Orange County Public Schools

Sand Lake Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sand Lake Elementary

8301 BUENA VISTA WOODS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32836

https://sandlakees.ocps.net/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
Phillips, Kathleen	Principal	Principal: ensures the mission and vision of OCPS are enacted daily, serves as the instructional leader and primary source of professional development and monitors distribution of leadership roles
Schwartz, Katie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: ensures the mission and vision of OCPS are enacted daily, serves as the instructional leader and primary source of professional development and monitors distribution of leadership roles; serves as Title IX coordinator
Lawhorn, Wendy	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach: provide coaching cycles and support for teachers. Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and individual meetings as necessary, facilitate instruction for Tier II intervention, monitor implementation of standards-based instruction, coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts and serve as assessment coordinators
Howland, Chelsea	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum Resource Teacher: Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and individual meetings as necessary, facilitate instruction for Tier II intervention, monitor implementation of standards- based instruction, coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts and serve as assessment coordinator.
Mills, Tara	School Counselor	School Counselor: facilitates individual and group counseling, classroom guidance, Child Safety Matters, assists with Quaver SEL implementation; serves as Title IX coordinator, Safe Coordinator, and McKinney-Vento program coordinator.
Munoz, Noemi	ELL Compliance Specialist	Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT): facilitates and monitors services for ELLs and organizes Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings, serves as MTSS Lead and assists teachers in implementing instructional/behavioral strategies, monitors the effectiveness of the strategies, holds monthly MTSS team meetings to review student, data and adjusts instruction as needed and facilitates instruction for Tier II and Tier III interventions
Strack, Chelsea	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist: Schedule meetings for the IEP team members to convene and discuss students. Remain in compliance with initial eligibilities, annual reviews and reevaluations of students receiving ESE services. Work with teachers and families to best meet students' needs.

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 was developed using input from teachers, school staff, parents, students, families, and community members. The School Improvement Plan was also reviewed with the School Advisory Council.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan is reviewed by the school's leadership team in weekly meetings and monthly at the School Advisory Council meetings. Data that has been reviewed includes FAST data, Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUA), and Panorama 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	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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: 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	10	32	32	35	23	24	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	6
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	0	34	35	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	28	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	27	33	37	33	0	0	0	0	130
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	12	15	14	38	30	0	0	0	109

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	33	34	35	22	24	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	2	31	27	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	2	24	25	0	0	0	0	51
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	1	0	2	23	23	0	0	0	49

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	9	33	34	35	22	24	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	2	31	27	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	2	24	25	0	0	0	0	51
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	1	0	2	23	23	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	

The Grade Level header spans columns K through 8.

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*	59	57	53	69	56	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				72			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			40		
Math Achievement*	63	60	59	69	46	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				73			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			25		
Science Achievement*	71	63	54	63	61	59	57		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	59	59	69			51		

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
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	29	Yes	4	2
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	41			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			

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	54			

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	63			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	57			

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	59			63			71					67
SWD	18			24			33				5	50
ELL	42			48			54				5	67
AMI												
ASN	84			78			80				4	
BLK	45			48							3	
HSP	47			48			43				5	71
MUL												

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	66			73			91				5	56
FRL	46			52			56				5	72

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	69	72	55	69	73	51	63					69
SWD	21	48	44	18	35	8	17					
ELL	47	62	54	51	62	41	41					69
AMI												
ASN	93	88		93	82		86					
BLK	79			47								
HSP	46	62	52	48	59	42	40					68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	72		80	86	85	74					
FRL	54	70	60	50	61	55	39					65

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	66	55	40	64	42	25	57					51
SWD	12	13	17	21	20		6					
ELL	46	37	36	48	39	31	33					51
AMI												
ASN	75			80								
BLK	48	54		50	31		56					
HSP	54	48	45	47	33	40	48					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	58		72	47		61					35
FRL	48	40	36	45	30	20	47					50

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	55%	54%	1%	54%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	59%	2%	51%	10%

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.**

Based on the data, the area with the lowest performance was ELA. On the 2023 3-5 FAST PM 3,
reading proficiency was 51%. This was a decline of 18% from the 2022 FSA achievement data.
Contributing factors include inexperienced teachers, and teachers with extended leave of absences.
Teachers' lack of comprehension of the new B.E.S.T standards also contributed to the performance.

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

Based on the data, the great decline was 4th Grade ELA proficiency. On the 2023 FAST PM 3, reading proficiency was 48%. This was a decline of 23% from the 2022 FSA 4th grade proficiency data. Contributing factors include inexperienced teachers, and teachers with extended leave of absences. Teachers' lack of comprehension of the new B.E.S.T standards also contributed to the performance.

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.

ELA had a 3% gap when compared to the state average on the FAST PM 3. Contributing factors include inexperienced teachers, and teachers with extended leave of absences. Teachers' lack of comprehension of the new B.E.S.T standards also contributed to the performance.

