

Orange County Public Schools

Windermere 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Windermere Elementary

11125 PARK AVE, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://windermerees.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
Bittick, Janet	Principal	<p>The principal, Ms. Bittick, serves as the instructional leader and sets the vision, mission, and expectations for the school; providing teachers with a common vision based upon data-based decisions by promoting standards-based instruction to maximize student achievement. Ms. Bittick supervises instruction and accelerates the learning momentum by setting high expectations for the use and success of the MTSS process.</p> <p>She provides ongoing support to staff and students and is an advocate for our school. Ms. Bittick oversees high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and works to motivate and encourage staff, parents, and students to work collaboratively to achieve academic excellence Ms. Bittick's daily primary goal is to create a safe and positive learning environment that leads all students to success.</p>
Williams, Sharon	Assistant Principal	<p>Dr. Sharon Williams is the assistant principal and works as an instructional leader while ensuring that the operational functions of the school are at the highest level at all times to guarantee that students have the best learning environment possible. She assists in supporting and evaluating teachers using the OCPS Instructional Framework; and assists in the assessment process and the ELL program. Dr. Williams provides support to teachers and students to effectively minimize behavior disruptions to help create a safe environment for all students.</p>
Fonseca, Carissa	Staffing Specialist	<p>As the Staffing Specialist, Mrs. Fonseca, coordinates all ESE, FTE, Federal and State Compliance Reports activities and meetings. She coordinates the development and review of IEPs, 504s, EPs, re-evaluations, initial placements, dismissals, and other ESE service meetings. Additional duties include: Facilitates and supports data collection activities, assists in data analysis, Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP, Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success.</p>
Salvati, Susan	Behavior Specialist	<p>Ms. Salvati is responsible for providing behavior support on campus. Member of the Threat Assessment Team. Supports the school-wide behavior plan and expectations. Provides social skills for ESE students and helps teachers with de-escalation and calming down techniques to support the classroom environment.</p>

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.

Windermere Elementary has a very rich culture of community support and engagement. Through the School Advisory Council (SAC), Windermere staff works closely with staff, parents, and community members to ensure that the stakeholders have a strong voice in the development of school procedures

and the School Improvement Plan. The School Improvement Plan's purpose is to convey to the community along with the most recent data from state and local assessments that were done in the Spring of 2023. The school leadership team then works with the SAC stakeholders to identify the areas of focus for refinement and growth. Goals for the 2023-2024 school years are established along with activities and identified barriers that may impede improvement. Plans are put in place to overcome any barriers and to ensure all subgroups are highlighted for continued monitoring and improvement.

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 Windermere leadership team will use ongoing state and local data to monitor and report to the stakeholders (through SAC meetings and grade-level collaboration meetings). In addition to the formal assessments, the Windermere leadership team will monitor lesson progress/effectiveness, and student engagement through classroom walks, weekly team collaboration meetings, and staff input/feedback. Ongoing discussions and refinements will take place at each data point analysis. Formal touchpoint monitoring as to the progression of the SIP goals will take place at the end of each quarter and be reported to both SAC and staff members. This process will focus in on all subgroups, particularly those that have demonstrated an achievement gap (ESE subgroup). The school leadership team will informally revise the SIP activities as needed and formally make adjustments after the first semester should some areas not make progress commensurate with the expected learning goals/outcomes.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	12%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	2	7	7	15	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
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	6	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	
	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	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	9	13	11	20	10	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	15

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	1	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) 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	1	9	13	11	20	10	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	15

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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*	82	57	53	85	56	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				77			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			57		
Math Achievement*	88	60	59	89	46	50	85		
Math Learning Gains				76			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			56		
Science Achievement*	85	63	54	85	61	59	80		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	88	59	59	65			81		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	85
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	424
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	618
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	56			
ELL	77			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	58			
HSP	79			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	86			

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%
FRL	58			

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	58			
ELL	76			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK				
HSP	87			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	64			

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	82			88			85					88
SWD	54			63			50				3	
ELL	72			76			73				4	88
AMI												
ASN	90			97			100				4	
BLK	54			62							2	
HSP	75			84			78				5	83
MUL	70			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	84			89			86				4	
FRL	59			65			45				4	

