

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Sybelia Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Lake Sybelia Elementary

600 SANDSPUR RD, Maitland, FL 32751

<https://lakesybeliaes.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
Dobbs, John	Principal	Supports grade levels 3rd - 5th, PTA Board, School Advisory Council, Grade Level Team Leaders
Murray, Maria	Assistant Principal	Supports grade levels kindergarten - 2nd, Bus Riders, Lunchroom, and Paraprofessional Duties
Sheldon, Ann	Instructional Coach	Coaching of the classroom teachers in instructional practice
Noonan, Rachael	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing Coordinator, Curriculum Support, MTSS Coordinator, ESE Support

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.

We meet with team leaders from the grade teams monthly to discuss upcoming events challenges and concerns. We have representatives from Teachers and Classified staff on the School Advisory Council along with a majority of parents and a community leader. We utilize this process for input and development of the School Improvement Plan. We share ongoing data with this committee in an effort to inform our decision-making.

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))

We review progress toward the School Improvement Plan goals with the School Advisory Committee throughout the school year. This provides us the opportunity to make critical adjustments to the plan in an effort to meet these goals.

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	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	19	19	18	18	17	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	21	13	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	17	20	21	0	0	0	0	66	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	13	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	17	20	21	0	0	0	0	66	

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

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	29	30	33	26	27	0	0	0	148	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	10	33	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	11	31	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	7	7	4	5	0	0	0	23	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	29	30	33	26	27	0	0	0	148	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	10	33	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	11	31	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	7	7	4	5	0	0	0	23	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	57	53	49	56	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				49			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				17			36		
Math Achievement*	56	60	59	51	46	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				57			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29			43		
Science Achievement*	50	63	54	52	61	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	87	59	59	92			59		

* 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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
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	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	18	Yes	4	2
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	48			

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	21	Yes	3	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	55			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	41			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			56			50					87
SWD	20			26			22				4	
ELL	42			42							3	87
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			40			54				4	
HSP	48			63			40				5	88
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56			67			59				4	
FRL	35			42			38				5	92

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	49	49	17	51	57	29	52					92
SWD	26	22	10	25	31	16	17					
ELL	38	58		44	21							92
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	36	51	15	39	57	23	46					
HSP	57	53		53	58		55					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62	40		64	54		50					
FRL	43	42	20	43	54	37	50					

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	49	53	36	54	49	43	65					59
SWD	13	35		29	35		40					
ELL	40			50								59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	29		40	18		44					
HSP	39	40		46	53		71					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	74		73	68		75					
FRL	34	40	18	35	40	27	46					40

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	60%	8%	58%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	62%	5%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	51%	-3%

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 component with the lowest level was ELA. This was the first year teaching the new BEST standards, and students' first year exposure to these standards. The FAST Assessment was also a new method of testing for students. We also believe that our intervention materials may not have moved student progression at an effective pace.

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

The data did not show that any components declined from the prior year.

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.

The data component with the most significant gap was ELA at 3% below the state average. This was the first year teaching the new BEST standards, and students' first year exposure to these standards. The FAST Assessment was also a new method of testing for students. We also believe that our intervention materials may not have moved student progression adequately.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was Math. We provided targeted tutoring support during the school day for math. We also provided ongoing support for teachers during the planning of instruction from the Corrective Programs Math Resource Teacher.

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

Early reading skills are one of the greatest predictors of academic success. Within the Early Warning Systems, there are two areas of concern that are interrelated. These areas are students at level 1 on the statewide assessment and students with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

The highest priority for school improvement will be increasing students' ELA proficiency for all of our students including deficient ESSA sub-groups. We need to increase our Science proficiency which is closely tied to students' reading 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.

We have a consistent challenge in reaching ELA proficiency and making learning gains with our Students With Disabilities (SWD). These students make up the majority of our students in the bottom 25%, which has been our greatest challenge for student growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will target an increase in the group's (SWD) overall proficiency in this category of 10% on the middle of the year ELA FAST assessment and an additional 10% increase on the end of year ELA FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Students within the SWD sub-group will be monitored through Exact Path data and the FAST throughout the school year to track student progression toward proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Dobbs (john.dobbs@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.)

We will provide students within this targeted sub-group with increased levels of support using an ESE-certified interventionist and tutors to target grade level and deficient academic skills as well as focused support for reading comprehension during Tier I instruction paired with implementing the Exact Path program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the prior year, we had many students start the school year with large deficiencies in their reading ability. We believe that too much time was utilized remediating below-grade-level deficiencies in areas besides reading comprehension and as such impacted student outcomes on the FAST. We believe that a more balanced approach will benefit these 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.

We have added additional interventionist positions to support teachers during Tiered Reading Instruction to provide SWD and struggling students additional reading support.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

We have reduced the caseload of the Varying Exceptionalities Teacher in an effort to provide an increased level of support for the students remaining on her caseload.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

We have hired an Interventionist who can provide additional instructional support to our SWDs who are in the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) classrooms.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

We will provide classroom teachers with training and support with the implementation of the Being A Reader program in Kindergarten through Third Grade. We believe this group will benefit from the support of this new program

Person Responsible: Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

We will provide training and support for the implementation of the Exact Path program to provide targeted support for students in this group. This will include support for the use of offline resources and tracking student progress.

