Aloma Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Aloma Elementary

2949 SCARLET RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

www.alomaes.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
Vega, Donald	Principal	-Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning, and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to facilities, budget, personnel, materials, and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement -Oversees high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups -Supports MTSS through PLC team collaboration while leading teachers to a common goal of student achievement -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Monitors classroom walk-through frequency and pinpoints areas of support with the leadership team for coaching -Develops documents necessary to manage and display data that addresses areas of focus identified in the SIP -Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed
Compton, Emily	Assistant Principal	-Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff -Supports MTSS through PLC team collaboration while leading teachers to a common goal of student achievement -Monitors implementation of intervention support and documentation -Provides adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Communicate with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities -Handles all discipline -Develops documents necessary to manage and display data that addresses areas of focus identified in the SIP -Monitors classroom walk-through frequency and pinpoints areas of support with the leadership team for coaching - Assists with school screening programs that provide appropriate, evidence-based intervention and differentiated teaching strategies
Engler, Nicole	Staffing Specialist	-Serves as the school liaison for ESE and identifies specific students for ESE testing -Identifies students for evaluation and determines students that may need a behavior/discipline plan -Facilitates IEP team meetings with parents and teachers -Monitors and disaggregates ESE students' reading/math data, maintains data, and works closely with the school psychologist and school social worker

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Monitors compliance regarding the development and implementation of IEP plans: as well as remains informed of current policies and procedures as they relate to students with disabilities
Meredith, Morgan	School Counselor	-Provides a developmental, systematic comprehensive program addressing the academic, career, and interpersonal/social needs of all students -In partnership with other educators, parents, and the community, the guidance counselor ensures that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to become effective students, responsible citizens, productive workers, and lifelong learners -Measures student competencies in the areas of academic and interpersonal/ social development -Monitors student progress, identifies opportunities for improvement each year based on results data, and share the successes of the program and areas of growth with stakeholders -Integral member of the school resiliency team providing site-based professional development
Thornburgh, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	-Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and data-driven instruction -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA and Math Plan -Assists in data analysis professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regard to data-based instructional planning -Supports the implementation and documentation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with teachers during PLCs to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP; supports common planning -Facilitates Tier III intervention groups
Lufkin, Lauren	Curriculum Resource Teacher	-Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs -Assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk" -Assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and data-driven instruction -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA and Math Plan -Assists in data analysis, professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regard to data-based instructional planning -Supports the implementation and documentation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with teachers to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP; supports common planning -Designated testing coordinator for all school-wide, district, and state assessments
Quinonez, Priscilla	ELL Compliance Specialist	- Monitors ELL students and ensures that teachers are using appropriate ELL strategies to safeguard student success

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		- Facilitates Imagine Learning, MPLC and grade level ELL support -Conducts meetings based on IEP dates and ELL guidelines -Organizes, trains and administers WIDA Access for ELL testing -Collaborates with MTSS coordinator to cross reference students needing support -Collaborates with teachers to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP; supports common planning

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.

Each year, OCPS provides the opportunity for parents, teachers, staff, and students to provide feedback through the Panorama Survey. The information collected through this process allows the leadership team to make decisions regarding school climate, school safety, professional development, and resources, as well as address barriers to engagement.

At the beginning of the school year, the Panorama results are shared with teachers and staff to analyze trends. This year, we will continue to focus on students' perceptions of school climate. This topic was Aloma's lowest area in the Spring of 2022. Although school climate was Aloma's greatest increase or Spring 2023, the staff and faculty feel there is still room for improvement. Members of school staff were identified and met to devise a plan to address students' perceptions of school culture. The school guidance counselor and classroom teachers will provide resiliency lessons and utilize a survey to gauge the students' perception of the school climate. Based on the results of the survey, the action plan will be modified as needed.

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))

Student data is monitored and discussed regularly throughout the year to see how the implementation of the SIP plan is impacting student achievement. Every nine weeks, grade-level data chats occur in order to monitor progress in meeting the outcomes of the areas of focus. In addition, individual teachers will meet with the school leadership team in regard to individual student data to ensure appropriate interventions are in place if needed. As part of the MTSS process, these chats will allow members to determine if the specific targeted intervention is working, and if not, then an intervention change may need to be made to ensure achievement gaps are being addressed. Through this explicit and systematic approach, individual student needs are identified and addressed through a multi-tier approach.

