

Orange County Public Schools

Sadler 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 | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 27 |

Sadler Elementary

4000 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

<https://sadleres.ocps.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Smestad, Lindsey | Principal | The school principal, Lindsey Smestad, will ensure a safe learning environment, monitor all student data, ensure implementation of instructional best practices, and coach teachers to perform to the best of their ability. The school principal will also monitor instruction and data and provide timely and actionable feedback for improving classroom instruction. |
| Mott, Rachel | Assistant Principal | The school assistant principal, Rachel Mott, will help Ms. Smestad with ensuring a safe learning environment, monitoring all student data, ensuring implementation of instructional best practices, and coaching teachers to perform to the best of their ability. The assistant principal will also monitor instruction and data and provide timely yet effective feedback for improving classroom instruction. |
| Hines, Ann | Reading Coach | Ms. Hines will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to ELA instruction. |
| Kuhns, Rebecca | Math Coach | Ms. Kuhns will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to math and science instruction. |
| Gaston, Brooke | Instructional Coach | Ms. Gaston will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to instruction. |
| Rodriguez Rivera, Carmen | ELL Compliance Specialist | Ms. Rodriguez will provide ongoing professional development and resources to teachers as it relates to instructional techniques, supports, and scaffolds for English Language Learners. |
| Lorenz-Clark, Mary | Staffing Specialist | Ms. Lorenz is responsible for coordinating the staffing and educational planning process for students with IEPs and 504s on campus. She provides professional development when necessary to the staff. |
| Callwood, Lakisha | Other | Ms. Callwood will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers as it relates to the MTSS process and all school-wide interventions in Reading and Math. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Sadler Elementary School Advisory Council (SAC) is the primary means for all stakeholders to provide input into the school improvement process. SAC has a representation of families, businesses, community partners, staff, and other entities with a vested interest in Sadler. Sadler's SAC meets monthly, typically on the third Thursday of each month unless it interferes with school closures, and discussions focus on school improvement plan action items, developing a plan to implement action items, data analysis, and annual stakeholder survey results with next steps. SAC also provides input on the budget.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored frequently and consistently throughout the school year. Classroom teachers, school-based coaches, and admin will monitor student performance on standards-based unit assessments to include a focus on subgroups. This data informs us of student progress toward mastery of benchmarks and will determine the next steps to ensure student progress is moving in a positive direction. Additionally, regular data meetings are conducted with classroom teachers to discuss progress on progress monitoring measures that predict and support proficiency. Based on these data meetings, the next steps will be developed to include additional interventions, scaffolds, professional development, and adjustments. The school leadership team will conduct regular classroom observations, which will inform if additional support is needed to promote student achievement. Also, the SAC will meet monthly to analyze data and progress toward action steps and 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 | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 86% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: D |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: D 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 | 16 | 49 | 39 | 31 | 39 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 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 | 85 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 40 | 50 | 53 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 |

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 | 17 | 21 | 24 | 87 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |

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 | 9 | 50 | 47 | 51 | 14 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 34 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 38 | 66 | 100 | 44 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 |

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 | 24 | 22 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

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 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 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 | 9 | 50 | 47 | 51 | 14 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 34 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 38 | 66 | 100 | 44 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 |

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 | 24 | 22 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

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 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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* | 26 | 57 | 53 | 26 | 56 | 56 | 19 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 29 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 41 | 60 | 59 | 36 | 46 | 50 | 23 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 27 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59 | | | 48 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 40 | 63 | 54 | 33 | 61 | 59 | 32 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 60 | 59 | 59 | 53 | | | 47 | | |

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 189 |
| 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 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 396 |
| 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 | 3 |
| ELL | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | | | |
| HSP | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | | | |

| 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 | 39 | Yes | 1 | |

| 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 | 29 | Yes | 3 | 2 |
| ELL | 49 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

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 | 26 | | | 41 | | | 40 | | | | | 60 |
| SWD | 11 | | | 22 | | | | | | | 4 | 47 |
| ELL | 22 | | | 40 | | | 35 | | | | 5 | 60 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | | | 45 | | | 59 | | | | 5 | 52 |
| HSP | 21 | | | 39 | | | 34 | | | | 5 | 59 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 69 |
| FRL | 27 | | | 43 | | | 42 | | | | 5 | 60 |

| 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 | 26 | 57 | 69 | 36 | 63 | 59 | 33 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 9 | 44 | 58 | 19 | 31 | 36 | 20 | | | | | 18 |
| ELL | 22 | 58 | 69 | 34 | 65 | 59 | 29 | | | | | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 56 | | 40 | 63 | 64 | 53 | | | | | 32 |
| HSP | 22 | 57 | 73 | 33 | 63 | 58 | 28 | | | | | 56 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 54 | 64 | 38 | 62 | 57 | 33 | | | | | 49 |

