

Orange County Public Schools

Shenandoah Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Shenandoah Elementary

4827 S CONWAY RD, Orlando, FL 32812

<https://shenandoahes.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
Houghton, Desiree	Principal	The principal, Desiree Houghton, functions as the instructional leader for the staff and stakeholders. In this role, she ensures standards-based instruction, implements school and district initiatives, facilitates teacher and student growth, monitors the effectiveness of instructions and interventions, and supports her leadership team to certify all aspects of the school are operating as efficiently and effectively as possible. Desiree Houghton ensures that her leadership team is analyzing data to identify student needs. Through her leadership and supervision, the team implements common planning with fidelity and effectiveness. Furthermore, she provides opportunities for differentiated professional learning opportunities via grade level Professional Learning Communities. The principal collaborates with her instructional leaders to implement the Positive Behavior Support Committee to promote a safe, collaborative school environment.
Saslov, Joy	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach (Joy Saslov) facilitates and guides teachers in data analysis and planning effective, research-based instruction via Professional Learning Community meetings. She also conducts lesson modeling, promotes teacher growth through the coaching cycle, and collaborates with staff to develop instructional and behavioral plans that certify children have a rigorous and safe learning environment. All members of the leadership team collaborate daily to analyze data and identify trends in classrooms. Joy facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) which are held one time a week to assist teachers with strategic planning, integrating Marzano strategies, and developing/implementing formative assessments based on the state standards. The team highlights and celebrates successes and studies data to identify areas of concern. Together, the team develops an action plan to address weaknesses. Through shared leadership, the team builds teacher capacity and increases student achievement.
Gromlich, Ilona	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The curriculum resource teacher (Ilona Gromlich), facilitates and guides teachers in data analysis and planning effective, research-based instruction via Professional Learning Community meetings. She also conducts lesson modeling, promotes teacher growth through the coaching cycle, and collaborates with staff to develop instructional and behavioral plans that certify children have a rigorous and safe learning environment. All members of the leadership team collaborate daily to analyze data and identify trends in classrooms. Ilona facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) which are held one time a week to assist teachers with strategic planning, integrating Marzano strategies, and developing/implementing formative assessments based on the state standards. The team highlights and celebrates successes and studies data to identify areas of concern. Together, the team develops an action plan to address weaknesses. Through shared leadership, the team builds teacher capacity and increases student achievement.
Houle, Angela	Assistant Principal	Ms. Houle, Assistant Principal, works to support the vision and mission of Shenandoah

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Elementary. She provides guidance for the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Ms. Houle is an instructional leader working to support the needs of all students at Shenandoah. Through her leadership and supervision, she is able to ensure quality instruction. As the MTSS coordinator, she implements research-aligned interventions to close gaps in learning. She monitors the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community.

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.

Our School improvement plan will be presented to the SAC for input and approval to provide staff, parents, and the community an opportunity to participate in the process.

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))

Shenandoah will collect multiple sources of data to monitor the effective implementation of our school improvement plan. Data include student formative/summative assessments, classroom walk-through, PLC minutes, and school panorama survey data. These sources will provide an analysis of the impact on instruction and school climate.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	12	23	17	15	11	12	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	11	
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	5	18	20	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	23	22	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	14	11	21	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	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	29	14	14	18	23	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	29	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	28	0	0	0	43	
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	8	27	0	0	0	35

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	29	14	14	18	23	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	29	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	28	0	0	0	43	
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	8	27	0	0	0	35

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	57	53	58	56	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				63			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			72		
Math Achievement*	46	60	59	64	46	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				69			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			25		
Science Achievement*	51	63	54	56	61	59	55		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	40	59	59	55			42		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	228
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	1	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	1	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
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	67			
FRL	35	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	51			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	53			

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	44			46			51					40
SWD	22			18			11				4	
ELL	31			31			37				5	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			18			8				3	
HSP	34			41			42				5	40

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	63			61			81				4	
FRL	34			36			38				5	34

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	58	63	48	64	69	66	56					55
SWD	27	47	56	41	67	67	45					54
ELL	41	60	56	59	71	81	35					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	57		38	43							
HSP	48	56	48	56	69	67	40					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	73		83	76		83					
FRL	44	56	43	51	66	64	43					55

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	60	64	72	57	49	25	55					42
SWD	31	45		45	30	18	35					18
ELL	44	65		40	39	20	38					42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			43								
HSP	52	60	64	46	42	14	47					41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	80		79	80		83					

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	43	52	77	42	32	24	34					32

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	41%	54%	-13%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	62%	-16%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	59%	-13%	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 upon the 2022 FAST PM3 results, the lowest performance was with only 45% of students achieving ELA proficiency. A contributing factor to last year's low performance was the lack of time spent analyzing formative data to make timely adjustments to instruction and teacher data efficacy. This trend helped to contribute to a lower PM3 as compared to the district average.

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

According to 2022 FAST results, the greatest decline was in overall math proficiency in grades three to five. Factors that contributed to the decline include teacher understanding of new benchmarks/resources, lack of effective small group instruction, and lack of use for formative data.

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

According to the FAST data, the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA proficiency. Lack of differentiated instruction and strategic usage of small group instruction for our SWD and ELL students hindered their proficiency levels. Increased data analysis and use of high yield instructional strategies should have occurred more regularly. Shenandoah will be more strategic in providing small group instruction to meet individual students' needs. Professional development on data analysis and high yield instructional strategies will occur during PLC.

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

While there was not an increase between the prior year's FSA to the new FAST assessment, there was the greatest growth from PM1 to PM3 in our third-grade ELA data. Proficiency grew 33 percent between assessments. The team began analyzing formative data in PLC and using the data to provide targeted small-group instruction.

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

Reflecting on the EWS, a top priority will be addressing the needs of students scoring level 1 in reading and math. Another concern is student attendance. Twenty percent of our students were absent for 10 or more school days.

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

Our highest priority for school improvement for the 2023-2024 school year is increasing proficiency in ELA and math. The priority order is as follows:

1. Implement standards-aligned and differentiated small group instruction
2. Use data literacy to inform instruction
3. Retain trained and mentored teachers.

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.

Based on our Spring 2023 Panorama teacher survey results, an area that needs improvement is school climate. Specifically, teachers reported a rating of 56 percent favorable with regard to support of new initiatives and feedback on job performance. These findings support the area of teacher retention. We experienced 30 percent teacher turnover.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to increase the overall school climate rating to 80 percent favorable based on our Spring 2024 Panorama survey. Additionally, we would like to increase the subsection of support for new initiatives to at least 75 percent favorable.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur using our classroom walkthrough tool and iObservation. Teacher input will be collected through informal coaching surveys and scheduled Panorama surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@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.)

Our school leadership team will increase support for new initiatives through on-going job embedded professional learning via PLCs. We have adjusted the schedules of our instructional coaches to prioritize coaching cycle sessions and quality feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the 2022 Panorama data, only 56 percent of teachers felt supported in new initiatives and feedback. Student achievement and teacher retention will improve when highly effective teachers feel they are supported and competent in new initiatives and can meet the needs of all 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.

Provide teachers with professional development in new initiatives through PLC. Additionally, select teachers will attend IMPACT in September and November/December.

Person Responsible: Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@ocps.net)

By When: Professional development will begin August 15 and continue throughout the year in our PLC.

Provide classroom coaching through the coaching cycle and provide immediate in-person feedback.

Person Responsible: Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

By When: Classroom walkthroughs will begin August 15, 2023 and continue throughout the year.

Collect data to monitor the effectiveness of professional learning via classroom walkthroughs, surveying teachers for feedback and panorama data.

Person Responsible: Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning August 15, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to 2022 FAST data, 46 percent of students showed proficiency in ELA. Student achievement will improve by focusing on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of the majority of students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023-2024, our overall ELA proficiency will increase by at least 14 percent as evidenced by the FAST assessment data.

Monitoring:

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

Shenandoah will monitor student progress through multiple sources of data individualized for each student. This data is then compiled, analyzed at weekly meetings, and instruction will be adjusted to include scaffolds that support students' needs. Furthermore, walkthroughs will occur daily to ensure teachers are differentiating their instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@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.)

Teachers will be provided with focused professional development in implementing the science of reading through small group, differentiated instruction. Professional learning will also focus on data literacy and how to analyze data to inform instruction. This will assist in increasing proficiency by increasing teacher knowledge of effective, systematic instruction in reading and data usage. Furthermore, MTSS interventions will include proper diagnostics to ensure students needs are met and weekly progress monitoring/data review will occur.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By targeting the individual needs of our students, overall student achievement will increase for all grades 3-5. For all students to be successful, instruction often needs to be differentiated. Also, by focusing on the MTSS process, we will target all students' learning needs.

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.

In August, the leadership team will begin weekly data meetings to increase teacher's data literacy and ensure instructional adjustments are made in a timely manner.

Person Responsible: Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@ocps.net)

By When: On-going beginning in August

Provide professional development opportunities in literacy instruction with an emphasis on differentiation and specific strategies to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Desiree Houghton (desiree.hitchmon-houghton@ocps.net)

By When: September, On-going

Provide an overview of the MTSS process with an emphasis on the new screening assessments adopted by the county and proper diagnostic assessments to identify student gaps.

Person Responsible: Angela Houle (angela.houle@ocps.net)

By When: Start of September

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

In kindergarten % of students are not on track to meet grade level proficiency on the statewide ELA assessment. In first grade % of students were not on track to reach reading proficiency. In second grade % of students are not on track to reach grade level proficiency on the statewide ELA assessment. The focus will be on teaching students to decode words, analyze parts of words, and write and recognize words.

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

Fifty-six percent of third-grade students, fifty-five percent of fourth-grade students, and fifty-eight percent of fifth-grade students scored below level 3 according to the statewide ELA assessment. The focus will be on routinely using 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

Our goal is that the students gain at least 15 percentage points from from PM1 and PM3 as measured on the EOY STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal is that the students gain at least 15 percentage points from from PM1 and PM3 as measured on the EOY FAST 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.

The SIPPS and PM1 and PM2 FAST assessment data will be used as ongoing monitoring of student progress to ensure students are making adequate gains. The Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Saslov, Joy, joy.saslov@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?

1. Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters;
2. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
3. Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters;
4. Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
5. Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.
6. Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text through build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text and consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read

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?

1. Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
2. Use of the comprehension pieces of the optional daily slides. Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.
3. Heggerty to develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

4. SIPPS to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words and to help students decode.
5. Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words and routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices.
6. Exact Path to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words, build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words and routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Consistent progress monitoring assessments will be given multiple times throughout the year.	Saslov, Joy, joy.saslov@ocps.net
Based on data points from the Progress Monitoring, adjustment are made in the intervention groups.	Houle, Angela, angela.houle@ocps.net
Weekly Classroom Walkthroughs and Coaching for literacy based practices.	Saslov, Joy, joy.saslov@ocps.net
Implementation of effective literacy focused PLCs weekly.	Saslov, Joy, joy.saslov@ocps.net
Monitoring of state progress monitoring assessments and adjusting coaching support for the teachers based on state PM1 and PM2 data.	Houle, Angela, angela.houle@ocps.net
Progress monitor assessment results and how students are making progress toward overall grade level proficiency.	Houle, Angela, angela.houle@ocps.net
Delivery of Science of Reading Professional Development	Saslov, Joy, joy.saslov@ocps.net
Conducting Bi-Weekly Data Meetings focused on BEST Benchmarks.	Saslov, Joy, joy.saslov@ocps.net

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$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