

Orange County Public Schools

# Lake Whitney Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Lake Whitney Elementary

1351 WINDERMERE RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://lakewestones.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
Crabb, Pamela	Principal	Duties include serving as an instructional leader by providing teachers with a common vision based on data decisions by promoting standards-based instruction in order to maximize student achievement.
Spensieri-Hughes, Kristen	Assistant Principal	Duties include serving as an instructional leader and providing teachers with a common vision based on those decisions by promoting standards-based instruction in order to maximize student achievement.
Dudek, Nancy	Instructional Media	Duties include serving as classroom coach for teachers to assist them with implementing rigorous reading and learning strategies.
Durham, Tambi	School Counselor	Duties include monitoring students' mental and emotional health to ensure that students are ready for learning.
Smirti, Kimberlee	Instructional Coach	Duties include overseeing the implementation of the curriculum and assessments of students, and serving as Instructional coach for reading, PLCs, for beginning teachers, and student interns and testing.
Matthews, Bridgette	Other	Duties include overseeing the implementation of the MTSS, PLCs, and common planning data for the school and teachers.

**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 process for involving stakeholders to gather input in the SIP development will be using surveys with teachers, staff, parents, and students, including Panorama and in-house surveys.

**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 School Improvement Plan is regularly monitored during weekly PLC meetings, monthly data meetings, and School Advisory Council meetings. The plan is shared with the stakeholders above and monitored for improvement of students. This data is used to adjust and monitor student interventions, MTSS, and reteach for continuous improvement.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	44%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	26%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	7	12	10	8	8	8	0	0	0	53	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8	
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		

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

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

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	3	26	18	26	16	19	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	

**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	2	4	0	0	0	6

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	26	18	26	16	19	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	

**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	2	4	0	0	0	6

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	78	57	53	82	56	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				71			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			48		
Math Achievement*	88	60	59	89	46	50	87		
Math Learning Gains				79			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78			58		
Science Achievement*	85	63	54	81	61	59	81		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	59	59				80		

\* 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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	72			
HSP	77			
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	84			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	70			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	51			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	71			
HSP	80			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	70			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	78			88			85					58
SWD	29			47							3	
ELL	9			55							3	58
AMI												
ASN	76			93			82				3	
BLK	63			84			75				4	
HSP	74			91			84				4	
MUL	87			93							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	82			87			89				4	
FRL	63			77			84				4	

## 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	82	71	55	89	79	78	81					
SWD	31	31	31	59	69	82						
ELL	61	90		67	36							
AMI												
ASN	74	73		85	88							
BLK	62	61		81	78							
HSP	88	75		92	68		75					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	83	70	52	90	81	72	83					
FRL	72	61	45	77	78	73	83					

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	84	67	48	87	67	58	81					80
SWD	38	40		58	36		60					
ELL	73			86								80
AMI												
ASN	83	75		92	81		88					
BLK	68	50		68	30		45					
HSP	86	71		81	73		67					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88	66	45	91	65		94					
FRL	78	70		83	75		71					

**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	82%	54%	28%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	58%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	52%	22%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	77%	59%	18%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	94%	62%	32%	61%	33%
05	2023 - Spring	90%	55%	35%	55%	35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	51%	33%

### 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Students With Disabilities. Students with Disabilities were in a Varying Exceptionalities classroom, due to the pull-out model, to focus on Individual Education goals. Some core standards taught in the regular education classroom were missed due to receiving pull-out services.

ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance at 31% based on FAST PM3 results. This has been a trend for the last three years for this subgroup. Contributing factors to this

low performance include the students' decoding, fluency, and comprehension deficits. These deficits and lack of scaffolded instruction make it difficult for them to read grade-level text proficiently.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Students with Disabilities. The contributing factors to the decline are lack of exposure to grade-level testing vocabulary, taking paper-based assessments rather than computer-based, and lack of proficiency on core standards.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Students with Disabilities. The data shows students with disabilities were at 32% proficient in 2022-2023 compared to the 2021-2022 state data indicating a 58.4% proficiency for students with disabilities. This shows a declining trend from the 2021-2022 school year with a proficiency of 51% which was below the state average.

ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Understanding and implementation of best practices in inclusive education by general education teachers and structured facilitative support by Exceptional Education teachers contributed to this gap.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 4th-grade math. In 2022-2023, the 4th grade math proficiency was 94%. This indicates an upward trend from 2021-2022 4th grade proficiency at 89%. Extra practice and support using a daily spiral review to provide students with additional practice throughout the school year.

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

The area of concern based on the EWS data is the number of Level 1s on the ELA statewide assessment.