| 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 | 19 | 29 | 36 | 23 | 27 | 48 | 32 | | | | | 47 |
| SWD | 5 | 17 | 23 | 9 | 40 | 64 | 19 | | | | | 35 |
| ELL | 16 | 28 | 29 | 21 | 26 | 48 | 25 | | | | | 47 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 27 | | 25 | 24 | | 41 | | | | | 56 |
| HSP | 18 | 32 | 32 | 22 | 30 | 52 | 28 | | | | | 45 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 18 | 31 | 50 | 22 | 25 | 44 | 31 | | | | | 48 |

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 | 29% | 54% | -25% | 54% | -25% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 60% | -29% | 58% | -27% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 20% | 52% | -32% | 50% | -30% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 59% | -16% | 59% | -16% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 62% | -29% | 61% | -28% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 55% | -20% | 55% | -20% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 59% | -21% | 51% | -13% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

According to FAST Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3), Sadler is well below the state average in proficiency for English Language Arts (ELA), specifically those in 3rd grade for the 2022/2023 school year. Sadler had 29% of students achieve proficiency in 3rd-5th ELA, and 21% of students achieve proficiency in 3rd grade ELA. According to iReady Beginning of the Year (BOY) Diagnostic, 9% of students school-wide were performing on grade level. To be specific, 69% of students in 3rd grade were performing 2 or more years below grade level in reading. In addition to this data, PM1 results showed 6% of students in 3rd grade were proficient in reading. This data indicates a significant reading learning gap in at least 69% of our students in 3rd grade at the beginning of the school year. Additionally, Sadler has a high English Language Learner (ELL) population with 73% of students in 3rd-5th being ELL and 75% of 3rd graders

being ELL. Sadler also continues to struggle with high tardiness and absence rates school-wide with 25% of students in 3rd-5th having 10% more absences.

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

When looking at school-wide data, reading, math, and science proficiency made overall growth compared to the 2021/2022 school year. The 2021/2022 3rd grade FSA scores indicate that 24% of students were proficient. The 2022/2023 3rd grade FAST PM3 scores reflect that 21% are proficient, which is a 3% decrease when looking at the same grade level. However, when looking at the same group of 21/22 3rd grader students, they showed an increase in proficiency in 4th grade increasing from 24% to 39% of students proficient. The decrease in 3rd-grade scores from 2021/2022 to 2022/2023 may have been caused by a significant learning gap in reading. According to iReady BOY Diagnostic, 69% of students entering 3rd grade were performing 2 or more years below grade level in reading. In addition to this data, PM1 results showed 6% of students in 3rd grade were proficient in reading. This data indicates a significant reading learning gap in at least 69% of our students in 3rd grade at the beginning of the 2022/2023 school year. Additionally, 75% of students in 3rd grade are ELL.

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.

According to FAST PM3, Sadler is well below the state average of 50% proficient for ELA, specifically those in 3rd grade for the 2022/2023 school year. Sadler had 29% of students achieve proficiency in 3rd-5th ELA, and 21% of students achieve proficiency in 3rd grade ELA. This reflects a school-wide gap in ELA of 21% and a gap in our 3rd-grade learners of 29%. According to iReady BOY Diagnostic, 9% of students school-wide were performing on grade level. 69% of students in 3rd grade were performing 2 or more years below grade level in reading. In addition to this data, PM1 results showed 6% of students in 3rd grade were proficient in reading. This data indicates a significant reading learning gap in at least 69% of our students in 3rd grade at the beginning of the school year. Additionally, Sadler has a high ELL population with 73% of students in 3rd-5th being ELL and 75% of 3rd graders being ELL. Sadler also continues to struggle with high tardiness and absence rates school-wide with 25% of students in 3rd-5th having 10% more absences.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement, having an 8% increase from the 2022/2023 school year. In the 2022/2023 school year Sadler increased our focus on vocabulary, implemented Science tutoring in the mornings and after school, offered Saturday School to targeted students with expert coaches and teachers, and focused on brain-based strategies during instruction. Additionally, students were ability grouped and provided differentiated instruction based on data.

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

Sadler's highest area of concern on the EWS data is students with a reading deficiency. Currently, 228 students are identified as students with a reading deficiency. Sadler's second highest area of concern according to the EWS data is students with absences above 10%. Currently, 194 students are identified as students with absences above 10%.

