Dr. Phillips Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dr. Phillips Elementary

6909 DR PHILLIPS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32819

https://drphillipses.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
Rogers, Christine	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Meets weekly with the Leadership Team as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Oversees the supervision of all personnel, instructional focus for all grade levels and subjects, and individual student progress, safety, and well-being.
McMurtry, Leanda	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Meets weekly with the Leadership Team as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Oversees supervision of personnel, instructional focus for all grade levels and subjects, and individual student progress, safety, and well-being.
Wallick, Deanna	Instructional Coach	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Assigned to coach all teachers with pedagogy and instruction. Assists teams with developing common assessments and lesson plans as well as selecting complex texts to use for standards-based instruction. Member of the MTSS team supporting KG, 1st, 2nd ELA, 4th/5th grade teachers and students.
Williams, Madeline	Instructional Coach	Part of the Leadership Team which meets weekly as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Assigned to support all ELL students with proper placement and testing. Supports teachers with instruction to support ELL students achieve success. Coaches and teachers will instructional focus on mathematics. Member of the MTSS team supporting 3rd grade, 4th/5th math/science teachers and students.

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

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

The School Improvement Plan is a collaborative effort between school leadership, faculty, staff, and SAC members. School data is used to identify areas of focus for the upcoming school year. SIP Goals and strategies are presented to school staff and SAC members for input. SAC members approve the SIP plan after input is provided.

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))

SIP Goals are the foundation for school plans and professional learning. Strategies and professional development related to SIP goals are monitored via classroom walk-through visits and observations. Data is collected to monitor the effectiveness of strategies and identify the next steps as needed.

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	52%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: 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	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	6

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	9

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	0	6	16	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	0	6	16	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	73	57	53	71	56	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				62			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			56		
Math Achievement*	72	60	59	76	46	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				65			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			44		
Science Achievement*	66	63	54	65	61	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	59	59	64			79		

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	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	53			
HSP	63			
MUL	93			
PAC				
WHT	78			

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	61			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	49			

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	73			72			66					69
SWD	30			26			22				4	
ELL	63			64			58				5	69
AMI												
ASN	85			89							2	
BLK	53			53							2	
HSP	63			61			60				5	67
MUL	93			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	78			77			71				5	77
FRL	58			61			52				5	70

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	71	62	38	76	65	42	65					64
SWD	16	28	27	40	53	43	38					
ELL	60	56	35	70	62	38	58					64
AMI												
ASN	93	83		93	67							
BLK	42	20		32	36		10					
HSP	63	62	36	72	62	29	59					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	64	48	82	69	64	76					55
FRL	57	47	28	61	62	39	46					50

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	73	64	56	74	67	44	70					79
SWD	35			26			33					50
ELL	67	77	60	71	69	50	60					79
AMI												
ASN	91	79		88	64		88					
BLK	53	50		35	40		45					
HSP	68	57	57	73	68	53	62					83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	69		77	75		82					60
FRL	63	51	55	63	63	46	54					65

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	62%	54%	8%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	58%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	62%	22%	61%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	51%	12%

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 lowest performance in proficiency is in 5th grade science. During the 22-23 school year, 66% of students demonstrated proficiency. The science proficiency is closely related to the 5th grade reading proficiency. Mid-year data for 5th grade showed that 49% of students scored one to two years below grade level. Teachers struggled with providing data-based instruction in small-group intervention settings. During the 22-23 school year, 6 of the 7 teachers were new to teaching 5th-grade content, which could have been a contributing factor to the small group struggles.

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

The greatest decline was in math proficiency. DPES has a 75% proficiency, a -1% decline. Targeted intervention was not effectively implemented during the 22-23 school year. Teachers struggled with differentiating instruction. Many teachers were new to their grade level and were challenged with learning their grade level content as well as ensuring that they provided standards-based interventions at the level to meet the needs of the individual students.

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.