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	78%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	2	27	24	21	21	25	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	8
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	1	22	17	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	19	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	13	24	22	0	0	0	0	71

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	9	5	10	25	15	0	0	0	64

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	2	7	15	14	22	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	3	13	3	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	14	34	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	10	26	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	20	15	22	0	0	0	57

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	1	2	7	20	17	22	0	0	0	69

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	2	7	15	14	22	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	3	13	3	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	14	34	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	10	26	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	20	15	22	0	0	0	57

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	1	2	7	20	17	22	0	0	0	69

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	57	57	53	57	56	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				67			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71			24		
Math Achievement*	57	60	59	62	46	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				70			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			25		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	63	54	48	61	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	59	59	62			60		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	48			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	59			

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	57			57			59					67
SWD	34			25			20				3	
ELL	49			54			36				5	67
AMI												
ASN	92			100							2	
BLK	44			44			40				4	
HSP	50			50			38				5	70
MUL	64			55							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			70			94				4	
FRL	46			44			47				5	70

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	57	67	71	62	70	50	48					62
SWD	17	42	47	29	46	25	6					60
ELL	50	69	67	64	77	64	46					62
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	45	68	58	49	50	23	44					
HSP	51	67	71	55	73	72	44					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	57		77	80		61					
FRL	48	70	78	52	66	56	42					56

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	58	38	24	52	36	25	49					60
SWD	18			23								
ELL	53	56		52	44		65					60

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
AMI												
ASN	100			85								
BLK	43			37								
HSP	53	33	20	46	31		47					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	33		60	40		53					
FRL	42	24	23	35	22	31	22					68

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	53%	54%	-1%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%

			MATH				
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	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 the 2023 state assessment data, the lowest performing areas are 2nd grade ELA at 46% and ELA proficiency at 59% for grades 3 through 5.

Although the 3-5 ELA proficiency went up two points from the previous year, there was very little growth in our 5th grade ELA scores from PM1 to PM3 which attributed to the small increase overall. A contributing factor to this was a limited capacity to plan and implement differentiated instruction to address foundational skill deficits.

Second grade also had very little growth from MOY to EOY as seen in their FAST data. Contributing factors for this are a lack of consistency in monitoring and adjusting instruction to meet the varied needs of students in reading.

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

Aloma's only decline was 3-5 math proficiency. Two factors contributed to math proficiency dropping 1 percentage point going from 62% to 61%. One factor that contributed to this was the loss of the two interventionists who supported fifth-grade math. Unlike 3rd and 4th grade, the 5th grade team did not have Tier 1 support in math for the majority of the school year. The second factor was the SWD subgroup in 5th grade scoring 10% proficiency. Conversely, the 3rd grade SWD subgroup scored 25% proficiency and the 4th grade SWD subgroup scored 50% proficiency.

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 5th-grade math proficiency had the greatest gap compared to the state average. The state was at 55% proficiency and Aloma was at 52% proficiency. One of the factors that contributed to this gap was the loss of the two interventionists who supported the math teachers in providing math instruction using a small group rotational model. While the 3rd and 4th grades had Tier 1 support, the 5th-grade team supported students with limited Tier 1 support. In addition, Alomas' SWD subgroup overall scored 30% proficiency in math. The 5th grade SWD subgroup scored 10% proficiency. A factor in this gap is the lack of computational math skills within the subgroup. As evident by trend data, Aloma continues to close the gap for 5th-grade math proficiency. In 2021, 5th-grade math proficiency was 42%. In 2022, we grew to 51%. Now, for 2023, we are at 57% proficiency.

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

Fifth-grade science proficiency went up 11 points from the previous year from 48% to 59%. This was due to strategic planning and standards-based instruction, utilizing new science resources, integrating science topics into ELA rotations, and providing additional support to the 5th team by our resource teachers.

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

Based on the EWS data, one area of concern is the amount of students in 3rd and 4th grade that have a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Focus on standards-based small group instruction for ELA and Math
2. Build teacher capacity to align instruction to BEST state standards and appropriately plan for rigor and differentiation within Tier I
3. Purposeful planning, monitoring, and adjusting of the walk-to intervention program to support growth in ELA
4. Professional learning communities and common planning to analyze, discuss, and plan for standards-based instructional and individual student needs
5. Student data tracking tools for students to set goals and monitor progress towards these goals

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 Other

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

The area of focus is to increase students' positive perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school. Based on the Panorama results from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, school climate is still an area of focus for the student survey at Aloma. In 2021-2022, 55% of students shared a favorable rating of school climate, and in 2022-2023, 72% of students shared a favorable rating of school climate. This demonstrates a 17% increase. When diving deeper into student responses one key question only showed a 2% increase from 2022 (56%) to 2023 (58%).

