Apopka Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Apopka Elementary

311 VICK RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://apopkaes.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
Buxton, Toni	Principal	Ms. Buxton serves as the instructional leader of Apopka Elementary School. She monitors instructional delivery of the standards and allocation of resources to ensure students are being provided with a high-quality education. The principal facilitates classroom walkthroughs and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Ms. Buxton establishes systems of support resulting in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. She sets expectations for teachers to collaborate, plan rigorous lessons, and contribute input for the optimal functioning of the school. The principal also ensures support and documentation to increase academic/behavioral instruction at the various tiers. In addition, the principal examines MTSS plans and activities with parents and stakeholders.
Rivera, Milagros	Assistant Principal	Dr. Rivera works with the principal to develop and facilitate school initiatives, monitor student achievement and instructional delivery of the standards, conduct coaching and evaluative observations, provide effective actionable feedback that promotes teacher growth and expertise, and facilitate discussions focused on progress monitoring data. She monitors discipline processes to ensure a safe learning and working environment.
St Gelais, Jessica	Reading Coach	Mrs. St. Gelais serves as the reading coach and the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) coordinator. As the reading coach, she facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity. She utilizes the coaching cycle to provide continuous support to teachers in need of Tier II or Tier III support. Provides guidance on K-5 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. Mrs. St. Gelais provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. She oversees the school-wide MTSS process by ensuring teachers are collecting academic data with fidelity and providing the appropriate intervention support for students in need of Tier II or Tier III support.
DeBauche, Jennifer	Math Coach	Mrs. DeBauche provides guidance on K-5 math and science plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. She facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity, and utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in need of Tier II or Tier III support. She also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments.
McCowan, Amanda	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Wubbena coordinates all testing throughout the school year. She also monitors for compliance with Florida State mandates, conducts and coordinates ELL Committee Meetings, conducts aural/oral language testing

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		on students entering the school and follows-up on students needing the Reading/Writing assessment, assesses, evaluates, and monitors the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program.
Bekas, Cynthia	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Bekas schedules meetings for ESE students receiving additional support through MTSS, invites participants, conducts meetings, schedules follow-up meetings and maintains accurate documentation for students with disabilities. She provides guidance on ESE strategies, analyzes data, and participates in progress monitoring.
Green, Sherron	Dean	Mrs. Green assists with the school-wide implementation of Positive Behavioral and Intervention Systems PBIS for Apopka Elementary. She provides support through professional development in classroom management, restorative practices, and effective strategies to aid students with successful academic, personal and social development. Additionally, Mrs. Bush works in conjunction with the guidance counselor and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) coordinator to collect data and develop differentiated intervention services for students in need of Tier II or Tier III support.
Alvelo, Auren	School Counselor	Mrs. Alvelo provides services to students on life skills and conducts group and individual counseling sessions to assist students. She completes assessments and tests as needed, analyzes results and provides appropriate plans for students. She also is on the Threat Assessment team.

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.

At Apopka Elementary, we convene a School Advisory Council (SAC) on a monthly basis. We invite instructional and classified staff, parents, and community members to attend and participate. Announcements inviting stakeholders to participate are posted on the school website, weekly call-out, and the school's social media accounts. At SAC meetings, we review the School Improvement Plan and solicit input to make decisions about improving outcomes at the school. School leadership shares data to inform those decisions made by stakeholders.