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	85	77	67	89	76	74	85					65
SWD	56	56	53	67	70	60	47					
ELL	80	68		83	82							65
AMI												
ASN	91	90		88	80							
BLK												
HSP	84	78	90	90	83	92	95					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	87	76	67	90	76	77	84					
FRL	70	65	70	60	59	58	64					

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	84	67	57	85	71	56	80					81
SWD	55	41		64	53	40	65					
ELL	84			76								81
AMI												
ASN	81	80		87	60							
BLK	58			58								
HSP	88	88		80	63		88					85
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	86	63	58	88	76	55	79					
FRL	65	56		61	58		50					

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	75%	54%	21%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	94%	60%	34%	58%	36%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	52%	27%	50%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	89%	59%	30%	59%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	94%	62%	32%	61%	33%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	83%	59%	24%	51%	32%

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.

In reviewing the 2022-2023 FAST data (raw scores) Windermere Elementary continues to have a high number of scholars achieving at or above grade level (level 3+). With the move from the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) for the 2022-2023 school year, there is still a bit of uncertainty on how the scores compare. When putting Spring 2022 FSA scores next to Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. scores Windermere should a slight decline in scores with overall ELA scores moving from 85% on 2022 FSA and now an 82% on F.A.S.T. 2022 FSA Math achievement at or above grade level remained fairly consistent with 89% scoring at or above a level 3 in 2022 on FSA and now 88% scoring at or above a level 3 on the 2023 F.A.S.T. assessment.

The subgroup data from the 2022 FSA ELA to the 2023 F.A.S.T. ELA held strong in terms of proficiency levels; however, did demonstrate a slight decrease in all areas but the ELL 80% to 85% (year to year ELA subgroup comparison: SWD 56% to 50%, Asian, 91% to 90%, Hispanic 84% to 74%, White 87% to 86%, and FRL 70% to 63%) In math We saw some similar trends with ELL, SWD taking a dip, and FRL, White and Asian subgroups increasing (year to year math subgroup comparison: SWD 67% to 62%, ELL 83% to 70%, Asian 88% to 97%, Hispanic 90% to 83%, White 87% to 89% and FRL 60% to 65%).

The overall lowest performance areas are the Students with Disabilities subgroup in both ELA and Math.

Contributing factors are that the number of students in these subgroups is very small, so any shift in students represents a large percentage of increase or decrease in overall scores. Windermere will continue to work on the professional development aspect of supporting teachers and staff with research-based strategies that support students with learning needs and students who do not have English as their first language. Close monitoring of the supports and services received through ESE direct services, as well as support provided by classroom teachers to both ESE and ELL students will take place and become a component in the common planning cycle.

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

An area for improvement for Windermere Elementary is to continue supporting strong standards-based Tier I instruction in both ELA and Math helping to continue the momentum that has been seen at Windermere in the last several years. We will continue to plan for strong support and monitoring of subgroups specifically in the area of Students with Disabilities (SWD)) in both ELA and math, English Language Learners in both ELA and Math, Freed and reduced Lunch (FRL) in the area of ELA.

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.

Windermere Elementary continually scores above the state average in all areas including specific subgroups. Windermere will continue to work to close the internal subgroup gaps.

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 based on the 2023 state assessment results was the growth seen in our Asian and Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL) subgroup in math.

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

Absenteeism is at a high rate.

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

- 1) Focus on closing the achievement gap for the Students with Disabilities (SWD subgroup)
- 2) Focus on closing the achievement gap for the English Language Learner (ELL subgroup)
- 2) Continued use of collaborative and distributive leadership structures to support student learning and teacher efficacy

Area of Focus

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

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

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

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

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material; therefore, it is crucial to build and establish a culture for Resiliency and social/emotional learning at our school with adults and students. By ensuring the strong focus on resiliency

our school will create culturally responsive environments to ensure students feel valued and connected and reduce the achievement gap for our Students with Disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Focusing on Resiliency (Social and Emotional Learning) will promote meaningful connections between home and school. Windermere Elementary will demonstrate an improvement in Early Warning System Indicator data in terms of attendance and grade-level achievement.