Dr. Phillips ES scored above the state average in reading, math, and science proficiency. During the 22-23 school year, grade-level teams focused on evaluating how centers' aligned tasks are aligned to the standard in addition to creating a center checklist to assist students in monitoring their own progression on a weekly basis. DPES also continued the utilization of Reading Plus which helped build student fluency, vocabulary, and reading skills.

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

The reading data showed the greatest improvement. Dr. Phillips scored 77% proficient, a 6% increase from the prior school year. The school focused on center tasks being aligned to the grade level standard and teachers monitoring student understanding. During the 22-23 school year, grade level teams focused on evaluating how centers aligned tasks are aligned to the standard in addition to creating centers checklist to assist students in monitoring their own progression on a weekly basis. DPES also continued the utilization of Reading Plus which helped build student fluency, vocabulary, and reading skills.

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

Attendance is an area of concern as we have seen an increase in student absences.

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

Student Attendance
Character Education
Differentiating Instruction

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.

Discipline data showed disrespect was the highest offense in student discipline referrals. Last year, 29.7% of all referrals for student discipline were related to disrespect.

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

For the 23-24 School Year, we will decrease the percentage of discipline referrals for disrespect by 2%

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

This will be monitored through quarterly discipline referral reports and MTSS behavioral meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Madeline Williams (madeline.williams@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 implement a school-wide behavior management plan (Stop-Think-Act) and PBIS (Eagle Club) to support students in developing character education and creating a positive classroom environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing Stop-Think-Act students will learn to become self-aware of their behavior and think about how to make good decisions which contribute to a positive learning environment. By implementing Stop-Think-Act and Eagles Club, students will learn effective self-management strategies to make good decisions and be productive classroom citizens. The school should see a reduction in referrals for disrespect.

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.

Professional Development for all staff on the implementation of the Stop-Think-Act school-wide behavior plan.

Person Responsible: Madeline Williams (madeline.williams@ocps.net)

By When: October 1, 2023

Quarterly refresher sessions for all students when reviewing the OCPS student code of conduct.

Person Responsible: Madeline Williams (madeline.williams@ocps.net)

By When: Second week of each quarter.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

This area of focus was targeted because according to the Federal Percent of Points Index, only 28% of our Black/African American subgroup were proficient on the 22-23 End of Year FAST. Additionally, only 35% of our SWD subgroup were proficient according to the Federal Percent of Points Index.

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

We expect to have our Black/African American subgroup to have an increase in proficiency from 28% proficient to 30% proficient on the 23-24 End of Year FAST assessment, according to the Federal Percent of Points Index. Additionally, we plan to increase our SWD subgroup from 35% proficient to 37% proficient on the 23-24 End of Year FAST assessment

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

Student data such as outcomes on intervention programs, common assessments, and achievement levels on FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 will be monitored for student growth in reading and math. Data will be added to the school-wide data-sheet to allow in-depth monitoring by the school leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@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 implement strategies to differentiate instruction in the teacher-led station during small group instruction. By differentiating small group instruction, teachers will be able to plan to meet the needs of all students. We will utilize Exact Path and SuccessMaker as part our our evidence-based intervention use.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the 2023-2024 school year, the school will use data to differentiate instruction for students during centers. 33% of SWD scored at grade level in reading; 47% of Black students scored at grade level in reading. The selected programs will provide an instructional learning path for each individual student that focuses on closing the learning gaps that exist.

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.

Professional Development will be provided to all teachers on how to use data to plan and implement differentiated instruction strategies during intervention small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Deanna Wallick (deanna.wallick@ocps.net)

By When: September 6, 2023

Intervention groups will be based on individual student needs. Teachers will use a "walk-to" model with teachers providing target instruction to individuals and small groups. Students will be grouped based on current data and instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs within the targeted group.

Person Responsible: Leanda McMurtry (leanda.mcmurtry@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing through the 23-24 school.

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).

During the spring of 2023, a budget committee meeting was held to review the school budget and allocation. In August 2023, the school Principal reviewed the budget and SIP plan with SAC members. District resources are being utilized to structure the teacher-led center. The school has purchased an additional resource teacher to support small group during interventions for our SWD and our Black/African American subgroups.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes