

Orange County Public Schools

# Waterford Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>22</b>

## Waterford Elementary

12950 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://waterfordes.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 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
Arbelaez-Willis, Danielle	Principal	Curriculum Leader, Instructional Support , All areas, Coaching, Evaluating, Lesson Plans, PLCs, Grades/ monitoring, Report Cards, Progress Reports, iObservation, Professional Learning, Bottom 25% monitoring,SELL, SAC, PTO Point Person, Budget, Staff Report, Threat Assessments
Pope, Karen	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Leader, Instructional Support , All areas, Coaching, Evaluating, Lesson Plans, PLCs, Grades/ monitoring, Report Cards, Progress Reports, iObservation, Professional Learning, Bottom 25% monitoring,SELL, SAC, PTO Point Person, Budget, Staff Report, Threat Assessments
Ebert-Jones, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum support, Science support, Science fair, Testing Coordinator (FSA, iReady), iReady Lead , PD Points, School Calendar, Staff & Parent Newsletter, PLC, Staff Development coordinator, Certification, Portfolios, Interns, Field trips, Fundraisers, Teach-In, Tutoring Coordinator, Skyward Cap, School, Committees, Quarterly & EOY Awards, Interventions
Farrow, Deadra	Other	Literacy Committee Lead, Battle of the Books, Literacy Night, Book Fair, Accelerated Reader Lead, DCTL Lead, 5 Star Chair, Fixed Assets/Property manager, Textbooks, Media Center Schedule, Media Center lessons, Spelling Bee Liaison, Intervention
Carey, Aimee	Other	MTSS Coach, Curriculum support, Science support, Science fair, STEM night Committee lead, PD Points, School Calendar, Certification, Portfolios, School Committees, Interventions
Anderson, Amber	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, PLC, Coaching Teachers, Curriculum support, Science fair, STEM night, Literacy Night , School Committees, Interventions
Soto Rosario, Jeannette	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist, Facilitates ESE meetings, ELL support, Facilitates ELL meetings, 504 Coordinator, Facilitates 504 Meetings
Wise, Michael	School Counselor	SELL Lead, Threat Assessments, Small group social skills support, Child Safety Matters, Health curriculum, Red Ribbon week, Character Ed Program, Character Trait Celebration, Homeless McKinney Vento Coordinator, News Crew, Pantry, Interventions

**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.

During preplanning our EOY assessment scores are reviewed for all grade levels. The school grade is also projected. Goals for the new year are determined based upon our data, school wide, with input from our staff. Our School Advisory Council during our first meeting in August will be informed of our school grade and assessment scores in Reading, Math and Science. Input from SAC is solicited and taken into consideration when finalizing the SIP goals for the school year.

**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))

Our SIP goals are monitored at MOY when the FAST diagnostic assessment is administered and also at the EOY when the final diagnostic assessment is administered. Leadership team along with classroom teachers determine if students are making adequate progress and determine next steps for students who are not making adequate progress. At mid-year review, once MOY assessment data is compiled, the leadership team will revisit our SIP goals and determine if we are on the trajectory of making adequate progress in every grade level for the year, or if we need to change something in order to make adequate progress.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	75%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	76%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	6	20	18	12	15	19	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	22	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	26	25	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	44	

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	8	4	3	20	20	0	0	0	55

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	6	3	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	31	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	22	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	15	30	0	0	0	64	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	6	7	10	15	22	0	0	0	68	

**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	6	3	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	31

**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	3	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	6	3	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	31	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	22	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	15	30	0	0	0	64	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	6	7	10	15	22	0	0	0	68	

**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	6	3	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	31

**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	3	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*	62	57	53	68	56	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				63			81		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			71		
Math Achievement*	63	60	59	65	46	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				68			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			69		
Science Achievement*	70	63	54	62	61	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	49			76		

\* 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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
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	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	57			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	77			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	51			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	47			
HSP	55			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	50			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	62			63			70					48
SWD	17			19			0				5	45
ELL	47			53			50				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			40			60				3	
HSP	57			60			65				5	45
MUL	80			70							2	

## 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	75			77			81				4	
FRL	48			52			52				5	48

## 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	68	63	39	65	68	57	62					49
SWD	3	32	33	23	61	53						29
ELL	59	57	33	59	61	42	54					49
AMI												
ASN	55			82								
BLK	57	63	40	31	50	67	20					
HSP	64	61	38	61	62	52	56					44
MUL	67			83								
PAC												
WHT	81	70		80	79		88					
FRL	53	56	34	51	63	61	50					30

## 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	71	81	71	73	70	69	71					76
SWD	8			12								57
ELL	63	75		66	75	70	65					76
AMI												
ASN	75			100								
BLK	56	80		54	50		64					
HSP	72	78	83	70	76	74	70					73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	85		80	65		71					
FRL	61	80	80	64	67	74	65					76

**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	64%	54%	10%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	51%	16%

### III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA, 64%. Waterford Elementary is still experiencing the negative impact of Covid, as many of our intermediate students are missing foundational skills that should have been acquired during their primary years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was ELA, declining by 4% compared to 2021-2022 performance. Waterford Elementary is still experiencing the negative impact of Covid, as

many of our intermediate students are missing foundational skills that should have been acquired during their primary years.

**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.**

Waterford Elementary performed well above the state average in every category.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year was science resulting in an increase of 11% from 60% to 71% proficiency. During 22-23 school year, our 5th grade teachers focused on science vocabulary and had all 5th grade students complete a science project during the first semester rather than the second semester.

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

Reading deficiency is an area of concern.

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

Increase overall reading proficiency.  
Increase reading proficiency for SWD.

#### **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.

Create a positive school culture and environment for our teachers and staff so they perform to the best of their ability, daily.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Based upon Panorama teacher and staff survey data school leadership was 93% favorable; school climate was 92% favorable; feedback and coaching was 79% favorable and resources were 62% favorable. For 23-24, our intended outcome is to increase the feedback and coaching category to 84% favorable.

**Monitoring:**

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

When teachers receive a classroom walkthrough from a CORE team member (Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach, MTSS coach or CRT), teachers are to seek out the observer to receive feedback in person. This will help ensure strategies are celebrated in person and areas of concern are shared and the teacher fully understands the feedback that is given. Teachers will be given an opportunity to ask follow-up questions, request for coaching support, etc.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@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.)

Create a survey during the first semester to check in with teachers to determine if the feedback they are receiving is valuable.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If teachers feel that the feedback they are given is valuable, they will actually implement the strategies and ideas that are being shared with their students.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and provided actionable feedback as well as Tier 3 teachers provided support through the Coaching cycle.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@ocps.net)

**By When:** January 31, 2024

## #2. 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.

Improve ELA progress/learning gains of our ESE students (SWD).

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on 21-22 FSA data, the learning gains for ESE students (SWD) was 33%. For 22-23, there was no ELA learning gain category for the FAST assessment. For 23-24, our intended outcome is to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to at least 41%.

### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through individual data meetings and during PLC meetings when common assessment data/diagnostic data are reviewed.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@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.)

1. Revamp system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes in PLC meetings.
2. Through PLC collaboration, teachers will make content, skills and concepts explicit by showing and telling students what to do or think while solving problems, enacting strategies, completing tasks and classifying concepts.
3. Build our culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) through ESE PLC meetings to increase student success.
4. Increase data driven conversations between the ESE teacher, the staffing specialist, and MTSS coach to increase student success.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Teachers need to study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making.
2. Teachers need to increase their systematic use of explicit instruction.
3. ESE teachers develop instructional goals, they evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students' instructional programs based on student data.
4. Increased conversations amongst stakeholders for SWD / B25 which will lead to better goal making for individual students.

### 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.

1. Continue to use Reading strategies during ELA instruction.
2. Monitor progress on common assessments in PLCs and individual data meetings.
3. Professional Development on MTSS strategies including reteaching content that students weren't proficient on.
4. Monitor trends in common assessments and discussion on reteaching action plan in PLCs.
5. Weekly Reading tutoring for identified students.
6. Teachers will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and provided actionable feedback as well as Tier 3 teachers provided support through the coaching cycle.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year.

**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).

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed by our school's budget committee comprised of staff members from every grade level and department as well as the School Advisory Council (SAC) comprised of members of the community. Both our budget committee and SAC assist in identifying fund allocations and ensuring we are supporting our area of focus.

Student data is the primary source to determine where the funds will be used. Funds have gone to instructional positions and instructional materials in the past.

**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**

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

**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****Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

**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?

**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****Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

NA

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

NA

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

NA

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

NA

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

NA

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

NA

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

NA

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

NA

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

NA

## 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	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

### Budget Approval

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

Yes