Orange County Public Schools

Orange Center Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Orange Center Elementary

621 S TEXAS AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

https://orangecenteres.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 an 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
Brooks, Fredrick	Principal	The principal's primary duties/responsibilities are to promote and maintain the highest level of academic, social and emotional achievement for all students by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing, and communicating information to enforce school, District, and State policies. The principal; maintains a safe school environment, coordinates site activities and communicates information to staff, students, parents, and community members. The principal is responsible for interviewing, hiring and supervising school employees to ensure the highest performance standards.
Albert, Erin	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal (AP) supports the principal in the overall administrative operations of the school. The AP assists the principal in providing instructional leadership to staff, including curriculum planning, review and implementation as well as professional development. The role also includes helping to ensure the overall safety and wellbeing of students, staff, and school visitors; supports in school discipline, and enforces school, district, and state policies
Robinson, Deedra	School Counselor	To provide assistance and developmentally appropriate lessons for students regarding their social, emotional, and intellectual growth that interfere with their educational or personal development.
Cerkiewicz, Breanne	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach is a reading and writing resource for our teachers and provides support in a nonjudgmental way. Most of the coach's time is spent working directly with teachers. When working with teachers, the ELA coach is focused on interpreting the standards, assessment data, planning, instruction, demonstration, collaboration, observation and peer feedback

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.

When creating the 23-24 SIP surveys from staff, students and parents were used in order to ensure all voices are represented. Leadership team members, parents and community members were brought together to review school data and create an action plan for growth.

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))

SIP Monitoring:
The 23-24 school improvement plan will be monitored through:
*Weekly PLC Meetings
*Data Meetings
*Classroom Walk Throughs
*Coaching Cycles
*Corrective Programs District Support
*SAC/PTA Meetings
*Small Groups of Lowest 30%

Using the different pathways above, the SIP will be discussed weekly as we examine daily practices in our pursuit of growth. A schedule of classroom walkthroughs will allow for a collection of students understanding as well as teacher output. Once information is obtained, we will use it to increase student understanding and output through PLC and data meetings ensuring rigor is in place to move achievement upward.

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	98%
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: B 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	5	7	12	16	6	12	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	12
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	6	14	10	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	6	5	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	12	22	14	0	0	0	0	54

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	2	2	17	15	5	0	0	0	41

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	23	18	15	21	25	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	23	18	15	21	25	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	38	57	53	38	56	56	24		
ELA Learning Gains				63			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			20		
Math Achievement*	52	60	59	56	46	50	26		
Math Learning Gains				79			17		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			10		
Science Achievement*	37	63	54	45	61	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	59	59	27			53		

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	213
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
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	427
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	10	Yes	4	4
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT				
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	5	Yes	3	3
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

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	38			52			37					53
SWD	6			13							2	
ELL	25			25							3	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			52			39				4	
HSP	39			50							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	36			51			32				5	46

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	38	63	55	56	79	64	45					27
SWD	0			9								
ELL	60			80								27
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	65	53	54	77	58	47					
HSP	36	50		64	81							30
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	59	52	53	77	60	42					

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	24	26	20	26	17	10	32					53
SWD				10								
ELL	25			18								53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	24		25	12		32					
HSP	26			30								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

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
FRL	26	29		26	18	10	35					42

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	28%	54%	-26%	54%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	60%	-3%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	52%	-21%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	55%	-25%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	59%	-27%	51%	-19%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the latest performance was Science at 36% proficiency. Orange Center's historical average over the last three years was 40% (45%, 32%, 45%). Analyzing this year's data there were a few factors that contributed to the data dropping most importantly being students not reading on grade level. Other trends include a lack of knowledge of science content as well as science being taught with rigor throughout all grade levels.

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

The area that took the biggest decline was Science with 9%. Factors contributing were the reading proficiency of the fifth-grade students as well as the culmination of science background knowledge. There was also a transition of teachers are the beginning of the school year.

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

The greatest gap in comparison to is Science with a 15% gap between our school average of 36% and the state average of 51%. The correlation is the ELA proficiency of those same students falling at 32%. Due to the gap in reading proficiency, we see it reflected in science.

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

The component showing the most improvement was 3% increase in math proficiency. Factors that helped increase student achievement in math were tier one interventionalists in each grade level, increase in small group instruction in math as well as a separate math intervention time built into the schedule.

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

Two areas of potential concern are the number of students with 10% or more absences and students with significant reading deficiencies. Both of these lend themselves to students with significant gaps in learning that must be filled.

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

1. Rigorous standards-based instruction in 100% of classrooms.
2.Increased focus on meaningful intervention, differentiated by student need with a focus on lowest 25% and learning gains.
3. Increased science knowledge throughout K-5 classrooms, including increase of hands-on, project-based learning in STEM rooms.
4. Planning and delivering of lessons through PLCs and data meetings looking at all aspects of the classroom (instruction, classroom management, MTSS needs and assessment data)
5.Utilization of MTSS coach and guidance counselor to ensure the needs of the "whole child" are being met through mental and behavioral health needs.

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

By May of 2024, teacher retention will increase by 5% from 54% to 59% at Orange Center Elementary due to practices put into place for teachers to have open communication with administration throughout the school year.

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

Teacher retention will grow by 5% from the previous year with teachers returning to Orange Center Elementary for the 24-25 school year.

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

Monitoring will be conducted through:
Panorama Data (staff survey)
Bagels with Brooks (an open forum for teachers to share their thoughts)
Tiger Together (monthly staff community building)
Staff Recognition (weekly via Brooks Bulletin)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@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.)

Throughout the school year, Orange Center will implement different methods to increase morale and sense of belonging. Throughout our different staff forums we will increase contact with teachers of ESE students to ensure that they are supported with those students.

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

Increase in retention leads to consistency and building capacity amongst the staff.

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.

Use different types of check-ins with teachers to ensure teachers are moving in ther right direction.
-Bagels with Brooks
-Tigers Together
-Differentiated Professional Development

Person Responsible: Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

Using extra hour and FBS time, Orange Center will focus on differentiated small group instruction to intervene early and close the achievement gap of the lowest 25% of students. An intense focus on students with disabilities will be in place to identify, differentiate and identify gaps in learning while using the MTSS process to identify areas of growth and deficits.

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

To achieve a school grade of "A" for the 2023-2024 school year the following outcomes will be achieved: By May 2023, ELA & Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will reach 65% in both reading and math.

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

Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom walkthroughs and analyzing data. The data analyzed for this area of focus will be:
-2022- 2023 PM3
-2023-2024 PM1 and PM2
-Extra Hour Intentional Intervention
-SIPPS
-OCPS Common Assessments
-Oral Reading Fluency
-Exact Path
-Success Maker
-Voyager

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@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.)

Throughout the school year, data meetings will take place to place a continued focus on the bottom 25% of students. This will allow for adjustments in instruction to take place as needed. Students will also move through the MTSS process as needed to identify the areas of gaps in learning.
-Identification of students
-Monitoring of progress through small group instruction, intervention and MTSS
-Monitoring use and productivity in Exact Path and Success Maker

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

In reflection of our 2023 FAST data,60% of students scored below proficiency in ELA and 40% scored below proficiency in math in grades three through five.

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

<div style="background:#e5c98a;padding:4px">

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.

</div>

Classroom walkthroughs during intervention and extra hour times.

Person Responsible: Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)

By When: Each Week

Meaningful data meetings focused on the bottom 25% and SWD

Person Responsible: Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

Professional Development on Exact Path and Success Maker

Person Responsible: Breanne Cerkiewicz (breanne.cerkiewicz@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

When comparing science FCAT score to the previous school year, overall proficiency decreased 9% to 36%.

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

By Spring of 2024, 65% of fifth grade students will score proficiency or higher on the science SSA.

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

Monitoring will be completed through the quarterly PMA assessments. Growth will also be monitored through science common assessments and Study Island.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@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.)

Targeted planning through weekly planning meetings will be used to fully understand the standards and implementation with rigor. Science content knowledge will be built kindergarten through fifth grade with hands-on integration in all STEM classes.

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

Common planning and plans for implementation of standards are essential to rigorous instruction. Intervention will be used to teach reading through science for those students who show readiness.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Provide common planning throughout the week for teachers to deepen understanding of standards and instruction.

