

Orange County Public Schools

Columbia 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Columbia Elementary

18501 CYPRESS LAKE GLEN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32820

<https://columbiaes.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
Brinkman, Katie	Principal	<p>Katie Brinkman, Principal: Responsible for setting expectations for the school; oversees digital implementation, provides supervision of all instruction, and accelerates the momentum by setting high expectations for the use and success of the MTSS process. She ensures the baseline outlook for the development of MTSS and the successful implementation of the process. The principal also ensures support and documentation to increase academic/behavioral instruction at the various tiers. In addition, the principal examines MTSS plans and activities with parents and stakeholders. Mrs. Brinkman will conduct data meetings. Data will be based on Exact Path, Success Maker, common assessments, and other resources. Schedules will be used to establish dates for the meetings, type of data, and grade level targets. Mrs. Brinkman will also be responsible for overseeing all school functions.</p>
Soldano, Michelle	Assistant Principal	<p>Michelle Soldano, Assistant Principal: Mrs. Soldano will work with the principal to develop and facilitate school initiatives, monitor student achievement and instructional delivery of the standards, conduct coaching and evaluative observations, provide effective actionable feedback that promotes teacher growth and expertise, and facilitate discussions focused on progress monitoring data.</p>
Sealey, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>Melissa Sealey, CRT: Mrs. Sealey is responsible for MTSS, progress monitoring, testing coordinator, and curriculum materials, and serves as the school's ECS. She will design a monthly schedule for individual teachers to meet for MTSS to discuss student progress. The schedule will be for 9 months and will include key team members. Schedule and MTSS notes will be used to monitor the frequency and completion of the task. She will provide coaching observation connected with MTSS/FBS instruction to assist with monitoring the lowest 25% ELA instruction. Mrs. Sealey coordinates all testing for the school and monitors the school for compliance with Florida State mandates. She conducts and coordinates ELL Committee Meetings, conducts aural/oral language testing on students entering the school and follows up on students needing the Reading/Writing assessment, assesses, evaluates, and monitors the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program</p>
Henry, Sharon	School Counselor	<p>Sharon Henry, Guidance Counselor: Ms. Henry is responsible for all 504 renewals and documentation. She will support teachers and students who may need assistance with behavioral structures, support groups, or other assistance. She will also teach monthly character education lessons and recognize students monthly from each grade level. Character lessons will be scheduled with teams and shared with the leadership team for updates. A support log will be used to track students needing small group support with frequency. She will also assist with health CRMs being implemented district-wide.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pressy, Robyn	Instructional Media	Robyn Pressy, Media Specialist. Mrs. Pressy is responsible for textbook inventory, media circulation and updating, Accelerated Reader Program, and intervention support. She will maintain inventory through electronic tracking of materials for teachers and students. Reports will be pulled mid-year and weekly during May to assist with inventory. Circulation will be monitored by pulling checkout rates each quin along with invoices on new purchases for books and media resources. Accelerated Reader program will be school-wide and tracked by class. Bimonthly reports will be sent out to all staff to track progress. Recognition events throughout the year will be held for class participation and student progress. Mrs. Pressy will also assist with intervention and enrichment groups.
Sykes, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Amanda Skyes, Instructional Coach: Ms. Sykes provides guidance on reading, math, and science plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. She also assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. She coaches beginning teachers, facilitates PLCs, and data tracking, Lead Mentor, curriculum updates from the county, and field trips. She also assists in pulling intervention groups.
Lajoie, Carey	Staffing Specialist	Carey Lajoie, Staffing Specialist: This individual schedules meetings for ESE students receiving additional support through MTSS, invites participants, ensures coverage for teachers (as needed), conducts and maintains focus of the meeting, sets and monitors time limits, schedules follow-up meetings and invites participants to follow-up meeting(s). Also, provides guidance on ESE strategies, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, and works with LY students.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Improvement Plan is a living document. The goals are embedded within the structures of Professional Learning Communities. Disaggregation of data and analysis will take place in Professional Learning Communities to make sure teachers and staff are involved in the development process of the School Improvement Plan. Goals and focus areas will be presented in SAC meetings so that our families and communities can have input.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored through Professional Learning Communities in weekly data meetings as well as through our MTSS model. Data will be used to create intervention groups and groups will be monitored weekly. Student groups will be changed if needed after analyzing the data. Lowest 25 percent will be monitored and bubble students will also be identified and worked with. In monthly, SAC meetings, the stakeholders will be able to give input to our school's goals.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	82%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	3	16	18	19	23	9	0	0	0	88	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	11	0	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	9	9	7	0	0	0	0	31	

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	1	4	7	9	11	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	6	22	22	18	14	7	0	0	0	89	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	10	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	4	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	12	12	10	0	0	0	34	

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	1	0	4	7	5	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	6	22	22	18	14	7	0	0	0	89	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	10	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	4	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	12	12	10	0	0	0	34	

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	1	0	4	7	5	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	75	57	53	71	56	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				77			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			48		
Math Achievement*	76	60	59	79	46	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				85			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76			25		
Science Achievement*	82	63	54	81	61	59	76		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	60			40		

** 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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	586
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	44			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	80			
HSP	74			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	65			

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	48			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	88			
HSP	65			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	68			

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	75			76			82					61
SWD	37			33			55				4	
ELL	38			48							3	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	80			80							2	
HSP	65			69			85				5	69
MUL	77			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	80			79			85				4	
FRL	61			65			76				5	60

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	71	77	57	79	85	76	81					60
SWD	22	48	45	43	72	69	36					
ELL	43	50	25	65	71							60
AMI												
ASN	70			80								
BLK	82	88		82	100							
HSP	68	73	39	74	79	56	73					58
MUL	79			86								
PAC												
WHT	71	80	73	81	86	88	85					
FRL	60	70	50	73	84	79	72					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	68	74	48	64	51	25	76					40
SWD	18	29	33	22	23	10	15					
ELL	43	50		41	30							40
AMI												
ASN	87			87								
BLK	83			61								
HSP	59	75		51	38		65					39
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	76		71	59		83					
FRL	55	72	58	49	42	9	63					35

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	80%	54%	26%	54%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	62%	10%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	51%	31%

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.

Overall math data showed the lowest performance. In 2021-2022, the overall proficiency was 77%. In 2022-2023, the overall math proficiency decreased by two percentage points to 75%. Students who scored a level two had a scale score close to a level three. The school needs to implement a strategic focus on math bubble students. Reading intervention groups were being pulled based on data, however, math intervention groups and the FBS block did not have a structure and was not an area of focus.

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

Grades 3-5 math proficiency was at a two percent decline from last year, while other subject areas showed an increase. A structure for the math intervention block will need to be implemented using research-based resources. The math block was used for whole-group instruction instead of including small-group instruction. Kindergarten and first-grade proficiency were the lowest out of all the grades. Both are below 70% proficiency. One area of focus in Professional Learning Communities will be on pulling intentional small groups daily and the resources being used. Schedules were created to reflect when teachers should be releasing independent tasks to the students instead of teaching 45 minutes of whole group instruction.

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.

One of the biggest gaps is the ELL subcategory. ELL students were at 25% for learning gains in 2022. In a recent staff survey, teachers are asking for more training and up-to-date strategies to use while working with ELL students.

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

5th grade ELA proficiency showed the biggest improvement. During data analysis, bubble students were identified and then pulled for extra support and reteach. Bubble students were also invited to our school's tutoring program that ran from October through May.

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

One potential area of concern is students who have 10% or more absences.

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

1. Reading -small group instruction
2. Truancy numbers
3. Math intervention
4. Structure FBS time- resources used and using reteaches effectively

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**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.

