

Orange County Public Schools

Bay Meadows 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Bay Meadows Elementary

9150 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32836

<https://baymeadowses.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
Dorries, Joann	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sets the vision, mission and expectations for the school as aligned with the district objectives. * Manages all operations and functions of the school consistent with district goals. * Develops and administers policies that provide a safe and effective learning environment. * Is visible in the school community and recognized as the educational leader. * Promotes, maintains, and monitors student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership * Uses a variety of problem-solving techniques and decision making skills to resolve problems. * Communicates and interacts effectively with all stakeholders in the community. * Provides effective actionable feedback that promotes teacher growth and expertise, and facilitates discussions focused on progress monitoring data.
Benveniste, Christine	Behavior Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Support Behavior Management Implementation(plans, interventions, tracking). * Create Behavior Intervention Plans for T2, T3. * Track and monitor BIP. * Restraint Reporting (P). * Support and coordinator PBIS (School store / Incentives). * Transportation Liaison (A). * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.
Hinton, Tami	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * As delegated by the principal, manages the daily operations and functions of the school consistent with district policy and district priorities. * Administers policies that provide a safe and effective learning environment. * Communicates the school's vision, mission, and priorities to the community * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals. * Communicates and interacts effectively with all stakeholders in the community. * Assists the principal to develop and facilitate school initiatives, monitor student achievement and instructional delivery of the standards. * Provides effective actionable feedback that promotes teacher growth and expertise, and facilitates discussions focused on progress monitoring data.
Fillenwarth, Mandy	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Monitors implementation of standards-based instruction. * Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and meets individually with teachers supporting lesson planning.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provides coaching cycles and support for teachers with a focus on math/science and STEAM integration. * Coaches teachers in instructional practices that facilitate instructional shifts. * Supports the MTSS process and interventions. * Serves as magnet coordinator and STEAM coordinator. * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.
Fiffick, Jessie	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Monitors implementation of standards-based instruction. * Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and meets individually with teachers supporting lesson planning. * Provides coaching cycles and support for teachers with a focus on ELA * Coaches teachers in instructional practices that facilitate instructional shifts. * Facilitates the MTSS process and interventions as the MTSS Coach. * Serves as test coordinator and professional development lead. * Serves as SAC Co-chair * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.
Gifford, Julie	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provides access to reading and research material through the media center. * Supports technology and textbook resources for the school. * Supports the implementation of digital learning. * Provides standards-based media lessons for K-5 students. * Communicates with all stakeholders maintaining the school website and student body Canvas course. * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.
Walls, Chrain	Staffing Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Schedules meetings for the IEP team members to convene and discuss students. * Oversees compliance with initial placements, annual reviews, and reevaluations of students receiving ESE & 504 services. * Works with teachers and families to best meet students' needs. * Coordinates screenings, initial placements, annual reviews, and reevaluations for students receiving gifted education services. * Serves as LEA designee in ESE meetings * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.
Dobson, Barbara	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * School Secretary / Bookkeeper * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Greenholt, Sharon	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Facilitates individual and group counseling. * Supports classroom guidance needs and provides instruction for Child Safety Matters lessons K-5 * Serves as McKinney-Vento program coordinator. * Supports MTSS process related to behavior interventions. * Supports attendance and truancy monitoring. * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.
French, Kelly	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Monitors implementation of standards-based instruction. * Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and meets individually with teachers supporting lesson planning. * Provides coaching cycles and support for beginning teachers * Coaches teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts * Supports the MTSS process and interventions. * Serves as test coordinator, ESOL Compliance Specialist, and Textbook Manager * Serves as Professional Development Lead teacher and supports beginning teacher induction program at the site with monthly meetings for beginning teachers and mentors. * Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and implementation of goals.

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 SIP begins with the principal developing the plan. Input is gathered from the school leadership team. The draft is then shared with team leaders and the SAC council for review, input, and updates prior to being finalized.

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 and goals are the focus during leadership meetings and SAC meetings. The goals are reviewed at the beginning of each meeting. The SAC agenda includes Principal Update. During Principal Update, staffing needs, budget, student progress through the curriculum, and progress monitoring are shared at each meeting. PLCs (Professional Learning communities) meet weekly by grade level area. Each PLC has created a focused calendar for meeting discussions following common assessments and uses a common PLC agenda template to record minutes. Student data will be reviewed as a PLC and plans will be adjusted accordingly. Data chats with teachers/administrators and teachers/students are scheduled

following BOY and MOY progress monitoring. PLCs and the leadership team track the progress of individual students and subgroups for all curriculum areas.