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

Based on the data, the area with the most improvement was 5th grade Science with an increase of 10%. New actions implemented included using new resources made available from the district. We also implemented targeted small group instruction for science based on SBUA and PMA data.

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

An area of particular concern is students with a substantial reading deficiency. Another area of concern is our students with disabilities.

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

The highest priorities is increasing proficiency of 3-5 FAST proficiency data for both Reading and Math. Other areas of priority is 3rd grade reading. We will also work closely with identifying and supporting students with 2 or more EWS indicators. We will also support our SWD population.

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.

Our focus is to use PBIS and teach life skills to strengthen a positive culture and climate school-wide. During the 2022-2023 school year, there were 56 office referrals. Our focus is to decrease the number of office referrals by implementing a school-wide behavior plan. Based on the panorama data, 64% of students surveyed felt safe at school. Our goal is to increase the number of students who feel safe at school.

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

Our focus is to decrease the number of office referrals by 5% by implementing a school-wide behavior plan. A secondary goal is to increase the percentage of students and families who feel students are safe by 6% on campus as indicated by Panorama survey results.

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

A school-wide PBIS system will be developed and implemented. The PBIS team will convene monthly to determine effectiveness based on referral data and feedback. Modifications will be made to our PBIS Plan accordingly in order to increase student achievement and decrease negative behavior and referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Schwartz (katie.schwartz@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.)

PBIS is an evidence-based intervention that supports building a positive school culture and climate. School-wide implementation of a PBIS plan will decrease behaviors outined in the OCPS Code of Conduct. This will ultimately lower the number referrals on campus.

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 invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of life skills with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of all stakeholders. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

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.

Establish and share expectations for the utilization of the school-wide PBIS system and life skills programs and strategies based on student needs including, but not limited to: Quaver, Second Step, and Class Dojo.

Person Responsible: Katie Schwartz (katie.schwartz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Establish and share expectations regarding school-based initiatives such as Bucket Filler and Student of the Month, focused on positive character development and positive behavior reinforcement.

Person Responsible: Tara Mills (tara.mills@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Develop PBIS system for expected behaviors: R.A.Y.S. Ensure the school team receives training and continued support on implementation.
Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum, strategies and school-based initiatives.

Person Responsible: Katie Schwartz (katie.schwartz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Monthly PBIS Committee meetings to monitor referral data, and determine modifications as needed.

Person Responsible: Katie Schwartz (katie.schwartz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 the data, the area with the lowest performance was ELA. On the 2023 3-5 FAST PM 3, reading proficiency was 51%. This was a decline of 18% from the 2022 FSA achievement data. Our SWD students only achieved 27% proficiency in ELA. This data indicates a need for a targeted focus on standards-based instruction coupled with monitoring resulting in instructional practice adjustments.

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

The 2024 ELA assessment data will show an overall increase of at least 10%, raising proficiency from 56% to 66%.The learning gains will minimally be 60% in ELA. The students with disability will benefit from increased Tier 1 instruction and will move from 27% proficiency to 42%.

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

Monitoring for this area of focus will occur with detailed analysis of Standards-Based Unit Assessment (SBUA), FAST, and diagnostic data. As a result, we will be able to identify specific growth opportunities and needs, thus being able to adjust instructional practice accordingly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Phillips (kathleen.phillips@ocps.net)

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

The evidenced-based strategy being implemented is data-driven, targeted, small-group instruction based on monitoring. Teachers will focus on providing the students with lessons in the small group that will close the achievement gaps. Targeted programs include using CRMs, Wonders, Being a Reader, SIPPS, and Heggerty Phonemic Awareness.

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

In order to increase proficiency and learning gains, teachers must deliver targeted instruction based on the monitoring of individual needs while systematically reviewing data to determine growth.
Small group reading instruction includes rich tasks which promote deep understanding; allows teaching to occur before and during the reading process, and allows teaching to be adjusted to meet the needs of all learners.

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.

During common planning, teachers will use the most current data to make instructional plans and adjustments. Teachers will actively monitor student understanding and make instructional adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible: Wendy Lawhorn (wendy.lawhorn@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Leadership team will conduct classroom observations and provide timely, actionable feedback with an intense focus on differentiating instruction. This includes classroom teachers and ESE units.

Person Responsible: Katie Schwartz (katie.schwartz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure: Students are appropriately identified and matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible: Noemi Munoz (noemi.munoz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

ESE Team will have a dedicated PLC to effectively plan lessons related to ELA instruction that will best support SWD students. ESE will also closely monitor data to provide support.

Person Responsible: Wendy Lawhorn (wendy.lawhorn@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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).

Administration team will meet with SAC and at least one grade level representative to generate ideas for area of focus. $3188.94 has been generated to support our students for school improvement. Funding will be utilized to support ELA instruction for our students including SWD.
Funding will be used to find substitute teachers for targeted, data drive teacher professional development and funds will be used to purchase instructional materials for Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction.