

Orange County Public Schools

Hidden Oaks 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	19
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Hidden Oaks Elementary

9051 SUBURBAN DR, Orlando, FL 32829

<https://hiddenoakses.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
Longhouse, Randall	Principal	Ensures a productive learning environment through continual collaboration with teachers, students, and parents. Facilitates opportunities to connect with students by being present and available during arrival and dismissal, appearing at school functions, and meeting with students. Enforces disciplinary policies and procedures with students. Participates in parent meetings and conferences and acts as an intermediary between parents, teachers, and students to support a variety of needs or issues. Maintains competency and student academic achievement as prescribed by the school board. Presides over staff meetings. Ensures completion of routine and required paperwork including attendance reports, test results, and licensing information for students, educators, staff, and school management. Ensures that necessary maintenance and repairs to the school property are performed. Coordinates staff development for faculty and staff; provides instruction if needed. Oversees the allocation of supplies and equipment. Oversees and implements the school budget, approving new programs and expenditures as appropriate. Represents the school in community activities and meetings. Interacts with various stakeholders to foster a positive relationship between the school and community including the PTA, community organizations, and leaders. Acts as liaison between the district and the school; communicates needs and information to both sides
King, Reginald	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist assists teachers and students to promote pro-social behaviors. The Behavior Specialist collects and analyzes data, and works collaboratively with other team members to design individualized behavior plans.
Oyler, Sally	School Counselor	Provides crisis intervention services, e.g. suicide prevention, child abuse, health concerns, substance abuse, and follow-up services as appropriate. Conducts individual conferences and group meetings with parents to effectively communicate with and involve parents in improving student performance. This also includes the referral of students and parents to appropriate specialists in keeping with district guidelines. Maintains student guidance records with confidentiality. Provides career counseling to students as assigned.
Peck, Shelby	ELL Compliance Specialist	Serves as the testing coordinator for local and state assessments. Maintains data on the LEP population as well as strategies for ensuring the academic success of these identified students.
Vanmali, Rajni	Assistant Principal	Ensures a productive learning environment through continual collaboration with teachers, students, and parents. Facilitates opportunities to connect with students by being present and available during arrival and dismissal, by appearing at school functions, and by meeting with students. Enforces disciplinary policies and procedures with students. Participates in parent meetings and conferences

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and acts as an intermediary between parents, teachers, and students to support a variety of needs or issues. Maintains competency and student academic achievement as prescribed by the school board. Presides over staff meetings. Ensures completion of routine and required paperwork including attendance reports, test results, and licensing information for students, educators, staff, and school management. Ensures that necessary maintenance and repairs to the school property are performed. Coordinates staff development for faculty and staff; provides instruction if needed. Oversees the allocation of supplies and equipment. Oversees and implements the school budget, approving new programs and expenditures as appropriate. Represents the school in community activities and meetings. Interacts with various stakeholders to foster a positive relationship between the school and community including the PTA, community organizations, and leaders. Acts as liaison between the district and the school; communicates needs and information to both sides.
Silva, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Work with classroom teachers to plan instruction, develop and implement effective strategies and techniques, analyze student achievement data to inform subsequent instructional decisions.

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.

SIP is developed and reviewed with input from the School Advisory Council and informed by feedback from Spring 2023 stakeholder surveys: teachers, parents, and students.

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 areas of focus will be monitored to determine the impact on student achievement and student subgroups. Adjustments to the plan will be made based on data to ensure optimal end-of-year outcomes.

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	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
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) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	16	10	17	15	9	0	0	0	68	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	
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	0	19	13	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	8	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	11	18	19	0	0	0	0	55	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	8	21	11	0	0	0	46

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

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	19	21	25	15	28	0	0	0	114	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	12	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	5	

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	0	9	13	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	19	21	25	15	28	0	0	0	114	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	12	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	5	

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	0	9	13	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55	57	53	57	56	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				69			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			38		
Math Achievement*	51	60	59	59	46	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				65			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			38		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	63	54	59	61	59	59		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	63			57		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	50			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	47			

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	52			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	46			
BLK	73			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	56			

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	55			51			59					61
SWD	28			26			25				4	
ELL	46			49			47				4	61
AMI												
ASN	55			73							2	
BLK	56			44							3	
HSP	53			47			49				5	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61			55			92				4	
FRL	50			43			51				5	43

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	69	52	59	65	67	59					63
SWD	22	52	62	32	68	73						
ELL	38	61		54	64							63
AMI												
ASN	42			50								
BLK	56	100		67	70							
HSP	52	64	44	58	67	73	58					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	72		63	52		67					
FRL	46	61	53	49	69	69	45					

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	52	55	38	57	39	38	59					57
SWD	23	40		33	20		45					
ELL	42	70		36	20							57

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	50			46								
BLK	44			56								
HSP	47	54		50	34		59					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76			83								
FRL	52	58		46	42	40	50					

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	51%	54%	-3%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%

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.

51% of students in grades 3-5 scored Level 3+ on FAST PM3 administered in May, 2023. In 2019, 64% of students scored Level 3+ so ELA achievement levels are not yet back to pre-pandemic levels.

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

Both ELA Achievement and Math Achievement declined 6% from 2022 to 2023.

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.

Math achievement had the greatest gap compared to state average. 58% of students statewide in grades 3-5 were proficient in math; 53% of our students scored Level 3+ on PM3 in May, 2023.

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

All 3 achievement components declined from 2022 to 2023. .

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

32 and 33 of our current fourth and fifth-grade students scored Level 1 on spring administration of PM 3 state assessments in ELA and Math.

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

Increase ELA Achievement; increase math achievement

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 Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

During the 22-23 school year, 68 students out of 381 total students were absent more than 10% of the school year. This equates to 18% of the school population. Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 23-24 school year, the percentage of students who have unexcused absences more than 10% of the school year will decrease from 18% to 0%.

Monitoring:

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

Absences will be monitored and only those meeting the OCPS policies will be excused. Weekly attendance reports will be pulled and monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sally Oyler (sally.oyler@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.)

Attendance will be monitored weekly by the attendance clerk, guidance counselor, social worker, and principal. Attendance meetings will be scheduled with students, parents, teachers, and leadership team members for targeted students with 20 or more absences from the prior school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Any absence, whether excused or not, denies students the opportunity to learn in accordance with the school's instructional program.

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.

Weekly attendance team meetings will be conducted. Supports for families who are struggling will be discussed, as well as sending required non-attendance reports and scheduling of truancy meetings.

Person Responsible: Sally Oyler (sally.oyler@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly monitoring of student attendance

#2. 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.

Multiple years of data indicate the need to improve the approach to ELA instruction. ELA achievement has ranged from a high of 64% (2019) to a low of 52% (2021) in the past 3 years despite a significant increase in learning gains over that same period of time. This suggests a successful implementation of MTSS but a less successful interpretation of the depth and rigor required of the ELA standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome to be attained as part of this plan is to increase ELA achievement on FAST PM3 from 51% in 2023 to 64% in 2024, achieve overall ELA learning gains of 75%, and achieve learning gains in the lowest quartile of 62%.

Monitoring:

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

Our area of focus will be monitored using a variety of formative assessments, including standards-based unit assessments, Progress Monitoring assessments, and the FAST Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented will be small group differentiated instruction which will allow for precise instruction based on data, skill-based instruction, and appropriate independent practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our goals for this year call for an increase in student learning gains and overall achievement. In order to accelerate learning to produce learning gains and achievement, teachers need to be efficient in their instruction. Small group differentiation allows for instruction to be tailored to student needs. A focus on prerequisite skills will allow our lowest achieving students to gain the skills needed to better access the curriculum. Finally, a focus on independent practice will help both the students and teachers better understand the expectation of the benchmarks and better inform actions to improve before assessment.

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.

Leadership will analyze and disaggregate multiple data, such as FAST results, Exact Path diagnostic results, STAR reading, common assessments, and other relevant and available program data, to establish baseline student academic needs for teachers.

Person Responsible: Rajni Vanmali (rajni.vanmali@ocps.net)

By When: End of August

Leadership will support teachers in implementing small group differentiated instruction through work in PLCs and monthly differentiated professional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Rajni Vanmali (rajni.vanmali@ocps.net)

By When: End of September

Leadership will develop a system by which teachers will track student progress in order to determine the effectiveness of professional development and coaching in the area of small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Rajni Vanmali (rajni.vanmali@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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

To increase the reading proficiency of our students in the primary grades, we will provide targeted instruction so that students develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. We will also provide explicit instruction to students to teach them how to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

To increase the reading proficiency of our third-grade students, we will provide targeted instruction so that students Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. We will also provide explicit instruction to students to teach them how to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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 for 2023-2024 is for at least 70% of our students in primary grades to attain grade-level proficiency skills in reading as measured by the spring administration of the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal for 2023-2024 is for at least 64% of our students in grades 3-5 to attain grade-level proficiency skills in reading (score Level 3 or higher) as measured by the spring administration of the statewide ELA assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

Progress toward meeting our student achievement goals will be monitored in multiple ways, including weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators followed by feedback to teachers. We will also conduct regular data meetings with teachers and leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments. Subsequent instruction and adjustments to interventions will be made as a result of collaborative data analysis.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Longhouse, Randall, randall.longhouse@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?

We will achieve the desired outcomes by utilizing instructional resources and strategies that are evidence-based, such as the foundational and comprehension pieces of the district-created daily slides, SIPPS (explicit instruction in decoding words and word parts), Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum, and Exact Path (digital personalized reading intervention tool).

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 resources we will be using address our needs and have a proven record of effectiveness. Students will learn how to: develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; increase decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; read with increased fluency; use a set of comprehension-building practices to help them make sense of 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
Literacy Coaching- The literacy coach attends district coach meetings and strategically shares out learning with individual team members and grade-level teams. Supports provided to teachers include implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, and PLC planning support.	Silva, Melissa, melissa.silva@ocps.net
Assessment- Use and analysis of a variety of assessments. Subsequent instructional resources, strategies, and student groupings will be determined by regular data analysis of student achievement outcomes. Assessments that will be monitored and analyzed: -FAST -District created Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2) -DIBELS (K-1) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5)	Vanmali, Ranji, ranji.vanmali@ocps.net