

Orange County Public Schools

Independence 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 | 12 |
| 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 |

Independence Elementary

6255 NEW INDEPENDENCE PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://independences.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 to 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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Peters, Jeffrey | Principal | Mr. Peters guides the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Through his leadership, the team can make decisions about students and then determine and implement best practices based on the needs of the students. Mr. Peters ensures that the team is implementing common planning effectively. Mr. Peters also provides opportunities for professional development. Additionally, Mr. Peters conducts classroom walkthroughs daily. Mr. Peters will lead the school's focus on early literacy skills. |
| Travis, Tricia | Assistant Principal | Dr. Travis works to support the vision and mission of Independence Elementary. She provides guidance for the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Through her leadership, the team can make decisions about students and then determine and implement best practices based on the needs of the students. She monitors the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community. |
| Hwang, Yoo Jin | Instructional Coach | Dr. Hwang provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction while modeling lessons for teachers. Ms. Hwang provides guidance on curriculum and intervention programs. Dr. Hwang also supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. Additionally, Dr. Hwang oversees and participates in common planning. She is a team member of the administrative leadership team. She provides input and feedback on other subject content areas and school functions that impact student achievement school-wide. |
| Badger, Aaron | Science Coach | Mr. Badger plans and provides instructional support and coaching to teachers in the area of science across grade levels. He educates students on the core concepts of science. He fulfills the role of an Intervention specialist. He regularly pulls small groups of students or pushes into classrooms to teach small groups for remediation of gap skills and reteach grade-level standards. He is a team member of the administrative leadership team. He analyzes data and provides input and feedback on science and other content areas that impact student achievement school-wide. |
| Hammond, Diana | Other | Ms. Hammond teaches information literacy skills, and promotes reading motivation and strategies in the Media Center. She also works with teachers during common planning to help with standards-based instruction. She works with coaches and teachers to help build on reading resources available to the students and teachers. Additionally, Ms. Hammond is our school's ADDitions Coordinator. She is a team member of the administrative leadership team. She provides input and feedback on other subject content areas and school functions that impact student achievement school-wide. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Bromby, Shauna | ELL Compliance Specialist | Mrs. Bromby coordinates the referral, placement, testing, and reevaluation process for students within the school. He is a team member of the administrative leadership team. He analyzes data and provides input and feedback on science and other content areas that impact student achievement school-wide. |
| Kneebone, Caitlin | Staffing Specialist | Mrs. Kneebone assists teachers in the development of Individual Education Plans (IEPs). She meets with teachers and family members to ensure the needs of every child are aligned with the services they receive and communicates this information to all concerned parties. She is a team member of the administrative leadership team. She provides input and feedback on other subject content areas and school functions that impact student achievement school-wide. |
| McGuinness, Deborah | Other | Mrs. McGuinness is the MTSS coordinator. She develops appropriate intervention plans based on available student data. She ensures that progress monitoring is conducted on a regular basis in all content areas. She collaborates with teachers to provide academic support directly to students in the form of intervention and remediation with the intention of increasing student achievement. She is a team member of the administrative leadership team. She provides input and feedback on other subject content areas and school functions that impact student achievement school-wide. She is a team member of the administrative leadership team. She provides input and feedback on other subject content areas and school functions that impact student achievement school-wide. |
| Korth, Emily | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Ms. Korth provides various resources to the staff and parents. She also analyzes data with teachers and researches scientifically-based curriculum and intervention programs. She collaborates with the reading coach to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She also ensures that teachers have the necessary data to make informed decisions about students. She is a team member of the administrative leadership team. She provides input and feedback on other subject content areas and school functions that impact student achievement school-wide. |
| Cedat, Patricia | School Counselor | Ms. Cedat provides mental health support for students and staff members. She provides lessons on life skills and resilience. She also provides support for 504 plans for behavior concerns. |

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.

Stakeholders are provided with opportunities to provide input through round table discussions and climate surveys. School administrators and the instructional coach utilizes the input from the stakeholder and the data results from students' end-of-the-year standardized test results to aid with the development of the SIP.