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

1. Targeted and research-based Walk to Intervention school-wide for reading
2. Differentiated reading small group instruction

3. Scaffolds and supports for English Language Learners (ELLs)
4. Differentiated and targeted professional development to include ongoing coaching cycles

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.

According to our Annual Stakeholder Survey, which is conducted to monitor school climate and culture, teacher efficacy was 71% favorable, which was our lowest increase compared to the 2022 results in the staff survey. Within teacher efficacy, the two lowest favorable areas within teaching efficacy at 62% favorable are how confident teachers are at helping our school's academically at risk students to learn (2% decline compared to 2022) and when one of your teaching strategies did not meet the needs of students, how easily can you think of a different approach to try (11% decrease compared to 2022).

According to our Early Warning Indicator data, 228 students have a reading deficiency. This is also reflected in our ELA PM3 FAST data, indicating that 71% of students in grades 3-5 are not proficient in reading.

In order to support staff and student growth in reading, we will focus on building teacher capacity to differentiate reading instruction in small groups. This will allow teachers to provide individualized to students with a reading deficiency, and increase their ability to use different approaches to learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to the annual stakeholder survey, we will see an increase from 62% to 75% in favorable response to:

"How confident teachers are at helping our school's academically at-risk students to learn."
When one of your teaching strategies does not meet the needs of students, how easily can you think of a different approach to try?

According to the FAST PM3 assessment,

ELA Proficiency will increase from 29% to 41%.
3rd Grade ELA Proficiency will increase from 21% to 41%.
Math Proficiency will increase from 43% to 53%.
Science Proficiency will increase from 40% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

The administration, school leadership team, and teachers will participate in ongoing professional development and data analysis to ensure students receive remediation and/or enrichment based on individual performance in professional learning communities. In addition, administration and school leadership will ensure Tier 1 whole group and small group instruction is standards-based, student-centered, and differentiated in weekly professional learning communities for reading, math, writing, and science. The school leadership team will support and monitor teacher implementation of the whole group and small group differentiated instruction through classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@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.)

Tier 1 interventionists will be provided in classrooms to monitor and support targeted students, and teach a small group. This will give students two rotations of teacher-led instruction, maximizing their instructional time. Brain-based strategies will be utilized throughout instruction, and scaffolds will be pre-planned in common planning. Ongoing professional development in research-based practices will help build teacher capacity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With additional instructional staff to support small-group learning, students will be provided the opportunity to engage in targeted small-group instruction based on individual needs. Students will also engage in research-based interventions and utilize the online platforms of Exact Path and Imagine Learning, which will provide students with instruction based on their greatest areas of need. This will maximize instructional time.

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.

The Leadership Team will collaborate with teachers to develop a data-based small group rotational model in ELA.

Person Responsible: Ann Hines (ann.hines@ocps.net)

By When: August with ongoing adjustments based on data.

As needed, teachers will be provided with professional development in the areas of Reading to ensure a full understanding of the standards, effective instructional strategies, appropriate scaffolds, student engagement, and active monitoring.

Person Responsible: Ann Hines (ann.hines@ocps.net)

By When: August, Ongoing throughout the year

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs weekly to monitor the effectiveness of small group, and differentiated instruction and provide teachers with immediate and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible: Rachel Mott (rachel.mott@ocps.net)

By When: September and ongoing as needed.

Instructional coaches will provide various brain-based strategies to teachers during common planning and one-on-one that will meet the needs of all learners in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Ann Hines (ann.hines@ocps.net)

By When: August and ongoing

Instructional coaches will facilitate monthly common planning days with grade-level teams to support mastery of standards, planned and targeted differentiated small groups, brain-based strategies, and pre-planned scaffolds.

Person Responsible: Ann Hines (ann.hines@ocps.net)

By When: September through April

#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.

Our Students with Disabilities is our only area below the threshold according to ESSA. We had an increase in our Students with Disabilities high achievement in ELA, showing a 2% increase from 9% to 11% proficient when compared to the 2022 school year. We had a decrease in our Students with Disabilities high achievement in Math, showing a 8% decrease from 19% to 11% proficient when compared to the 2022 school year.

We currently have 23 ESE students in grades 3-5 and 47 school-wide. Of our 55 ESE students, 72% are ELL.

In order to increase the academic achievement and growth of students with disabilities, we will embed research-based strategies and scaffolds for ELLs and ESE students during Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to the FAST PM3 assessment,

ESE ELA Proficiency will increase from 11% to 41%.
ESE Math Proficiency will increase from 11% to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

The administration, school leadership team, and teachers will participate in ongoing data analysis to ensure students receive remediation and/or enrichment based on individual performance. In addition, administration and school leadership will ensure Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction has pre-planned research-based scaffolds and strategies for ESE and ELLs in weekly common planning. Classroom walkthroughs will regularly be conducted to monitor the implementation of and effectiveness of scaffolds and supports and to make adjustments as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@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.)