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))

Each month the School Advisory Council (SAC) examines the most up-to-date student data and progress toward goals to determine what adjustments to practice need to be made. Additionally, the School Leadership Team meets on a weekly basis to monitor progress in academic and non-academic areas so that we are able to articulate progress and needs to the SAC.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	25	27	23	25	20	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	13
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	20	31	34	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	35	33	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	18	28	51	30	29	0	0	0	158

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	2	5	4	26	37	29	0	0	0	103

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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	8
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	5	37	34	35	27	16	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	2	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	38	30	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	30	24	0	0	0	57
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	2	6	32	18	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	5	37	34	35	27	16	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	2	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	38	30	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	30	24	0	0	0	57
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	2	6	32	18	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	10
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*	51	57	53	55	56	56	54		
ELA Learning Gains				58			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			19		
Math Achievement*	59	60	59	64	46	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				72			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			26		
Science Achievement*	57	63	54	49	61	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	59	59	46			43		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
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	55

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
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	34	Yes	4	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	47			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	51			

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
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	51			59			57					46
SWD	21			30			43				5	47
ELL	40			42			37				5	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51			61			51				4	
HSP	44			47			55				5	43
MUL	50			78							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			74			68				4	
FRL	47			55			56				5	45

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	55	58	42	64	72	55	49					46
SWD	25	40	30	31	61	50	14					27
ELL	39	56	47	47	66	48	42					46
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	56	60	42	72	81	70	53					
HSP	43	50	43	54	65	48	41					48
MUL	76	58		71	58							
PAC												
WHT	69	69		72	73		50					
FRL	44	50	38	57	68	50	38					57

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	54	45	19	53	39	26	45					43
SWD	26	33		29	39		41					18
ELL	34	35		42	29		33					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	43	17	52	38	29	38					
HSP	45	38	23	46	33	17	38					44
MUL	59			65								
PAC												
WHT	60	61		62	44		62					
FRL	45	32	13	46	35	11	36					49

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	56%	54%	2%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	60%	-5%	58%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	59%	-7%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	51%	5%

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.

Based on FAST preliminary data, the lowest performance was in the area of ELA proficiency (56%). Additionally, only 25% of students with students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency in ELA. Although this is an increase of 1% in overall proficiency and an increase of 12% among students with disabilities from the prior assessment, there is still opportunity for improvement. Contributing factors for the increase in ELA proficiency include a focus on planning for and implementing processing strategies during instruction.

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

The greatest decline was in math proficiency, down from 64% in 2022 to 62% in 2023. Students in third (57%) and fourth (66%) grades demonstrated lower proficiency than in previous years, while students in 5th grade increased by 12% to 66% proficiency. A contributing factor for the decline in math may be shifting from a paper and pencil exam to a computer-based exam.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average was in students with disabilities. While there was an increase among students with disabilities in all areas of proficiency (ELA +12% to 25%; Math +9% to

29%; and Science +46% to 46%), these students are demonstrating proficiency at much lower rates than their peers. The increase in proficiency may be attributed to the focus on processing during instruction. However, the low percentage of students demonstrating proficiency may be attributed to gaps in foundational skills and knowledge in each of the core content areas.

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

Science proficiency increased by 8% to 57%. This may be attributed to staffing changes, with science teachers in 5th grade having strong content knowledge and a wide variety of instructional strategies that they are skilled in implementing. Additionally, there was intentional planning in the use of hands-on learning through labs and cross-curricular use of reading strategies when reading science texts.

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

Excessive absences are of concern, with 154 students missing 10% or more days of school. Additionally, there are 58 students with two or more early warning indicators. As a result of this, the Apopka team must quickly identify those students with a pattern of absences and/or multiple early warning indicators to be able to quickly implement interventions to address the concerns.

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

1. Continue to close the gap between students with and without disabilities.
2. Focus on Early Literacy skills to increase proficiency in English Language Arts/Reading
3. Address excessive attendance concerns (including absences, tardies, and early sign-outs)

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on preliminary FAST data, Students with Disabilities (SWD) performed below the 41% Federal Index Threshold with only 35 Federal Percent of Points. This subgroup has been an area of focus for several years, so we would like to close the gap between students with and without disabilities in both proficiency and learning gains. Other locally created progress monitoring data such as Standards-Based Unit Assessments in the 2022-2023 reflected this gap between students with and without disabilities.