Person Responsible: Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

We will provide training and support for the implementation of the Exact Path program to provide targeted support for students in this group. This will include support for the use of offline resources and tracking student

Person Responsible: Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

Prior to last school year's testing, we did not reach the required percentage for our Black students. Since we have not received notification of our ESSA sub-group data from the FAST assessment we will target support for this group of students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the last ESSA proficiency level for this sub-group of 38%, we will target an increase in the percentage of students on the level to 52% proficiency on the end-of-year FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

We will target an increase in the group's (Black) overall proficiency in this category of 10% on the middle of the year ELA FAST assessment and an additional 10% increase on the end of year ELA FAST assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@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.)

We will provide students within this targeted sub-group with increased levels of support using the interventionists and tutors to target grade level and deficient academic skills as well as focused support for reading comprehension during Tier I and Tier II instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the prior year, we had many students start the school year with large deficiencies in their reading ability. We believe that too much time was utilized remediating below-grade-level deficiencies in areas besides reading comprehension and as such impacted student outcomes on the FAST. We will utilize SIPPS, Being A Reader, Exact Path, and Magnetic Reading to support this goal.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

We will provide students within this sub-group with ongoing ELA support from the interventionists and monitor their progress throughout the year using FAST data and Exact Path data.

Person Responsible: Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

We will provide After-school Tutoring for reading to support student growth for this group of students using Performance Coach materials.

Person Responsible: Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

We will target students for tutoring support during the school day to support gains for this group of students using CHIPS resources.

Person Responsible: Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

We will provide classroom teachers with training and support with the implementation of the Being A Reader program in Kindergarten through Third Grade. We believe this group will benefit from the support of this new program

Person Responsible: Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

#3. 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.

Based on the most recent Panorama Survey of our Classified staff indicated that they wanted more feedback and coaching.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Panorama Survey of Classified Staff showed that the area of coaching and feedback was the lowest of any area on the survey at 28%, We will increase this percentage by 21% to a level of 49% on the final survey for the year.

Monitoring:

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

We will conduct a Panorama survey with classified staff at the beginning of the year survey and the end of the year survey to receive feedback regarding our efforts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Dobbs (john.dobbs@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.)

We will conduct Roundtable Discussions with classified staff.

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/who-benefits-from-roundtable-discussions-everyone-linda-sherman/>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is a common practice within our district to gather stakeholder input on important topics.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

We will conduct the initial classified staff Panorama survey to establish baseline data for the current school year.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: November 30, 2023

We will conduct a roundtable discussion with classified staff to determine the best methods for providing feedback and coaching.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: November 30, 2023

We will implement an action plan developed with classified staff on targeted methods of feedback and coaching methods.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: December 30, 2023

We will conduct an end-of-year Classified Staff Survey to determine outcomes of achieving targeted outcomes.

Person Responsible: John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

By When: May 30 2024

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).

We have two major groups in which we are focusing our efforts to improve student proficiency. The sub-groups being addressed are the Students With Disabilities and Black Students. We have allocated funding and personnel to support tutoring for these groups during the school day and after school. We are pushing interventionists into classrooms during core instruction to support struggling students. Two of these interventionists have an ESE background to support the needs of this sub-group. We have structures built into the school day to support student well-being such as class meetings which are supported by our Guidance Counselor and the District Mental Health Counselor.

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

The percentage of first-grade students at Lake Sybelia Elementary was below 50% based on the FAST results. We believe that a contributing factor was the intervention strategies used last year to support struggling students did not provide enough support for basic reading foundations. We are shifting our strategy to include Being a Reader/SIPPS to support students' need for this support.

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

The percentage of Third and Fourth Grade students at Lake Sybelia Elementary was below 50% based on the FAST results. We believe that a contributing factor was the intervention strategies used last year to support struggling students did not provide enough support for basic reading foundations. We are shifting our strategy to include Being a Reader/SIPPS to support students' need for this support.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students that are on-level in reading in first grade will be above 50% based on the EOY results on the FAST Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students that are on-level in reading in the Third and Fourth Grade will be above 50% based on the EOY results of the FAST Assessment.

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.

We will utilize the results from the FAST Assessment to monitor students' progress within the targeted grade levels to determine progress and any need to adjust our efforts throughout the year. We will also review Classroom Walkthrough Data during small group instruction to determine instructional support or changes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dobbs, John, john.dobbs@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The chart at this link identifies the ESSA evidence level for Being a Reader and SIPPS is a level 2 Moderate Evidence: <https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/evidence-base/research-being-a-reader/>

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?

Being a Reader/SIPPS program are scientifically researched Reading Intervention program. These materials will support students' understanding of basic reading strategies that will move them closer to grade-level reading ability.

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
The first step will be to provide teachers with training in utilizing the Being a Reader/ SIPPS material within district training and grade-level PLCs.	Sheldon, Ann, ann.sheldon@ocps.net
We will utilize data from the assessment to determine placement of students into the Being a Reader or SIPPS programs.	Noonan, Rachael, rachael.noonan@ocps.net
We will monitor students' progress using the FAST assessment and adjust students' support based on the data from the assessment.	Murray, Maria, maria.murray@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes