Deerwood Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Deerwood Elementary

1356 S ECONLOCKHATCHEE TRL, Orlando, FL 32825

https://deerwoodes.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
May, Melanie	Principal	Once a week, the Leadership team meets as a group to discuss the current status of the school. Each team member has specific duties and responsibilities that contribute to the shared decision-making process. Dr. May oversees the overall decision-making process, as well as observes and evaluates instructional staff. Dr. May also participates in weekly data meetings, common planning, MTSS, and PLCs. In addition, Dr. May works directly with teachers as instructional leaders to develop and monitor best practices for academic instruction. Dr. May also conducts classroom walk-throughs to ensure instructional practices align with the Florida BEST standards.
Shepherd, Natalie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Shepherd is responsible for facilitating the day-to-day requirements of the school. She ensures the safety of students, as well as fulfillment of federal and state student and teacher performance guidelines. Mrs. Shepherd is responsible for student discipline and Title IX. She holds respectful interactions with students, teachers, other administrators, board members, and parents. Mrs. Shepherd oversees weekly data meetings, common planning, MTSS, and PLCs. Mrs. Shepherd also works with a small group of students to help foster academic progress and additional duties as assigned.
Rawls, Erica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Rawls collaborates with grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. She works closely with new teachers and is responsible for overseeing new teacher mentorship. In addition, Mrs. Rawls collects the weekly data from each teacher on their common assessments and identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with both school and district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. She assists teachers with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning. Mrs. Rawls participates in the design and delivery of professional development. She is responsible for working with a small group of students to help foster academic progress along with any other duties assigned.
LoTurco, Rebecca	School Counselor	Ms. LoTurco collaborates with the teachers, behavior specialist, and instructional coach to work together to support students with their social-emotional needs. She provides monthly guidance lessons for all K-5 classrooms and works directly with the teachers to support behavioral needs within the classroom. Ms. LoTurco is responsible for monitoring students who are eligible for services through the McKinney-Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support for these families identified as homeless. Ms. LoTurco also works with a small group of students to help foster academic progress and additional duties as assigned.
Lean, Lori	Staffing Specialist	As a staffing specialist, Ms. Lean, monitors services and accommodations provided to students and ensures their IEP plans and Section 504 plans are

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		current and followed. Ms. Lean works with the team of teachers of exceptional education students to review curriculum, assessment, and instruction. She helps develop IEP plans, EP plans, and Section 504 plans and facilitates IEP team meetings which include teachers, therapists, and parents. Ms. Lean is responsible for coordinating with district transportation regarding student busing and student busing needs. She also has additional duties as assigned.

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.

Deerwood utilizes a School Advisory Council to ensure all stakeholders are involved in the SIP development process.

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 goals and strategies of the school improvement plan are continually monitored by administrators, the school leadership team, and teacher leaders to evaluate the impact on student performance. Ongoing adjustments are made based on various performance, process, and perception 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	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	85%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: 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	3	15	17	25	11	13	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	11	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	8	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	8	14	6	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	5	7	8	8	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	3	3	5	1	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	1	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	3	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	8	1	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	1	4	8	6	1	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	3	3	5	1	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	1	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	3	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	8	1	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	1	4	8	6	1	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	67	57	53	71	56	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				70			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			33		
Math Achievement*	73	60	59	76	46	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				81			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			21		
Science Achievement*	73	63	54	74	61	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	74			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)	N/A
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
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	77			
FRL	62			

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	47			
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	66			
HSP	73			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	72			

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	67			73			73					64
SWD	31			32							3	
ELL	53			70			71				4	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58			63							2	
HSP	60			73			70				5	69

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77			76			81				4	
FRL	60			66			64				5	55

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	70	58	76	81	70	74					74
SWD	19	60	60	28	67							
ELL	68	75		77	96							74
AMI												
ASN	90			100								
BLK	65	69		63	67							
HSP	68	75	65	76	87	82	63					71
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	59	40	78	76	73	82					
FRL	64	71	58	73	84	74	69					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	72	47	33	71	45	21	51					79
SWD	31	17		18	17		15					
ELL	54	21		63	21		23					79
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	63			56								
HSP	69	38		67	34		43					79
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73	57		74	62		54					

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
FRL	69	40	20	66	30		48					68

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	71%	60%	11%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	51%	22%

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.

Grade 5 English Language Arts data was the lowest performing group. This group of students did not finish their second-grade year in the brick-and-mortar schoolhouse due to the Covid-19 pandemic (March 2020) and many participated/attended school virtually with the LaunchEd program for their third-grade year. These years are paramount in foundational reading skills and were perhaps factors in the low performance across the grade level.