General Education and ESE teachers will discuss student data, both formative and summative, during data meetings and common planning meetings in Professional Learning Communities. Additionally, research-based scaffolds and supports will be utilized throughout instruction to meet the needs of our ESE and ELL students. Research-based programs, such as SIPPS, Being a Reader, and Reading Mastery, will be utilized for targeted ESE students during intervention, small group, and tutoring. In addition, technology programs SuccessMaker and Exact Path will provide individualized instruction to students, and will be used daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During data meetings, teachers and coaches will review data and provide students with appropriate interventions and scaffolds based on student needs. Research-based programs, such as SIPPS, Being a Reader, and Reading Mastery, will be used during intervention, small group, and tutoring to support

student achievement. Additionally, technology programs SuccessMaker and Exact Path will provide individualized instruction to students, and will be used daily. Pre-planned scaffolds and strategies will be embedded in daily lessons, and discussed in weekly common planning in reading, math, and science. Ongoing professional development will take place as needed to support the needs of teachers.

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 meet one-on-one with the ESOL Compliance Specialist and Staffing Specialist to understand the data, needs, and scaffolds of their students. WIDA ACCESS 2.0, IEPs, PM3, and diagnostic data will be shared and analyzed as a team.

Person Responsible: Mary Lorenz-Clark (mary.lorenz-clark@ocps.net)

By When: August and ongoing as new students enter

Professional development will be provided on research-based ELL strategies to include frontloading vocabulary, previewing the text, use of visuals, and use of sentence frames.

Person Responsible: Carmen Rodriguez Rivera (carmen.rodriguezrivera@ocps.net)

By When: September and ongoing as needed

Data meetings will be conducted to monitor the progress of ESE students and adjustments will be made as needed.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)

By When: Bi-weekly starting in August

ESE students will be placed in intervention groups, as well as after-school tutoring/acceleration that is differentiated to meet their academic needs.

Person Responsible: Lakisha Callwood (lakisha.callwood@ocps.net)

By When: August 28th for Intervention, September 7th for tutoring

Professional development will be provided on research-based programs to include SIPPS, Being a Reader, Reading Mastery, SuccessMaker, and Exact Path.

Person Responsible: Lakisha Callwood (lakisha.callwood@ocps.net)

By When: August and ongoing as needed.

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs weekly to monitor the effectiveness of small group, intervention, and tutoring with immediate and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Smestad (lindsey.smestad@ocps.net)

By When: August and ongoing as needed.

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 Advisory Committee as well as the budget committee will meet throughout the school year to discuss funding allocations and ensure that resources are being purchased and used based on student needs. This will include supplementary materials for interventions as well as professional development and extended planning opportunities to enhance resources and opportunities for identified students in our ESE subgroup. This will also ensure instruction and student tasks are aligned to grade-level benchmarks.

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

On the most recent Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) PM1 assessment, data indicated that 77% of students are performing below expectations in Reading. We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention and small group, which will support an increase in students performing on grade level by 40%.

In order to increase proficiency in reading, research-based reading programs will be used 4-5 times per week with fidelity for 30-45 minutes in Reading Intervention with students performing below grade level. Additionally, research-based programs will be used 5 times per week with fidelity for 15-30 minutes in small group with students performing below grade level. (Language for Learning, SIPPS, Being a Reader)

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

On the most recent Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) PM1 assessment, data indicated that 89% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention for targeted students, which will support an increase in ELA proficiency by 30% on F.A.S.T. PM3.

In order to increase proficiency in reading, research-based reading programs will be used 4-5 times per week with fidelity for 30-45 minutes in Reading Intervention with students performing below grade level. Additionally, research-based programs will be used 5 times per week with fidelity for 15-30 minutes in small group with students performing below grade level. (Language for Learning, SIPPS, Being a Reader)

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

According to the 2024 ELA F.A.S.T. PM3, KG-2nd ELA Proficiency will increase from 23% to 41%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to the 2024 ELA F.A.S.T. PM3, 3rd-5th ELA Proficiency will increase from 29% to 41%