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	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	19	15	19	12	16	0	0	0	81	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	18	16	11	0	0	0	0	54	
	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	4	5	5	11	10	0	0	0	35

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	4	36	26	23	22	32	0	0	0	143	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	24	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	16	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	6	24	0	0	0	31	

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	5	16	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	4	36	26	23	22	32	0	0	0	143	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	24	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	16	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	6	24	0	0	0	31	

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	5	16	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	77	57	53	72	56	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				65			78		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			59		
Math Achievement*	75	60	59	76	46	50	67		
Math Learning Gains				73			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			36		
Science Achievement*	74	63	54	71	61	59	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	54			65		

** 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	54			
HSP	67			
MUL	94			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	65			

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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	60			
HSP	53			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	54			

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	77			75			74					64
SWD	18			18			11				3	
ELL	55			65			62				4	64
AMI												
ASN	92			94			95				4	
BLK	63			52			47				3	
HSP	67			66			56				5	65
MUL	100			88							2	
PAC												
WHT	78			79			82				4	
FRL	65			60			56				5	63

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	72	65	41	76	73	44	71					54
SWD	33	33	27	27	33	25						
ELL	53	59	37	63	69	38	60					54
AMI												
ASN	86	77		90	83		79					
BLK	63	56		56	65							
HSP	59	56	29	66	65	32	61					56
MUL	71			79								
PAC												
WHT	81	69	62	84	77	73	86					
FRL	65	55	32	62	60	42	62					56

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	73	78	59	67	62	36	77					65
SWD	8			22								
ELL	48	56		53	69		50					65
AMI												
ASN	84	78		84	78		81					
BLK	57			33								
HSP	64	73		58	68		64					61
MUL	67			53								
PAC												
WHT	80	80		74	63		91					
FRL	60	77	58	52	48	23	66					52

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	71%	54%	17%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	60%	16%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	82%	52%	30%	50%	32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	59%	15%	51%	23%

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.

Bay Meadows end-of-year (EOY) FAST Data showed growth in ELA (3%), Mathematics (1%), and Science (3%) as compared with the previous year's FSA outcomes for students in grades 3-5. The lowest overall achievement area was in science and the lowest growth area was mathematics. School year 22-23, 5th-grade iReady progress monitoring for mathematics also had the least gain as compared with all other grades. A contributing factor may be the larger number of students in the grade level identified as SWD receiving pull-out resource services. Students with disabilities have an achievement gap in ELA, mathematics, and science as compared with their peer group.

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

All areas assessed through state-wide FAST measures showed an increase on end-of-year outcome assessments. Progress monitoring data from iReady had the least growth from the beginning of the year to the end of the year in 4th-grade ELA (17% growth) and 5th-grade mathematics (33%). Testing fatigue in May may contribute to the gap in growth as compared with other grade levels. SWD showed an increase in all areas, however, continues to have gaps in achievement as compared with a peer group. The instructional resource pull-out model may not be sufficient to support students with standards-based

grade-level content. A combination of resource class instruction along with a support facilitation model is needed to provide a range of services.

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.

Bay Meadows ES outperformed district and state averages for all three assessment areas in ELA, Math, and Science for grades 3-5th as measured by FLDOE. Vertical planning between grade level teams contributes to consistency with STEAM integration and project-based learning used throughout the school.

The percent above the state average for each grade level is listed below:

ELA - 3rd (32%), 4th (16%), 5th (17%)

Math - 3rd (23%), 4th (20%), 5th (13%)

Science - 5th (17%)

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

ELA and 5th grade science increased by 3% from the previous year. An increase in data analysis through PLCs and data chats along with classroom walk-through observations with actionable feedback contributed to the focus of standards-based instruction. In addition, vertical alignment and school-wide thematic STEAM planning helped to develop consistency and focus across the school.

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

Based upon the EWS, Bay Meadows has 11 students in each 4th and 5th grades scoring a level 1 on the ELA FAST assessment. Additionally, students identified with reading deficiencies for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade will need to have targeted intervention and monitoring to close achievement gaps.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ELA learning gains
3. Math proficiency
4. Math learning gains
5. Science proficiency

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities continue to have an achievement gaps as compared with their peer group. The subgroup deficient has decreased but has not achieved minimal targets toward proficiency in three years.

2017-2018 - 7%

2018-2019 - 14%

2019-2020 - NT

2020-2021 - 14%

2021-2022 - 30%

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will increase proficiency in ELA to meet the federal index of 41%. We will increase the percentage of SWD students scoring proficient or above by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Common Formative Assessments, end-of-unit assessments, and progress monitoring assessment data will be reviewed a minimum of twice monthly to determine student needs and identify additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joann Dorries (joann.dorries@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 MTSS model is used to identify levels of support for all students. During Tier 2 intervention, a walk-to-intervention model will be utilized. Students will be placed into SIPPS reading intervention based on placement testing. Programmatic measures will be used to monitor progress after every 10 lessons. We will restructure supports for SWD to include resource classroom instruction along with support with grade-level standards through the support facilitation model. Tier 3 support will be provided by leadership team members allowing classroom teachers to focus on Tier 2 support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPS(Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) is a research-based foundational skills program proven to help both new and struggling readers in grades K–12, including English learners and students identified with dyslexia. The program provides a structured-literacy approach to instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling sounds, and sight words.

When used as Tier 2 and Tier 3, SIPPS accelerates progress so that students can efficiently close the gap and engage in grade-level reading. SIPPS aligns with the MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Support) framework and can be used across all three tiers of instruction. SIPPS will be used for Tier 2 intervention and intervention resources from the Wonders curriculum will be used for Tier 3 instruction.

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.

Identify students for diagnostic assessment and conduct SIPPS placement testing.

Person Responsible: Jessie Fiffick (105503@ocps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

Continuously review multiple measures of data to determine students' needs for instruction and monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Jessie Fiffick (105503@ocps.net)

By When: Every six weeks; on-going throughout the year.

Data Chats will be conducted following the beginning of the year progress monitoring with teachers, MTSS coach, and administration to analyze student performance, determine needs for instruction and adjust intervention groups. Data chats will be conducted at least three times during the year following progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Joann Dorries (joann.dorries@ocps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

Create master schedule to provide both resource room service through the ESE teacher and support facilitation provided by the ESE teacher during Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Joann Dorries (joann.dorries@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023; monitor on-going

#2. 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.

We will continue to work on strengthening our culture and environment specifically relating to Resilience instruction at our school with adults and students. During the 2022-2023 year, nineteen bullying investigations were conducted, with two substantiated incidents; and twenty-six behavior incidents classified as threat to others were investigated with either no threat or transient threat.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, the percentage of behavior incidents related to bullying/harassment will decrease to ten or less investigations/reports; and incidents classified as threats to others will be reduced to ten or less.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the number of bullying and harassment discipline referrals that are completed at school as well as the number of threat to others discipline referrals that are written. As students learn strategies and understand the impact they have on the feelings of others, the number of bullying or harassment and threat referrals will be reduced.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami Hinton (tami.hinton@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 behavior intervention systems will be used school-wide to support Tier 1 practices and systems to establish a foundation of regular, proactive support while preventing unwanted behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Center on Positive Behavior Intervention Supports recommend schools continue to prioritize Tier 1 supports that are inclusive, robust, and supportive of all students, including students with disabilities. The discipline committee met to revise the school-wide discipline plan to focus on Positive behavior supports which will be implemented in each classroom and supported by school-wide incentives.

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.

Develop a school-wide discipline plan with a common language. Develop a Discipline handbook with resources for staff. Create a Google Drive Shared folder for shared access. Train staff for implementation of "Give Me Five" schoolwide plan and expectations.

Person Responsible: Tami Hinton (tami.hinton@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Conduct school-wide assemblies to introduce staff, schoolwide procedures, and expectations. Give Me Five (Be Kind, Be Responsible, Be Respectful, Be Safe, Be Your Best) will be taught to all students during grade-level assemblies. Reteach as needed in small groups or individually.

Person Responsible: Tami Hinton (tami.hinton@ocps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Implement school-wide recognitions (Koala of the Week, Anchor Award, Koala Store)

Person Responsible: Christine Benveniste (christine.benveniste@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly recognition for Student of the Week by leadership team; quarterly recognitions and school store.

Implement a Child Safety Matters lesson for each grade. A "Trusted Adult Program" will be created for students to identify a staff member as a point of contact.

Person Responsible: Sharon Greenholt (sharon.greenholt@ocps.net)

By When: By May 2024 all K-5 grade classes will have completed grade level appropriate lessons in Child Safety Matters and key staff will be identified to support the Trusted Adult Program.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Advisory Council meets monthly school goals and updates them as agenda items. Progress monitoring data is shared with the SAC along with progress toward annual goals. Team leaders meet monthly with the leadership team to review the school's systems, data, and needs. Feedback from both groups is used to make adjustments as needed with action steps to achieve the goals.