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

Grade 5 English Language Arts data dropped 9 percent from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. The grade level consisted of a higher-than-average ESOL and ESE population. Students were also tested during the 2022-2023 school year on the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking a computer-based assessment for the first time.

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.

Deerwood Elementary performed above the state average in every data component viewed.

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 during the 22-23 school year was 4th-grade math scores. During the 21/22 school year 4th grade math showed 77% proficient. During the 22-23 school year they had 80% proficient. This is due to the use of the rotational model, hands-on activities, pull-out Tier 1 intervention, and acceleration model for tutoring.

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

In reflection on the 2022-2023 school year EWS data, attendance rates are a large area of concern. During the 2022-2023 school year 84 students (nearly 1/5) were absent 10 or more days. In addition, overall grade level proficiency in third through fifth grades was also identified as a potential area of concern.

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

Our priorities are ensuring consistent student attendance and targeting students in third through fifth grade for overall grade-level proficiency.

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 Student Engagement

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.

Deerwood Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning standards-based lessons coupled with delivering rigorous instruction to include student engagement and effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of BEST standards.

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

As teachers improve their understanding and implementation of standard based lessons, student proficiency will increase by 5% overall in third, fourth, and fifth grade as compared to the previous school year on the statewide Florida Assessment for Student Thinking.

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

This area of focus will be monitored utilizing Progress Monitoring 1, Progress Monitoring 2, and districtwide unit-based assessments which the leadership team and grade level teams will analyze as part of regularly scheduled data meetings to identify areas of proficiency and areas that continue to show a need for support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie May (melanie.may@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.)

Standard based planning through the PLC process will be utilized to deliver high-quality data-driven instruction. This will include training on the Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words Program (SIPPS) for all teachers in order to provide a structured-literacy approach to reading instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling-sounds, and sight words.

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

Initial and ongoing assessment in SIPPS helps ensure that students receive the appropriate instruction and that they move through the accelerative scope and sequence of lessons successfully and as efficiently and as effectively as they can based upon their individual progress. Assessment data determines placement in the program. Students are placed at their points of need within a level and a lesson. Flexible groups that are based on placement test results ensure that students are provided differentiated instruction.

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

Tier 2 - Moderate 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.

Common planning time 2 days per week to allow for teachers to purposefully, and collaboratively plan standards-based lessons utilizing the Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) program

Person Responsible: Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)

By When: Implementation will begin week of August 21, 2023.

Teachers currently trained on SIPPS will lead professional development in order to train all staff on the implementation of SIPPS with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Melanie May (melanie.may@ocps.net)

By When: Implementation will begin week of August 21, 2023.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Based on our EWS data, student attendance is an area of concern. Nearly 1/5 of our students were absent 10 or more days in the 2022-2023 school year. Improving attendance will be an area of focus for the 2023-2024 school year. At Deerwood we believe a positive school culture fosters safety, promotes a positive academic, disciplinary and physical environment, encourages trusting and caring relationships between adults and students and directly relates to higher rates of attendance, and achievement.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, we will decrease the percentage of student absences (10+ absences) by at least10% (from 84 students to 75 students).

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

We will hold consistent student services meetings with the student services school-based team. Deerwood will also utilize a concise attendance plan when students are not in class for more than 2 consecutive days. A school-wide, positive behavior plan will assist students and teachers in building continued positive relationships.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Shepherd (natalie.shepherd@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.)

To increase and promote a positive school culture and environment, staff will implement age-appropriate Resiliency Learning lessons from Sanford Harmony in their classroom.

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

Studies have shown students with higher Resiliency Learning usually have better grades, assessment scores, behavior, and attendance than students with lower Social Emotional Learning. When school leaders create a positive school culture, students are more likely to want to be at school.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Meeting with cafeteria leads, school staff, and teachers to ensure our SOAR school wide positive behavior plan is being implemented with fidelity. Deerwood has a SOAR committee (comprised of staff members) who will meet to discuss any adjustments that may be needed.

Person Responsible: Natalie Shepherd (natalie.shepherd@ocps.net)

By When: SOAR behavior plan will be implemented starting the week of August 14, 2023. Monitoring will take place on a monthly and/or quarterly basis.

Staff training by school guidance counselor on Sanford Harmony with suggestions and ideas on how to implement it in the classrooms.

Person Responsible: Natalie Shepherd (natalie.shepherd@ocps.net)

By When: Training and implementation will begin in October 2023

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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.

No