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

The measurable outcome the school plan intends to achieve is to increase the ELA proficiency of Students with Disabilities subgroup population above the 41% Federal Index Threshold on the Every Student Succeeds Act. This will mean an increase of 7% in ELA/Reading proficiency for Students with Disabilities in grades three through five.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings with the staffing specialist, administration and teacher leaders on the implementation of IEP services.

Administrators and content area coaches will use classroom walkthroughs to monitor that instruction and interventions are implemented as planned.

Following each unit assessment, PLCs will review student data on common assessments and make instructional decisions based on individual student needs.

Administrators will monitor the implementation of the support facilitation schedule and progress toward IEP goals will also be used to measure for the desired outcomes. Teachers will be responsible for documenting implementation through lesson plans, keeping IEP and MTSS data current, and IEP meeting notes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented is the practice of providing interventions for students by building decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read; routinely using a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text; and providing students with opportunities to practice making sense of challenging text that will expose them to complex ideas and information.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions outlined above will be implemented through the use of the foundational skills and comprehension-building questioning sequences in the Curriculum Resource Materials daily slides developed by Orange County Public Schools, SIPPS lessons for students needing additional instruction in decoding skills, Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum used to provide fluency-building activities and

comprehension-building practices, and Exact Path used to address individual student needs based on their current reading skill or ability.

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.

ESE teachers will be active participants at Professional Learning Community meetings reviewing data, forming intervention groups, and sharing ideas with PLC team members of high yield instructional strategies for Students with Disabilities. The shift in practice will be that ESE teachers are clear in their understanding of the standard/benchmark beyond the IEP goals so that they are appropriately supporting instruction.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Literacy Coach will attend the district coach meetings, then share learning with teams, including ESE teachers, at the school level. The Coach will analyze data with the school support team and the literacy leadership team to identify areas of need and where coaching cycles may be warranted.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Implement assessments (FAST, District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2), DIBELS (K-1), Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3), and SIPPS Formative Data (K-5), etc.) to determine interventions and support individual student needs. Administration will analyze data of academic performance of Students with Disabilities on common assessments and progress monitoring checkpoints with classroom teachers and ESE teachers.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Develop professional learning based on identified school needs. This will include providing support for individual teachers based on progress monitoring data. As needed, teachers will be encouraged to attend district professional development to support implementation of curriculum, interventions, and BEST standards. The plan will be developed following the PM1 of the FAST Assessment.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

#2. 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.

Based on 2022-2023 attendance data, 126 students were absent 10% or more days of the school year, accounting for just over 16% of students enrolled for the whole school year. Chronic absence may contribute to students having difficulty learning to read by the third-grade and graduating from high school. Of those students with chronic absences, many are students with two or more early warning system indicators, that include suspensions and substantial reading deficiencies.

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

The measurable outcome the school intends to achieve is a reduction in the number of students absent 10% or more days to below 10% of students enrolled. As a result, the number of students with two or more Early Warning System indicators will be reduced as well.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the Resource Teacher for Behavior, the Behavior Specialist, and the Attendance Clerk in collaboration with the classroom teacher and administration through attendance tracking on a weekly basis.

Tier II interventions will be triggered when a student misses 2 days in a month, or 10% or more days enrolled, beginning early in the school year to begin to predict attendance patterns and prevent later absences.

Tier III interventions will begin immediately with students who missed 20% or more of the previous school year. During the current school year, Tier III interventions will be implemented with a student misses 4 days in a month or 20% or more days enrolled.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented to address attendance is based on the plan outlined by Attendance Works (https://www.attendanceworks.org/) and includes a tiered system of supports that includes practices that support a positive learning environment; Tier I supports for all students encouraging and educating families about the importance of attendance; Tier II early interventions that may include working with families to address attendance barriers and individual attendance plans; and Tier II intensive interventions that support families with the most challenging barriers to attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Results First Clearinghouse Database identifies Attendance Works as an implementation resource that is a scientifically supported intervention that assists chronically absent students in improving their attendance. Found at https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/take-action-to-improve-health/what-works-for-health/strategies/attendance-interventions-for-chronically-absent-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.