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

1. SWD proficiency and learning gains
2. Decrease the number of Level 1s on statewide assessments

Focus on ELA proficiency for all  
Differentiated Instruction to support ELL and ESE students

### Area of Focus

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

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

To create a more positive culture and environment, Lake Whitney Elementary will support teachers through coaching feedback and professional development. Based on the Panorama survey of staff, the data indicates that 29% of staff would like to receive more feedback on their daily work and 27% of staff would like to know more about the evaluation process.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The specific measurable outcome our school plans to achieve is to continue to increase the percentage of staff who responded favorably to receiving feedback on their daily work from 71% to 75% by the end of the school year using the Panorama survey data.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using the Panorama staff survey and school-developed staff surveys.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@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 intervention is being implemented for this area of focus, using data-driven decision-making, by providing more frequent coaching feedback to staff using the classroom walkthrough tool, written feedback, emails, and opportunities to celebrate successes during professional development and staff meetings.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is so teachers receive professional support and feedback from the administration indicating a projection of movement towards success. Professional Development provides opportunities to develop and apply strategies effectively.

**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.

School administration will provide frequent coaching feedback with the use of the classroom walkthrough tool.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)



**By When:** weekly

School administration will leave written feedback in classrooms after completing a walkthrough.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** weekly

Professional development will be provided to increase the teacher's depth of knowledge with the evaluation process.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** May 2024

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students with disabilities' proficiency was identified as a crucial need because, over the past few years, the overall percentage of proficiency on state assessments has declined. This area of focus comprises increasing learning gains in ELA and reducing the achievement gap for students with disabilities.

FAST state assessment data for PM3 shows that ELA proficiency is at an overall 83%, with significant gaps for our Students with disabilities at 31% proficiency. Focusing on reading proficiency for all students, while differentiating instruction for these subgroups, should increase reading proficiency and the overall federal index for these two subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will be at 45% proficiency on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the classroom teacher and ESE teacher using PM1, PM2, and PM3 statewide FAST ELA assessment, Grade-level SBUA, classroom data, and IEP progress reports.

We will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting classroom observations during the ELA block to ensure small group structure and accommodations for Students with Disabilities. Structured time for collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers during common planning and Professional Learning communities monthly to ensure the use of targeted and differentiated resources in reading to support Students with Disabilities. The grade-level tracking tool will be used to monitor common assessment data for Students with Disabilities compared to grade-level performance and reviewed at monthly data meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@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 interventions being implemented for this area of focus include SIPPS, Core phonics, Heggerty, and reteaching core standards. Members of the leadership team will monitor grade-level PLC meetings for how closely teachers apply curriculum content and processes as they are designed. Teacher curriculum and activities will result in positive child outcomes and achieve school readiness goals. The Walk to Win model will be implemented for differentiated instruction and adjust instruction and monitor how closely the implementation was aligned to the way the intervention was designed. Differentiated Instruction will be used to provide explicit and targeted instruction for students. Instructional personnel will increase the systematic approach to providing scaffolded support for Students with Disabilities students during whole-group instruction. This will include using graphic organizers, chunking content, and highlighting vocabulary. Professional Development opportunities for instructional personnel on Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) will be embedded throughout the school year.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to provide students with targeted instruction in their specific areas of weakness. This targeted instruction will give students additional instructional support to become proficient readers. Teachers need to identify the individual academic levels of their students to differentiate the instruction to match the student's needs.

Using data to differentiate instruction will ensure that Students with Disabilities are provided accommodations and scaffolded instruction to experience success. Collaboration in common planning between the ESE teacher and general education teacher will ensure planning and use of necessary supports that provide Best Practices in Inclusive Education in all of our classrooms. Scaffolded supports will provide temporary assistance to students so they can complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success.

### **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.

Teachers will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to analyze assessment data to drive instruction of individual needs.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** Weekly

Teachers will choose from a variety of texts and deliberate questioning techniques in planning standards-based lessons and units.

Provide strategies and support to classroom teachers on the use of effective strategies to support SWD during monthly data meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** Weekly

Teachers will be provided additional opportunities to create formative assessments in their PLCs. Teachers will develop and implement exit slips to check for understanding.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** weekly

Teachers will analyze student performance on common assessments to determine student progress toward grade-level standards.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** weekly

Teachers will determine appropriate differentiated activities based on common assessment outcomes. Teachers will consult with the MTSS coordinator to implement support facilitation and tiered instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** weekly

Teachers will monitor the progress of students regularly and make academic adjustments if students are struggling. All students will be included in tiered instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** weekly

Teachers will be provided additional time and professional development to support differentiated and engaging lessons for Resilience Education.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

**By When:** weekly