			36			17				5	58
ELL	53			68			60	56	53		7	71
AMI												
ASN	76			90			87	93	100		7	74
BLK	53			53			56	100	60		6	
HSP	53			67			61	59	65		7	72

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	53			88							2	
PAC												
WHT	78			81			82	96	67		7	71
FRL	56			66			59	78	62		7	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	69	64	63	76	73	66	76	93	85			55
SWD	25	44	53	37	50	52	38					44
ELL	55	64	62	67	67	60	63	97	72			55
AMI												
ASN	83	81		90	81		86		94			69
BLK	58	73	69	55	67	68	61					
HSP	63	58	62	71	69	65	69	95	77			54
MUL	50			79								
PAC												
WHT	77	63	69	85	76	67	86	88	93			55
FRL	64	63	70	67	69	60	73	96	66			54

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	72	70	64	71	47	44	66	80	82			68
SWD	33	52	36	34	41	29	27					50
ELL	59	74	71	62	48	48	48	59	72			68
AMI												
ASN	87	76		82	54		84	75	86			
BLK	58	58		54	35	27	57		53			
HSP	67	72	68	67	47	46	55	74	80			67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	67	60	80	50	47	79	90	91			68

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	62	62	53	64	46	44	53	71	81			61

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	54%	54%	0%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	45%	10%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	46%	27%	47%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	64%	44%	20%	47%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
07	2023 - Spring	89%	38%	51%	48%	41%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	61%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	55%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	81%	50%	31%	44%	37%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	51%	8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	47%	17%	50%	14%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	45%	48%	48%	45%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	66%	13%

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.

We saw a substantial increase in students who had a Level 1 (159 students) performance in ELA compared to the previous year (115 students) in grades 3-8. We are still addressing learning loss from the pandemic and a systematic approach to support students with disabilities.

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

The year prior we had 89 students who had two or more early warning indicators. Currently we have 139 students that have two or more early warning indicators.

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.

We see a gap when comparing the state reading average to the school reading average. We can attest some of the factors would include the support of four Tier I Intervention teachers, additional tutoring supported by ESSER funding and additional teacher planning opportunities to focus on reading support.

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

Overall we had fewer students show course failures in both ELA and Math. This can be attributed to the support of Tier I Interventionists, additional tutoring and additional teacher planning opportunities.

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

The two areas of concern would be the growing number of students who are performing at a Level 1 of progress in both English Language Arts and Math.

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

The highest priorities would be ensuring that fewer students perform at a Level 1 in both ELA and Math and to continue the downward trend on students who show course failures in ELA and Math. Reducing these will help to reduce the number of students who have two or more early warning indicators.

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.

From the data reviewed, there were declines or static results in School Climate results on the 2023 Panorama Survey.

Measurable Outcome:

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

After reviewing the Panorama Survey data, the goal will be to increase each School Climate satisfaction rating by 10% by the spring administration.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor progress throughout the year, we will administer short survey questions to track the school climate among the four target populations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Herrera (jacqueline.herrera@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.)

Intentional focus on building school culture through strengthening our PLC and building upon the school community for the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were designed to build upon previous structures that were previously in place.

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.

Building and supporting a strong Professional Learning Community.

Person Responsible: Karena Chunoo (patricia.lachance@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing with efforts happening daily through the work of the collective and professional commitments.

Monitoring the culture of the staffulty and students quarterly.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Herrera (jacqueline.herrera@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly short surveys to monitor the growth or decline of the school culture.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

After reviewing the Early Warning Indicators, a significant number of students scored a level 1 in ELA (159) and Level 1 in Math (109).

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to reduce the number of students receiving a Level 1 on ELA (159) and Math (109) by 20% on the Spring Progress Monitoring Assessment. Therefore ELA will be reduced to no more than 127 students and math no more than 87 students scoring a Level 1 on the spring PMA.

Monitoring:

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

These data will be monitored throughout the year on the Standards Based Unit Assessment and the Fall and Winter PMA scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Lemieux (jacqueline.lemieux@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.)

In order to address the number of students receiving a Level 1 score, the Instructional Leadership team must work with collaborative teams to plan for the needs of every student. They will also have to supportive with monitoring student data, and responding to that data. Teachers will plan for small group instruction and teach the foundations of reading in K-2.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing these strategies it will ensure that every student has the opportunity to receive a high quality education based on their individual needs.

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.

Collaboration used for planning essential skills.

Person Responsible: Juvi Velez (juvidalex.velezdavila@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing every week until the final PMA.

Monitoring of Formative and Summative assessments to provide dedicated time to re-teach and reassess.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Lemieux (jacqueline.lemieux@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing until the final PMA.

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: Professional Learning Communities				\$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			1061 - Windy Ridge K 8	General Fund		\$7,000.00
			<i>Notes: Training in Professional Learning Community for teacher leaders.</i>			
Total:						\$7,000.00

Budget Approval

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

No