Foundational supports to promote positive conditions for learning: Ensure that each classroom has a plan for creating a positive learning environment that includes behavioral expectations for classroom activities, encouragement procedures, correction procedures, and routines to welcome students, a "Safe Place" in classroom that students can go to self-regulate, a "buddy" classroom for students needing a change of location to compose themselves, and a positive routine to wrap up the day.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: October 1, 2023

Classroom teachers will highlight attendance data in the weekly "Dolphin Report" that summarizes student data and is shared with both students and their families. When students reach the threshold of 2 days in a month, or 10% or more days enrolled, Tier II Interventions to include a conference with families to identify barriers to attendance and possible solutions. Reports of students approaching the threshold absences by teachers will be discussed in the weekly leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing, beginning September 1, 2023

Convene a committee of faculty and students to determine ways in which the school can begin recognizing good and/or improved attendance.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: October 1, 2023

Conduct child study meetings to include the family, attendance clerk, guidance counselor, school social worker, teacher(s), and an administrator to develop an individual plan for improved attendance with any student who misses more than 10% of days enrolled.

Person Responsible: Toni Buxton (toni.buxton@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing, beginning September 2023

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).

Based on previous year student and classroom walkthrough data, it was evident that teachers needed additional support on implementing standards-aligned instruction, including using authentic engagement strategies. The School Support Team determined that a Kagan training with a focus on how to use collaborative structures to provide strategic opportunities for students to engage with content, including how to monitor student responses or discussion. As we progress through the year, the support team will continue to monitor student progress and instructional practice to determine what next steps must be taken. If additional

funds become available, the team will work with the School Advisory Council to make determinations about tutoring or additional human resources may be used to address school improvement goals.

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

According to the STAR PM3 ELA statewide assessment, the percentage of students performing below grade level was 30% in kindergarten, 38% in first grade, and 39% in second grade. Apopka Elementary will focus on foundational skills to support reading for understanding in 1st and 2nd grade by developing awareness of the segments of speech and how they link to letters, teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. These skills are recommendations 2 and 3 of Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade from the IES Practice Guide Recommendations, which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements.

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

According to the ELA Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3, the percentage of students performing below grade level was 50% in third, 43% in fourth, and 43% in fifth.

Apopka Elementary will focus on foundational Skills to support reading for understanding in 3rd Grade. The specific focus in 3rd grade will be to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. These skills are recommendations 2 and 3 of Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade from the IES Practice Guide Recommendations, which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements.

In fourth and fifth grade, the focus will be on building students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly, and routinely using a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. Comprehension practices will include building students' world and word knowledge, providing them with opportunities to ask and answer questions about the text, teaching them a routine for determining the gist of a text, and teaching them to monitor their comprehension as they read. These skills are recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9 from the IES Practice Guide Recommendations, which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements.

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

In 2023, 38% of first grade students scored below grade level, so 62% scored on or above grade level. Our goal is for 70% of the students in first grade to achieve at or above grade level on the statewide ELA STAR PM3 assessment in 2024, which would be an increase of 8%.

In 2023, 39% of second grade students scored below grade level, so 61% scored on or above grade level. Our goal is for 70% of the students in second grade to achieve at or above grade level on the statewide ELA STAR PM3 assessment in 2024, which would be an increase of 9%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 2023, 50% of third grade students scored below grade level, so 50% scored on or above grade level. Grade 3 students will achieve 60% (10% increase) of the students at or above grade level on the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA statewide assessment.

In 2023, 43% of fourth grade students scored below grade level, so 57% scored on or above grade level. Grade 4 students will achieve 60% (3% increase) of the students at or above grade level on the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA statewide assessment.

