

Orange County Public Schools

Moss Park 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Moss Park Elementary

9301 N SHORE GOLF CLUB BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

<https://mosssparkes.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
Harris, Willam	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to facilities, budget, personnel, materials, and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus on school improvement -Oversees high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups
Vetter, Rob	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluative Observations -Oversees MTSS Process K-5 -Liaison with Middle School -Serves as Principal's designee when principal is off campus -SIP -Master Schedule -Manages morning/afternoon duties and lunch duty -Skyward and class lists -Field Trips -Drills
Miller, Lisa	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student Special programs (Foster care, MVP) -Works with Registrar on Child Study Team -Coordinates Red Ribbon Week -Resiliency Lessons -Guidance Groups -SOAR -School Threat Assessment -School data and reports -SEDNET -Resource for Health Course -Child Safety Matters -Academic support (study, test taking and organizational skills) -Peer Relationships -Bullying awareness
Garcia-Jenarine, Maritza	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admin/Resource Team member -Textbook manager -AR program -Morning Announcements -Book Fairs -Book Clubs -Literacy Week

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Classroom media resources -Destiny inventory -Circulation of books -Media Center inventory -General supervision of students -Digital one-to-one
Villar, Edni	ELL Compliance Specialist	Admin/Resource Team Member <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ELL Compliance -ACCESS for ELLs/WIDA testing -PLC (ELL) Chair -Manages all ELL records -Schedules and monitors all LEP meetings -Pulls ELL student groups -Oversees ELL paras -Oversees Use of Imagine Learning for ELL students -General student supervision
Gardner, Diane	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees the progression and monitoring of lowest quartile students in both math and reading -Manages the MTSS process -Schedules and monitors all MTSS (Tier 2 and 3) meetings -Schedules and monitors all 504 meetings -other duties as assigned
Borgerding, Jeana	Instructional Coach	Admin/Resource Team Member <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supports teaching and learning throughout grade levels -Supports planning processes, professional development, and data analysis -Supervision of students
Barrett, Aimee	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Admin/Resource Team Member <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees and manages all testing coordination -Organizes and maintains school calendar -Oversees beginning teachers through the Induction program -Supports teachers with professional development -Teacher certification needs -SAC member -PTA Liaison

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.

All SIP goals are created in collaboration with the SAC members. Feedback on how to achieve those goals is discussed. The teachers and staff are presented with data from the previous year to discuss what the goals should be focused on in the current 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))

We will continue to review our SIP goals after each FAST PM and adjust as needed. We will look at data from FAST/STAR/Standards-Based Unit Assessments and intervention data.

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	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	23	20	23	21	22	20	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	7	15	5	8	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	7	7	10	4	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	8	10	12	25	29	29	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	10	7	16	27	27	0	0	0	87
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	3	5	4	2	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
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	23	25	27	23	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	30	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	28	0	0	0	49
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	1	17	21	0	0	0	39

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	23	25	27	23	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	30	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	28	0	0	0	49
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	1	17	21	0	0	0	39

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*	68	57	53	72	56	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				70			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			53		
Math Achievement*	73	60	59	76	46	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				73			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			45		
Science Achievement*	75	63	54	73	61	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	59	59	69			65		

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
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	13	Yes	4	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	50			
HSP	66			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	58			

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	73			
HSP	65			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	58			

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	68			73			75					59
SWD	18			20			8				4	
ELL	49			55			64				5	59
AMI												
ASN	66			86			100				4	
BLK	47			56							3	
HSP	65			69			73				5	58
MUL	60			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	76			79			77				4	
FRL	54			60			58				5	62

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	72	70	56	76	73	54	73					69
SWD	20	44	40	29	54	50	20					
ELL	58	58	41	63	67	54	44					69
AMI												
ASN	65	75		85	79							
BLK	68	76		69	75		76					
HSP	69	68	56	71	70	54	65					67
MUL	88			81								
PAC												
WHT	77	71	63	82	81	63	81					
FRL	59	60	41	63	66	51	61					63

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	71	60	53	70	59	45	74					65
SWD	18	20	18	24	29	27	27					36
ELL	58	64	76	57	52	46	68					65
AMI												
ASN	88			84			100					
BLK	63			67								
HSP	68	63	68	65	57	44	70					69
MUL	76			82								
PAC												
WHT	73	54		74	59		70					
FRL	62	54	60	55	46	50	72					60

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	67%	54%	13%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	60%	9%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	50%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	62%	10%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	55%	14%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	51%	21%

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 science data showed the lowest overall proficiency. It remains higher than the district and state proficiency but is the lowest component in overall proficiency. The only major change from the previous year is a change in staff members for science instruction. Science scores have slightly decreased each year for the past three years.

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

The largest decline from the previous year was in our Science scores. We achieved 65% proficiency last year compared to 73% proficiency the previous year. One factor is that our teachers are usually very consistent with little turnover. Our fifth-grade teachers are departmentalized and we added new team members to our science team last year. Another possible factor is that there may have been more focus on all of the new components of ELA and Math. The teachers may have been more centered on the new standards, curriculum, and assessment for the year.

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 students typically score higher than the district and the state in proficiency for ELA, Math, and Science. ELA proficiency had a large gap when compared to the state average. At Moss Park Elementary, 70% of students scored proficiently compared to the state's 54% proficiency. The largest gap was in math. The students scored slightly higher in math with 75% proficiency compared to the state's 58% proficiency. So, the ELA showed only 16% higher than the state, whereas the math scores showed 17% higher than the state. A trend that was noticed is teachers focusing more attentively on standards-based instruction due to the new standards in intermediate grades.

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

Even though the scores in all subject areas were much higher than in the state and district, we declined slightly in each subject area. There were many new actions taken this year due to the new standards and curriculum. ELA and math scores are difficult to compare to the previous year since the assessment and standards changed.

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

Looking at the data overall, attendance stands out as a concern. We have a community of people who take experience vacations with their children. For students who are academically proficient that doesn't necessarily net an issue for our overall proficiency. On the surface, it may also seem like we have a larger attendance issue than what we have in reality. In the units, we have many students who miss frequently miss ABA therapy or other outside therapies one to two days every week.

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

1. Increase overall proficiency in all subject areas
2. Early Literacy
3. Learning gains

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 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.

Moss Park 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 37% in 2021-2022. 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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a five percentage point increase in the Students with disabilities ESSA Subgroup Federal index in the area of ELA.

Monitoring:

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

The school's leadership team will be active participants in all common planning meetings for each content area. Feedback on instructional trends in each content area will be provided during the common planning sessions. The school's leadership team will also attend monthly data meetings, which will focus on analyzing data from common assessments, program use, intervention group data, and district progress monitoring assessments to determine trends and needs for changes to instruction. Implementation of any shifts made to lessons will be monitored by the school's leadership by conducting daily classroom walkthroughs. Upon completion of daily walkthroughs, individual feedback will be provided to instructional and support staff via the instructional framework, progress monitoring tools, and the coaching teacher support log. There will be a strategic focus on ensuring proper program placement and tiered intervention for students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Barrett (aimee.barrett@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will create and implement differentiated instruction geared toward meeting the needs of their Tier II and Tier III students. The Instructional leadership team will monitor data from common unit assessments, implementation of intervention programs, SIPPs, and Reading Plus, which are researched evidence-based interventions. The instructional leadership team will support the development and implementation of small group instruction including push-in support and the walk to intervention model. The staffing specialist will also work with teachers to ensure proper program placement and support services.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data analysis will help teachers better understand their students' differences and needs. Through analyzing will be able to make informed instructional decisions. These informed decisions will help them create small group learning for their students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The school's leadership team will assist in best practice planning for differentiated instruction to reach the instructional needs of Tier II and Tier III students.

Person Responsible: Jeana Borgerding (jeana.borgerding@ocps.net)

By When: December 2023

Teachers will remediate and reteach skills in small groups considering the needs of our SWD.

Person Responsible: Aimee Barrett (aimee.barrett@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

Leadership Team members will visit classrooms to identify standards being taught and strategies being used.

Person Responsible: William Harris (william.harris2@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

#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, Moss Park Elementary will work to improve our Panorama survey from the Spring of 2023 where School Fit was the category with the highest opportunity with just 78% of the respondents stating that Moss Park was a fit for their student. Specifically, just 69% of respondents rated Moss Park Elementary favorably with the question, How comfortable is your child in asking for help from school adults. In order to improve these numbers, the school leadership team will reach out to parents and students to hold roundtables with them in order to create a culture of listening to the concerns and needs of our stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of our plans, a 6% increase in favorable responses to the question how comfortable is your child in asking for help from school adults.

Monitoring:

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

The focus area will be monitored by through a BOY and EOY survey and roundtables with the students and parents of the Moss Park Elementary community.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Harris (william.harris2@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.)

Building a positive environment for all is a research-based intervention to increase student fit for Moss Park Elementary. Everyone wins when a school community creates a welcoming, emotionally supportive learning environment. According to research, understanding what is working to promote a positive, supportive school climate and areas that require improvements and recommendations for making these improvements requires incorporating the voice of all members of the school community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to continue to invest in the culture of the school building. To continue to create a culture of appreciation with adults and students, it is critical to create a welcoming, emotionally supportive learning environment.

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.

Student roundtables held each semester facilitated by the Principal

Person Responsible: Willam Harris (william.harris2@ocps.net)

By When: December 2023

Student discussions and conversations through conducting resiliency lessons with the students.

Person Responsible: Lisa Miller (lisa.miller3@ocps.net)

By When: February 2024

Providing structured and caring classroom environments that are conducive to learning; creating trusting relationships with students and staff to promote social-emotional stability and a positive culture.

Person Responsible: Rob Vetter (robert.vetter@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process used to review the school improvement funding allocations will be conducted through the school's School Advisory Council. This will be based on data from state and district assessments and adjusted when necessary based on those results.