Teachers will provide small group instruction during reading and math so the needs of all students are addressed in the classroom. This need was identified based on the school's subgroup data. ELL students scored significantly lower than other subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcomes we will monitor is for each student subgroup to make a year's worth of gain from the beginning of the year FAST and STAR test to the end of the year FAST and STAR test. We will see a 10% increase in ELL student data on the 2023-2024 FAST ELA assessment. In 2021 -2022, 25% of ELL students made gains in reading. The goal is for the ELL subgroup to increase to 35% in the ELA lowest 25% subcategory.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored via classroom coaching, teacher observations, progress monitoring unit assessment data, and professional development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Brinkman (katie.brinkman@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 begin to use the Gradual Release Model to ensure reading whole group lessons last 30-40 minutes and then an hour of small group time for ELA and math lessons should be made up of whole group, small group and then intervention using the Gradual Release Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Staff will be involved with a book study on guided reading. Once the teachers gain the strategies for differentiating the instruction in the classroom, the means to teach in small groups can be shared with others. In small group instruction during the reading block, Being the Reader will be used. In FBS (intervention) teachers will be utilizing SIPPS and Exact Path.

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.

ELL strategies Professional Development for teachers.

Person Responsible: Melissa Sealey (melissa.sealey@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

Professional Development on SIPPS and Being a Reader

Person Responsible: Amanda Sykes (amanda.sykes@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Classroom walkthroughs done weekly tracking school trends.

Person Responsible: Katie Brinkman (katie.brinkman@ocps.net)

By When: This will be on-going all school year.

#2. 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 staff knows each other very well and there are many talented professionals on our campus. Building on this, the staff needs to come together more for team-building and cross grade level activities. A monthly team-building event will take place so teachers can collaborate with other grade levels. The leadership team and teacher leaders will plan activities for staff to promote a positive school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome will come from the results of the Panorama Survey. Teachers will have a place that helps them feel connected and secure. Evidence will be determined by the school climate section. On the 2023 Panorama Survey 81% of the staff felt there was a positive school climate. The goal will be a 5 percent increase to 86% on the 2024 Panorama Survey.

Monitoring:

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

Team building will be monitored by seeing the different types of team building activities teams sign up for. The outcome will be the morale of the staff and how the staff works with each other effectively.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Brinkman (katie.brinkman@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.)

Team building will resonate through many activities on campus. A positive culture will be the outcome of the team-building activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The staff is very effective on their teams. It is important to get to know other staff members across the school. Instructional rounds and deliberate practice element groups will help the staff get to work with other members of the staff and grow their professional strategies by learning from each other.

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.

Wednesday PDs will occur monthly, so teachers collaboration will be focused on instructional strategies. Strategies will include collaborative work (Kagan), using data to drive small group instruction and integrating technology into daily academic tasks.

Person Responsible: Katie Brinkman (katie.brinkman@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Create a school "Cheer Team" to help boost moral and plan school team building activities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Soldano (michelle.soldano@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Teachers will use the B.E.S.T Standards, for the 2023-2024 school year and focus on what interventions need to be done after each common assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of establishing an instructional practice in math, we anticipate a 5% increase in math achievement within our ESSA subgroups for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners on the F.A.S.T math assessment.

SWD: 43%-48%

ELL: 65%-70%

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor the measurable outcomes throughout the year by analyzing the progress monitoring and Success Maker data. We will also monitor students through common assessments and discuss their progress during data meetings and PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Brinkman (katie.brinkman@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.)

Columbia will plan and implement professional learning to provide training, and opportunities for math instructional practices. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through data analysis, common assessments, progress monitoring, and PLCs. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and teacher needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To achieve improvement in our ESSA subgroups, it is necessary to provide students with math skills to close the achievement gap. Columbia will create a school climate that involves all within the school building. To strengthen a climate of instructional practices with staff and students, it is critical to create a positive setting for learning, academic achievement, and student growth through PDs and PLCs.

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 Professional Learning Communities, teachers will discuss math data and how to reteach standards that were low in proficiency, plan for strategic interventions and monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Michelle Soldano (michelle.soldano@ocps.net)

By When: This will start in September 2023 and be on-going.

Professional Development for Success Maker.

Person Responsible: Amanda Sykes (amanda.sykes@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Professional Learning Communities focusing on data analysis' of formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Katie Brinkman (katie.brinkman@ocps.net)

By When: On going- September 2023-April 2024