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 use a variety of tools to progress monitor for desired outcomes. We will utilize data spreadsheets to track and monitor student progress in SIPPS, Being a Reader, Reading Mastery, and Language for Learning. We will also progress monitor student progress through Standards-Based Unit Assessments, DIBELS, and Oral Reading Fluency Probes (ORF). The MTSS Team will meet the first Wednesday of each month to analyze data and make data-based adjustments. Ongoing data meetings will take place at least once per month with teachers to triangulate the data from the programs listed above, and make necessary adjustments. We will utilize digital platforms and student tracking sheets to monitor progress of technology programs in Exact Path and Imagine Learning, and use this data to provide follow-up instruction to students. F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 2 and 3 will be used to monitor progress toward goals, and individual teacher data meetings will be held following each progress monitoring assessment to review data-based adjustments. Additionally, the leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs weekly to monitor the effectiveness of small groups and intervention groups, and teachers will be provided with immediate and actionable feedback. The monitoring of data followed by data-based adjustments will have a direct impact on an increase in student achievement and mastery of foundational skills in reading.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@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?

We will use placement assessments for each student in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in primary and intermediate grades, to place them in a research-based program. SIPPS, Being a Reader, and Reading Mastery will systematically teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Research-based programs will be used 4-5 times per week with fidelity for 30-45 minutes in Reading Intervention. Additionally, research-based programs will be used 5 times per week with fidelity for 15-30 minutes in small group.

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?

The strategy above was selected because there is strong evidence to support the fact that teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers.

Additionally, this selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf#page=28

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 |
|--|---|
| Provide professional development and ongoing training for SIPPS, Being a Reader, Learning A to Z, Exact Path, Reading Mastery, Imagine Learning and Language for Learning. These programs are research-based and help students learn to decode and build word attack skills. | Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@ocps.net |
| Provide assessment materials and dates for Intervention Team to complete placement assessments for our lowest 25%, intermediate non-readers, and primary struggling readers. | Callwood, Lakisha, lakisha.callwood@ocps.net |
| Use placement assessment and F.A.S.T. PM3 and PM1 data to create 1st-5th Reading Walk to Intervention groups that allows 100% of students to receive research-based targeted instruction. | Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@ocps.net |
| Meet as an MTSS team monthly to review data and make adjustments to groupings. | Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@ocps.net |
| Complete classroom walkthroughs and provide actionable feedback weekly to intervention and small groups. | Mott, Rachel, rachel.mott@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.

The SIP will be shared and reviewed in both English and Spanish on our school website, at monthly SAC meetings, at our Title I Parent Meeting in September, and at Open House in September. The SIP will also be shared with staff at a staff meeting and via e-mail.
 Sadler's School Website: <https://sadleres.ocps.net/>

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))

We will continue to build positive relationships with our parents, families, and other community stakeholders through our SAC meetings, PTA meetings, school messenger, and monthly parent engagement nights.

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)

In order to provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, we will continue to offer after-school tutoring and clubs. These tutoring opportunities will be available to our ESE students as well as indicated in our ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to the Students with Disabilities area of focus. We will strengthen the academic program and increase the amount of quality, differentiated instruction by focusing on differentiated and targeted small group instruction as indicated in our Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to the Early Warning Systems area of focus.

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))

Our after-school tutoring program is funded through Title I funds.

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))

Sadler has a school-based Mental Health Designee and a district-based Mental Health Counselor who both see students in individual and group settings. Our student support team includes our Social Worker, School Psychologist, and Mental Health Designee. They work together to provide Child Safety Matters lessons and meet weekly to develop a plan of support for identified students. Our Behavior Specialist teaches school skills to groups of students and supports with behavior plans as needed.

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))

Sadler has a Teach-In event, where members from families and the community present to students regarding their careers. Students also learn about postsecondary opportunities when learning about important heroic figures during Hispanic Heritage Month, Black History Month, and Women's History Month.

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).

Sadler has a student support team that includes our Dean, Behavior Specialist, MTSS Coach, Staffing Specialist, Mental Health Designee, Social Worker, Psychologist, and Assistant Principal. This team meets weekly to analyze school-wide and individual student behavior data and develop supports for identified students. We are a CHAMPS school and PBIS school-wide.

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))

Sadler has weekly PLCs for all instructional personnel in the subject areas of ELA, Math, Science, and Intervention. Data analysis following each standards-based common assessment is embedded within each PLC, to include reteach opportunities and next steps. We have bi-weekly professional development for the whole staff, and ongoing professional development in small groups on an as-needed basis. Additionally, our staff receives monthly common planning days that embed differentiated professional development. Our staff also attends off-campus professional development within the district.

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))

Sadler has one full-time VPK class. This allows for the 20 students attending to learn the school expectations, procedures, and curriculum prior to entering Kindergarten. Students who enter Kindergarten are screened through DIBELS in the summer and within the first two weeks of school. This allows teachers to form data-based small groups and begin differentiated instruction specific to the needs of each student at the start of the school year.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$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.
 No