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

Utilizing the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, Aloma Elementary will increase 3% to 75% favorability within the school climate section of the student survey.

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

Students' perceptions will be tracked utilizing Google surveys. Students will take surveys after character lessons from the school's guidance counselor. In November, current data will be analyzed and the action plan will be adjusted as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Vega (donald.vega@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 school counselor will use OCPS' Child Safety Matters lessons throughout the school year with students to reinforce life skills. In addition, teachers will utilize lessons from Second Step during their health block.

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

In order to achieve academic growth, it is necessary to provide students with skills to navigate daily challenges and reach personal fulfillment. As a result, the climate and learning environment are strengthened leading to a positive setting for learning and academic growth.

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.

Aloma classroom teachers will deliver life skill lessons during the health block. The school guidance counselor will also provide lessons and utilize a survey to gauge the students' perception of the school climate. Based on the results of the survey, our action plan will be modified as needed.

Person Responsible: Morgan Meredith (morgan.parker@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023, Google survey. February 2024, Student Panorama survey.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Aloma Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic engagement strategies. There is a need to differentiate small group instruction to support Tier II and Tier III MTSS students. A continuum of Tier II and Tier III researched-based
resources and assessments will be used to vigorously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing our staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces proper data collection, progress monitoring, and data analysis, we ensure that students' individual needs are met. is to accelerate student performance by increasing the overall proficiency of the ESSA subgroup,

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

Increase the overall ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 37% to a 41% minimum proficiency as outlined in the Every Student Success Act.

Increase the overall math proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 30% to a 41% minimum proficiency as outlined in the Every Student Success Act.

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

The Students with Disabilities, ESSA subgroup, will be routinely monitored during weekly Professional Learning Communities to ensure small group instruction is specifically targeted to meet the individual needs of all students. Identified students will work with a designated staff member during intervention time. In addition, a Tier I core instruction teacher will be assigned to strengthen core instruction. A monthly progress report will be created to monitor students toward individual IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Vega (donald.vega@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.)

Aloma will implement school-wide interventions in both ELA and Math utilizing SIPPS, which is a researched, evidence-based intervention program for ELA. Number Worlds, SAAVAS Intervention Resources, and Successmaker will be utilized for math.

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

OCPS has adopted these programs as a means to support school-based intervention initiatives. They play a pivotal role in narrowing the educational gap for students who possess substantial foundational deficiencies in both ELA and math.

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.

Collaboration between ESE and non-ESE teachers to support student learning through intensive standards-based reading and math instruction. Collaboration will occur once a month during PLCs and coverage will be provided for the ESE teacher to attend. The focus will be on adapting instruction and developing materials to match the unique learning styles and strengths of the students. The effectiveness will be monitored by teachers and leadership staff utilizing common assessment and FAST progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

By When:

Monthly data meetings with the leadership team to monitor the implementation of instruction as assessed through common assessments. Trend data will allow students to be identified for Tier II interventions as part of the initial MTSS process. Interventions are then implemented in both small groups and FBS.

Person Responsible: Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

By When:

Implement common planning sessions and data-driven professional learning communities to enable teachers to collaborate effectively and identify educational trends. This action step empowers educators to make timely adjustments to instruction and interventions based on their collective insights and analysis of student data.

Person Responsible: Donald Vega (donald.vega@ocps.net)

By When:

#3. 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.

Aloma Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic engagement strategies. There is a need to differentiate the small group instruction to support Tier II and Tier III MTSS students.

ELA proficiency was at 59 percentage points and Math proficiency was at 62 percentage points. A continuum of Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to vigorously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing our staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces proper data collection, progress monitoring, and data analysis, we ensure that students' individual needs are met.

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

By the end of the school year, students will demonstrate a 5% increase in proficiency on the FAST ELA and math assessments.