In 2023, 43% of fifth grade students scored below grade level, so 57% scored on or above grade level. Grade 5 students will achieve 60% (3% increase) of the students at or above grade level on the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA statewide assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administrators and academic coaches will conduct weekly walkthroughs during reading instruction to provide actionable feedback to teachers.

Monthly data meetings will be conducted by the School Support Team to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Intervention plans will be developed and implemented based on individual student data and monitored by the MTSS team.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Buxton, Toni, toni.buxton@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?

Apopka Elementary will focus on foundational skills to support reading for understanding in 1st and 2nd grade by developing awareness of the segments of speech and how they link to letters, teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. These skills are recommendations 2 and 3 of Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade from the IES Practice Guide Recommendations, which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements. The evidence-based programs and practices that will be used with 1st and 2nd grade students include foundational skills instructional lessons based on the BEST ELA Standards developed by the district, Heggerty lessons, SIPPS lessons, Being a Reader small group curriculum, Exact Path computer-based instructional program, and use of the district Multisensory kits.

Apopka Elementary will focus on foundational Skills to support reading for understanding in 3rd Grade. The specific focus in 3rd grade will be to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. These skills are recommendations 2 and 3 of Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade from the IES Practice Guide Recommendations, which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements. The evidence-based programs and practices that will be used with 3rd grade students include foundational skills instructional lessons based on the BEST ELA Standards developed by the district, SIPPS lessons, Being a Reader small group curriculum, Exact Path computer-based instructional program, and use of the district Multisensory kits.

In fourth and fifth grade, the focus will be on building students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly, and routinely using a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. Comprehension practices will include building students' world and word knowledge, providing them with opportunities to ask and answer questions about the text, teaching them a routine for determining the gist of a text, and teaching them to monitor their comprehension as they read. These skills are recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9 from the IES Practice Guide Recommendations, which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements. The evidence-based programs and practices that will be used with 4th and 5th grade students include reading comprehension instructional lessons based on the BEST ELA Standards developed by the district, SIPPS lessons, and Exact Path computer-based instructional program.

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 programs/practices described above use the IES Practice Guide Recommendations which meet ESSA's strong level of evidence. The use of daily instructional lesson plans with foundational skills and reading comprehension practice from the state-adopted ELA curriculum will meet recommendation 3, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. It will also meet the 4th and 5th grade recommendation 3, routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

The use of Heggerty phonemic awareness curriculum will meet recommendation 2, develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

The use of SIPPS intervention program will meet recommendation 3, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words, and recommendation 1, build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

The use of Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum will meet recommendation 2, develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; recommendation 3, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; recommendation 1, build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; recommendation 2, provide purposeful fluency building activities to help students read effortlessly; and recommendation 3, routinely use a set of comprehension building practices to help students make sense of the text.

The use of the district Multisensory Kits will meet recommendation 2, develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and recommendation 3, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

The use of Exact Path as an individualized computer-based instructional program in reading will meet recommendation 2, develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; recommendation 3, teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; recommendation 1, build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; recommendation 2, provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; and recommendation 3, routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

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
Professional Learning: Apopka Elementary will develop professional learning plans based on the needs of the school. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District professional development opportunities that will be included in these plans include, the Instructional Leadership Institute, literacy coach meetings, Being a Reader, SIPPS, Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction, and the ELA Impact Series for teachers.	Buxton, Toni, toni.buxton@ocps.net
Assessment: Apopka Elementary will use and analyze data collected from the FAST assessment, Heggerty assessments, district created Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), district created Foundational Unit Assessments, DIBELS (K-1), Being a Reader formative data, and SIPPS formative data. We will also use data to determine interventions and support the needs of students who are performing below grade level.	Buxton, Toni, toni.buxton@ocps.net
Literacy Leadership: Apopka Elementary will hold literacy leadership team meetings, during which data is analyzed and action steps planned and monitored. This team will work closely with our MTSS problem solving team.	Buxton, Toni, toni.buxton@ocps.net