Person Responsible: Tamara Preston (tamara.preston@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

Professional Development for STEM teachers K-5 to build science background knowledge

Person Responsible: Tamara Preston (tamara.preston@ocps.net)

By When: Spring 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

The area of focus is specific to increasing proficiency in ELA and on grade level reading across all grade levels .

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

By May of 2024, ELA FAST will show an increase of at least 10 percentage points from 40% (22-23) to 50% proficiency overall and 60% proficiency when looking solely at third grade.

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

ELA proficiency and grade level reading will be monitored through a multitude of data sources:
-2022-2023 FAST PM3
-2023-2024 FAST PM1 and PM2
-Exact Path
-Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations
-District Standards Based Common Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@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.)

Throughout the school year we will be using our extra hour time and ELA intervention times to pinpoint and differentiate students needs. Exact Path will be tracked weekly to show progress over time.

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

Using a mapped out plan for Exact Path and small group instruction we will be able to close gaps in learning throughout the ELA block and extra hour time. Students with disabilities will be specifically monitored on their accomplishments on their reading IEP goals as well as reviewed in data meetings.

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.

Conduct professional development on differentiation and intervention.

Person Responsible: Fredrick Brooks (fredrick.brooks@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

Conduct weekly progress monitoring of student performance through collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Breanne Cerkiewicz (breanne.cerkiewicz@ocps.net)
By When: Weekly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School improvement funding allocations were reviewed with staff, parents and SAC committee to ensure understanding and development of a solid plan. A focus on foundational reading in K-2 will lend itself to a higher level of readers in third grade. Our ESE students have been provided with the following additional supports:
-Behavior Specialist- to ensure students' behavioral and social skills needs are met
-Tier One teachers and support staff pushing into classes to support small group instruction of students
-Parent engagement liaison to assist with parent communication and understanding
-Newsletters- Weekly newsletters with tracking of ESE parent involvement

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

-Teacher students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge.
-Develop 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.

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

-Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
-Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly
-Routine use of a set of comprehension building practices to help students make sense of the text.

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

55% of K-2 students will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

65% of 3-5 students will score a level three or higher on the standardized, statewide ELA 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.

-Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators
-Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS team and Cadre leadership with review of FAST PM, K-1 DIBLES, SIPPS progress monitoring and standards based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention

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

Brooks, Fredrick, fredrick.brooks@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?

Yes, all programs meet the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in grades K-5.

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?

-Use of foundational pieces of the optional daily slides.
-Use of comprehension pieces of the optional daily slides
-Develop awareness of segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters through Heggerty
-SIPPS program through small group and extra hour
-Being a reader small group curriculum

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
Monthly Literacy leadership team meeting, where data is analyzed and action steps are implemented and monitored.	Brooks, Fredrick, fredrick.brooks@ocps.net
Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLCs planning. Literacy Coach also is MTSS coach and plays a role in the process.	Cerkiewicz, Breanne, breanne.cerkiewicz@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.

During the 23-24 school year the SIP and budget information will be shared in numerous ways. SAC committee meetings, school/parent surveys, Title One meetings and parent conferences will all allow us to share the goals for the school year and the program we are making throughout the year. A copy of the focus areas will also be available in multiple languages on the school website and in the front office.

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))

During the 23-24 school year, we are taking a bigger step towards better communication between parents, community and faculty members to increase school culture. This will be done through the Family Engagement Plan located on the school website and in the front office. Our PEL (Parent Engagement Liaison) will also hold Parent Workshops and activities this year to engage families in their children's learning. This will include Title One Meetings, Skyward informational meetings, FAST nights and different curriculum nights to draw in families to the learning process.

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 strengthen academic programs throughout the school, OCE will ensure that every minute of instruction is thoughtfully planned out through PLC meetings, Common Planning and Data Chats. Discussions will be had about specific students, their needs and how best to close achievement gaps. During intervention times, focus will be turned to tier 2 and tier 3 individual needs to enrich standards that have been mastered and intervene when there are gaps in student learning.

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))

Not Applicable

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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$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