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

1. The leadership team will support teachers during weekly PLCs to analyze formative assessment data and develop data-informed lesson plans and learning tasks. Teams will also analyze intervention data to make sure all students are showing success in closing gaps and make adjustments where needed to support all learners through the structured literacy approach and math initiatives.
2. The leadership team will meet weekly to debrief on grade-level data, PLC meetings, and review PLC notes to ensure the implementation of complex texts, and standards-aligned tasks as well as planned text-dependent questions.
3. Weekly classroom walkthrough observations will help ensure the fidelity of the implementation.
4. Data meetings will indicate if students are progressing through standards-based assessments and provide teachers time to discuss student data and make adjustments.
5. The leadership team will review of school-wide data spreadsheet monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Compton (emily.compton@ocps.net)

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

During Success TIme (Intervention), teachers will utilize SIPPS, Reading A-Z, and Wonders intervention to address individual student needs in ELA and SAVVAS intervention resources and Successmaker for math.

During the ELA block, teachers will utilize explicit systematic instruction.

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

OCPS has adopted these programs as a means to support school-based intervention initiatives. They play a pivotal role in narrowing the educational gap for students who possess substantial foundational

deficiencies in both ELA and math.

Explicit systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. This strategy is effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including ELL and ESE 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.

1. Analyze ELA and math data from FAST progress monitoring assessments throughout the year.
2. Identify students who are below proficiency and on the threshold of proficiency and provide support and resources.
3. Provide professional development on FAST progress monitoring reports to use for grouping students to meet their needs.
4. Monitor and adjust Success Time (Intervention) groups utilizing FAST and intervention progress monitoring data.
5. Conduct data chats with teachers monthly to review growth and areas that need support.

Person Responsible: Emily Compton (emily.compton@ocps.net)

By When:

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).

Aloma Elementary reviews the use of resources that are allocated through general funds and those funds dedicated to school improvement activities. The deficiencies most notable include lack of time and/or people may have been a barrier to student achievement. These deficiencies are addressed through planning and learning processes offered in after-school opportunities for teachers to become more familiar with standards, content, and the pedagogical practices needed to increase student achievement.

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

PM3 FAST data indicated that 60% of kindergarten students scored on or above grade level. First-grade students scored 62% on or above grade level and second-grade scored 46% on or above grade level.

Our areas of focus are to establish weekly ELA PLCs facilitated by our instructional coach. The teams will utilize the curriculum resource materials to discuss standards-aligned instruction and student tasks. They will examine best practices, collaborate with teammates and coaches, and identify possible misconceptions in student learning. Student data will be reviewed to drive instructional decisions and address learning gaps. A big emphasis will be on the science of reading targeting early foundational skills such as phonemic awareness and phonics.

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

The 2023-2024 proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows:
1. In 3rd grade, 56% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
2. In 4th grade, 63% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
3. In 5th grade, 57% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
1) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on

track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
2) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
3) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 64% of tested students in grades 3-5 will achieve a proficient score on the state assessment which is an increase of 7 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
1) By the end of the year, 62% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of 6 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
2) By the end of the year, 67% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of four percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
3) By the end of the year, 62% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of five percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

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.

Aloma Elementary will use the beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through FAST as well as the Exact Path instructional tool. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data from the Standards-based Unit Assessments and data gained from documented MTSS interventions provided to students at Tier II and Tier III levels through such programs as SIPPS and Heggerty. Monthly data meetings will
occur with grade-level teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made in order to monitor response to intervention. Weekly walkthroughs by administrators will occur to observe the teaching and learning processes including foundational skills and reading interventions.

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

Compton, Emily , emily.compton@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?

Aloma Elementary will use evidence-based programs such as Heggerty, Exact Path, and SIPPS for instruction and monitoring. The school will align with the district's expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted
professional development, and differentiated instruction for students needing Tier II and Tier III support. The school will use the district-approved streamlined walkthrough tool weekly to monitor instruction and identify trends.

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 following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with appropriate educational programs like that of Heggerty, SIPPS, and Exact Path meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA
subgroups:
-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
-SIPPS (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.)

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
Standards-Based Unit Assessment data will be reviewed after each instructional unit to determine learning gains, misconceptions, and learning gaps; ExactPath, progress monitoring, SIPPS, and STAR data will be reviewed quarterly. - Literacy Leadership- Leadership members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made. - Literacy Coaching- The literacy coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content. - Assessment- Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and making adjustments to future lessons. EOY and FSA data are being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the groups as changes are being made in the data. - Professional Learning- Available in SIPPS, Heggerty, and BEST standards.	Vega, Donald, donald.vega@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.

Aloma Elementary is a non-Title school.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Aloma Elementary is a non-Title I school.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	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