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 goals, implementation of tasks linked to the SIP, and the SIP's progress will be regularly monitored by adding it to the agenda for discussion at Leadership Team Meetings. The Leadership Team Members will assist administration and stakeholders with ensuring that tasks such as classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, implementing interventions for struggling students, common planning minutes/input, staff feedback, and parental and community input is executed throughout the school year. This process will be discussed, monitored, and executed through shared data analysis meetings and discussions with stakeholders including School Advisory Committee members. This process will be facilitated and/or monitored by the Leadership Team Members and/or selected Leadership Team Members.

The Leadership Team Members will use a Glows and Grows chart monthly at meetings. This criterion will be utilized to track and discuss whether the SIP goals are being met. If the goals are at risk of not being met, then the Leadership Team will make the needed adjustments to make greater progress toward meeting the SIP 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 KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 54% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 24% |
| 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) |
| <p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p> | 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 | 4 | 33 | 19 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 2 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

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 | 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) 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 | 4 | 32 | 21 | 27 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 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 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 4 | 32 | 21 | 27 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

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 | 11 | 6 | 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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* | 76 | 57 | 53 | 83 | 56 | 56 | 85 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 75 | | | 82 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 61 | | | 84 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 76 | 60 | 59 | 88 | 46 | 50 | 84 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 78 | | | 68 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 73 | | | 60 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 81 | 63 | 54 | 85 | 61 | 59 | 87 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 67 | 59 | 59 | 87 | | | 63 | | |

* 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 | 76 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 381 |
| 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 | 79 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 630 |
| 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 | 47 | | | |
| ELL | 70 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | | | |
| BLK | 67 | | | |
| HSP | 74 | | | |
| MUL | 82 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | |

| 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% |
| FRL | 73 | | | |

| 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 | 80 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | |
| HSP | 77 | | | |
| MUL | 96 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | | | |
| FRL | 71 | | | |

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 | 76 | | | 76 | | | 81 | | | | | 67 |
| SWD | 43 | | | 41 | | | 62 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 66 | | | 73 | | | 74 | | | | 5 | 67 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 93 | | | 80 | | | | 4 | |
| BLK | 72 | | | 61 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 71 | | | 69 | | | 78 | | | | 5 | 69 |
| MUL | 75 | | | 88 | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | | | 77 | | | 83 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| FRL | 68 | | | 64 | | | 78 | | | | 5 | 74 |

| 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 | 83 | 75 | 61 | 88 | 78 | 73 | 85 | | | | | 87 |
| SWD | 42 | 58 | 33 | 51 | 65 | 50 | 55 | | | | | |
| ELL | 80 | 75 | 72 | 87 | 76 | 75 | 90 | | | | | 87 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 88 | | 94 | 88 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 79 | 72 | 61 | 86 | 76 | 75 | 86 | | | | | 83 |
| MUL | 100 | | | 92 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | 78 | 67 | 90 | 77 | 72 | 85 | | | | | 100 |
| FRL | 71 | 64 | 50 | 78 | 78 | 73 | 76 | | | | | 79 |

| 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 | 85 | 82 | 84 | 84 | 68 | 60 | 87 | | | | | 63 |
| SWD | 56 | | | 57 | | | 50 | | | | | |
| ELL | 76 | 95 | 100 | 87 | 85 | 100 | 84 | | | | | 63 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | 95 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 64 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | 89 | 100 | 84 | 76 | 69 | 89 | | | | | 68 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 78 | | 84 | 60 | | 83 | | | | | 44 |
| FRL | 77 | 78 | | 76 | 66 | | 86 | | | | | 61 |

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 | 66% | 54% | 12% | 54% | 12% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 60% | 17% | 58% | 19% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 52% | 26% | 50% | 28% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 59% | 19% | 59% | 19% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 62% | 20% | 61% | 21% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 55% | 14% | 55% | 14% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 59% | 19% | 51% | 27% |

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.