Monitoring:

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

The Cognia survey data should show positive results in terms of students feeling safe and positive about their school environment. The use of distributive leadership to support school-wide social-emotional learning will

enhance collaboration and build academic expertise with all students. The integration of the Caring School Community framework will strengthen home-school connections and engage all stakeholders in maintaining a positive culture on the Windermere campus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janet Bittick (janet.bittick@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.)

Windermere will implement The Caring School Community program as the framework for supporting Resiliency and school-wide Social and Emotional learning. The program builds caring relationships among students and adults and directly teaches social skills that students need in school and life. All teachers were provided training as part of the Caring School Community Program and follow-up training opportunities, safe practice, and impact data will be reviewed throughout the year. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Windermere Elementary will harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school to create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students. It is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through the school-wide implementation of the Caring School Community Program and collaboration with our stakeholders, we will have an opportunity to strengthen the individual and team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvements and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide a refresher training for the Caring School Community curriculum/materials to all instructional staff focusing on the utilization of a common language to support a culture of resiliency and a positive learning environment.

Person Responsible: Susan Salvati (susan.salvati@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Utilize the established PBIS system to continue to promote a positive school culture. Work with students identified as in need of Behavior MTSS support to ensure that they find success within the classroom environment.

Person Responsible: Sharon Williams (sharon.williams@ocps.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Use professional learning opportunities and discussions during common planning to integrate academic and Resiliency (social-emotional learning) through the morning and closing circles, class meetings, and engagement

structures. Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Classroom observations will be conducted weekly to

monitor morning and closing circles, and monthly checks of lessons plan to include Caring School Community lessons.

Person Responsible: Sharon Williams (sharon.williams@ocps.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#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.

An analysis of the F.A.S.T. data for 2023 demonstrates that there is an achievement gap between our general education students and our Students with Disabilities. This gap has increased over the last two years. Although the assessments are different, and a true side-by-side comparison cannot take place at this time, we do see that the gap between Students with Disabilities (SWD) and the overall ELA and Math scores continue to need support and monitoring (2023 ELA: SWD 50%, all students 82% 2023 Math: SWD 52%, all students 88%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with Disabilities will increase grade-level proficiency and increase learning gains by 7% resulting in an increase of students performing on or above grade level to 57% in ELA and 59% in Math based on the FAST PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Windermere Elementary leadership team will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting classroom observations during the ELA and Math blocks to ensure small group structure and accommodations for Students with Disabilities. Additionally, schedules will be created and monitored to ensure that the appropriate MTSS tiers are supported in addition to the services provided to students with an IEP. Lesson plan checks for specific planning, noting BPIE strategies and accommodations are in place based on individual student goals//needs. Structured time for collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers during common planning and Professional Learning Communities monthly to ensure the use of targeted and differentiated resources in reading to support Students with Disabilities. The grade-level tracking tool will be used to monitor common assessment data for Students with Disabilities compared to grade-level performance/trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janet Bittick (janet.bittick@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.)

During the ELA and math blocks, classroom teachers will effectively implement strong tier I, standards-based instruction, along with differentiated, small-group instruction based on multiple sources of data. Targeted scaffolded support will be provided for Students with Disabilities, and professional learning opportunities for instructional personnel on Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) will be embedded throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using data to differentiate instruction will ensure that Students with Disabilities are provided accommodations and scaffolded instruction to experience success. Collaboration in common planning between the ESE teacher and general education teacher(s) will ensure the planning and use of necessary supports that provide Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) in all classrooms serving SWD 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 analyze student performance on common assessments and discuss proficiency data during monthly data meetings. Specific tracking of subgroup data toward proficiency will be monitored, focusing on Students with Disabilities, and any achievement gaps with the SWD subgroup.

Person Responsible: Carissa Fonseca (carissa.fonseca@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly monitoring throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Provide monthly structured Professional Learning Community time and common planning for ESE teachers and classroom teachers to discuss effective differentiated strategies and resources to support Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Janet Bittick (janet.bittick@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Teachers will be provided half-day planning during the 1st semester after the first state progress monitoring administration to review data, make changes to instructional calendars, and refine targeted reading instruction and tiered support

Person Responsible: Janet Bittick (janet.bittick@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023