ELA proficiency rates showed the lowest performance according to the state assessment results. The contributing factors may be less exposure to informational text and limited science and social studies teaching time.

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

5th Grade ELA proficiency rates showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The contributing factors may be exposure to reading and writing during the COVID-19 Pandemic's online learning period. Also, all assessments switching to online might have had an effect decline.

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.

Overall, Independence ES performed better than the state average from all components.

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

Math proficiency rates showed the most improvement. Independence ES was strategic about center resources, intervention, and frequent classroom walkthroughs for feedback.

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

The areas of concern are SWD and ELL students.

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

1. Lowest 30% progress monitoring
2. Small group and pull-out support
3. Supporting ELLs and SWDs
4. MTSS

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 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.

Independence Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic monitoring strategies. There is a need to differentiate the small group instruction to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III MTSS support. Historically, students with disabilities have been an under-performing subgroup with a federal index score of 56% in 2020 - 2021.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023 - 2024, 78% of students in the lowest 25% will make the learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to continuously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces data-driven instruction, students with disabilities' individual needs will be met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah McGuiness (deborah.mcguiness.@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 MTSS will begin with administering a DIBELS assessment to figure out the student's deficiency. Then, depending on the result, students will be administered with SIPPS for phonics placement or placed in fluency/comprehension groups. Teachers are trained and provided with intervention materials that are provided by the district (SIPPS, Learning A - Z, etc.). Teachers will be provided with focused professional development in small groups based on data and supporting the lowest 25% achievement students through interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By targeting the specific needs of our students, overall student achievement will increase, as well as student achievement for our lowest 25%. For all students to succeed, instruction often needs to be differentiated to target specific needs. Also, by focusing on the MTSS process, we will target all learners to meet their specific needs. Students' achievement gaps will be targeted to ensure they are receiving high-quality instruction.

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 MTSS Instructional Support Resource Teacher will provide an MTSS overview and expectations for the year to all instructional staff.

Person Responsible: Deborah McGuiness (deborah.mcguiness.@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

Plan for and develop MTSS professional development and in response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities, discuss specific strategies for targeting the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible: Deborah McGuiness (deborah.mcguiness.@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Provide ongoing MTSS professional development based on the needs of students and staff.

Person Responsible: Deborah McGuiness (deborah.mcguiness.@ocps.net)

By When: Providing meetings every 4 weeks

Provide support for differentiated instruction for teachers through the coaching cycle (Administration).

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@ocps.net)

By When: Leadership weekly walkthrough

#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.

In order to create a positive culture and environment, Independence Elementary will find ways to keep staff members feeling happy and supported which is vital to student success. In 2022 - 2023, the school climate category of the staff survey showed the least growth. We will provide additional support sessions for various needs throughout the year by the leadership team. We will also provide walkthroughs to provide on-spot feedback.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school, we will raise our school climate score on the spring staff survey by 3 percentage points to 78%.

Monitoring:

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

Throughout this school year, we will increase our support of our teachers and we will survey them to establish their needs. We will allow them to provide input on school functions. We will take steps to build an even more positive school climate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@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.)

Roundtable discussions with staff are evidence-based interventions that will be implemented this school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are going to conduct evidence-based roundtable discussions with staff. It will improve their opportunities to connect with others in meaningful and impactful ways as they listen to each other, exchange ideas, and provide information that will be gathered to help increase a positive school culture and environment. All input and feedback gathered from staff during the roundtable discussions will be addressed and utilized for school improvement purposes. This initiative will help promote positive interactions among staff and help impact student achievement.

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.

We will implement more staff social activities.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@ocps.net)

By When: All year long

School staff will be provided more opportunities to interact socially and professionally during meetings and during other inside/outside of school gatherings.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@ocps.net)

By When: All year long

Staff will be invited to participate and interact together at different school events with parents and students.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Peters (jeffrey.peters@ocps.net)

By When: once a quarter