Wyndham Lakes Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wyndham Lakes Elementary

14360 WYNDHAM LAKES BLVD, Orlando, FL 32824

https://wyndhamlakeses.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
Zizza, Margarita	Principal	The principal's role is to provide strategic direction in the school system to ensure the mission and vision of OCPS are enacted daily. The principal serves as the instructional leader and is the primary source of Professional Development. The principal also monitors the distribution of leadership roles and addresses the needs of the students, parents, and local stakeholders. * Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making * Ensures school resources, including but not limited to, budget, personnel, materials, and supplies are maximized to achieve school improvement goals. * Ensures that the school-based team is implementing FCIM, MTSS and addressing School Improvement goals and targets. * Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation.
Vidal Llado, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader, oversees facility management, and maintains behavioral expectations. * Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP. * Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff. *Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation. * Develops documents necessary to manage and display data that addresses goals and targets identified in the SIP. * Monitors subgroups' progress and keeps track of data collection. * Collects school-wide discipline data and uses the problem-solving process to address the needs of the school, as well as those of small groups and individual students. * Helps to determine appropriate interventions, such as individual behavior plans, for at-risk students. * Attends MTSS Team meetings as needed. * Oversees Culturally Responsive activities at the school level.
Johnson, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The role of the coach is to build teacher capacity and their understanding of instructional practices. The instructional coach facilitates PLC meetings and assists teachers with planning and pacing of lessons, the development of differentiated lessons, and the selection of best practices to meet the needs of their students. They also Informally observe (non-evaluative) lessons and provide feedback for a teacher's professional growth and students' success, in addition to modeling lessons. * Organizes and provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction. * Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. * Oversees data analysis. * Ensures fidelity of core reading instruction and provides PD if needed. * Coordinates and keeps track of professional development points. * Assigns mentors to new teachers and monitors the extent to which

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		mentoring is effective. * Supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP.
Brooks, Velena	School Counselor	* Oversees Culturally Responsive activities at the school level. * Provide support for healthy emotional and social development strategies and programs. * Facilitates and supports data collection activities. * Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. * Supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP.
Guettler, Cara	Other	* Schedules all required testing, along with overseeing implementation and technology requirements. * Coordinates tutoring services and keeps track of progress monitoring data. * Supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP.
Thomareas, Michele	Other	Facilitates the process of building consensus and increasing infrastructure to support a school-wide implementation of MTSS. * Facilitates MTSS Team meetings that are focused on problem-solving processes to address the needs of all learners. * Maintains a log of all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. * Presents data with the classroom teacher at MTSS parent meetings for individual students. * Ensures fidelity of Tier 2 intervention and provides PD if needed. * Plans and implements Tier 3 interventions. * Assists teachers with progress monitoring, data collection, and graphing. * Attends monthly grade-level data meetings to address the needs of the school, small groups of learners, and individual learners. * Coaches teachers in the use of the problem-solving process, ongoing progress monitoring, differentiated instruction, and intervention planning and implementation.
Harper, Marie	Instructional Media	* Supports and oversees the implementation of one-to-one devices and digital learning.
Rosado, Evelyn	ELL Compliance Specialist	The Curriculum Compliance Teacher facilitates and monitors services for ELLs and organizes the Multicultural Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings. The CCT also assists teachers in implementing instructional strategies and monitors the effectiveness of those strategies.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		* Maintains ESOL compliance. * Oversees bilingual program. * Assists in data analysis. * Shares best instructional practices for our ELL population. * ADDitions/PIE Coordinator. * Community relations.
Puskarik, Jamie	Staffing Specialist	* Supports our ASD and ESE population and ensures best practices are in place for our scholars. * Documents intervention and provides follow-up to ensure student success. * Facilitates and supports data collection activities. * Assists in data analysis. * Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP. * Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed.

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 drafted by the leadership team at the end of the school year based on state assessment data, discipline data, and panorama survey results. The plan is presented to the School Advisory Council in August and sent for review at the district level where input is provided prior to submitting the plan to the State.

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 monitored during our BOY, MOY, and EOY state assessment windows. Data is collected throughout the school year and plans are adjusted before our MOY reflection is completed.

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	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	26	21	21	19	15	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	23	19	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	29	26	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	29	33	24	23	0	0	0	0	109

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	14	12	9	28	16	0	0	0	79

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	11
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	8	36	35	34	20	22	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	20	26	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	20	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	8	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	0	0	1	1	14	19	0	0	0	35

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	8	36	35	34	20	22	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	20	26	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	20	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	8	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	0	0	1	1	14	19	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	11
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*	58	57	53	60	56	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				63			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			37		
Math Achievement*	57	60	59	63	46	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				65			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			52		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	69	63	54	51	61	59	50		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	60			54		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
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	11	Yes	3	3
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	57			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	2	2
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	51			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	51			

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	58			57			69					64
SWD	13			9			8				4	
ELL	51			49			55				5	64
AMI												
ASN	93			79							2	
BLK	47			42			67				4	
HSP	56			55			67				5	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62			72							3	
FRL	55			52			72				5	61

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	60	63	40	63	65	43	51					60
SWD	12	30	22	20	36	32	25					50
ELL	47	59	39	58	64	53	35					60
AMI												
ASN	96	91		92	85		80					
BLK	49	57	48	56	62	44	43					
HSP	60	64	35	62	66	43	52					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	63	50	66	54		41					
FRL	51	61	42	52	64	42	39					56

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	61	62	37	59	61	52	50					54
SWD	15	33	31	29	53	45	19					
ELL	50	56	44	49	51	47	40					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
AMI												
ASN	87			96								
BLK	58	57		54	64		25					20
HSP	61	66	35	57	59	50	52					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	20		63	50		58					
FRL	57	61	43	52	58	60	49					49

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	60%	54%	6%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	50%	2%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	51%	11%

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 our FAST overall data, our lowest performance was in Math. Our end-of-year score of proficiency was 55% in grades 3rd through 5th. Some contributing factors are that we began new standards in these grade levels, with a new state assessment. Some of the standards taught last school year required background knowledge that the students may not have previously learned and/or mastered. This was also a new format of testing with the new standards.

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

Based on our FAST overall data, our greatest decline was in 3rd-grade Math. Aside from the possible contributions stated in question one, this grade level group was in Kindergarten when school closings occurred in 2020. Following a year of potential online or hybrid learning, we continue to address the learning loss. This is their second school year learning the new standards, the first year for their teachers teaching these grade-level standards.

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

Based on our FAST overall and grade level data, 3rd grade Math has the greatest gap between district and State. In mathematics, the District scored 58% proficient, the State scored 59% proficient, and Wyndham Lakes Elementary 3rd Grade scored 53% proficient. When comparing the data for the 3rd grade ELA FAST results, 3rd grade students scored at 52% proficiency. It could be determined that the students who were proficient in ELA were also proficient in Math. Third-grade math requires students to be able to read word problems in order to solve them. Thus, a student would need to be proficient in ELA in order to be proficient in math.

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

Based on the Science Assessment for 5th grade, 5th Grade Science demonstrated the most improvement. In the 2022 school year, our students scored 51% proficient, and in the 2023 school year, they scored 69% proficient. Teachers used the district's CRMs to teach lessons to their students and also used the science booklets provided by the district for curriculum review.

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

Two potential areas identified by the early warning signs are as follows:
-Number of students scoring Level 1 and Level 2 on their state assessments.
-Number of students with substantial reading deficiencies.

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

Priorities for school improvement:
1) Increase proficiency in ELA

2) Increase proficiency in Math
3) Increase proficiency in small-group teaching and learning

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our preliminary data on our FAST PM3 ELA, shows 61% of our scholars proficient in reading whereas our SWD subgroup scored 50% proficient in ELA. Our FAST Math PM3 shows 60% of our scholars proficient in Math whereas our SWD subgroup scored 44% proficient in math. Our focus is to increase proficiency in reading and math by focusing on deepening teacher knowledge of rigorous, standards-based instructional practices, small group instruction, and the role that common assessments and data play in order to accelerate student performance and increase proficiency with our SWD subgroup.

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

We will increase the proficiency score of our SWD subgroup in ELA from 50% to 55% and in math from 44% to 50%.

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

We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of our instruction with our common assessment data, progress monitoring data, and classroom walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margarita Zizza (margarita.zizza@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.)

For the evidence-based interventions, we will utilize Successmaker for Math and Exact Path for ELA to monitor progress over time. In addition to using these programs, we will also...
- Monitor standards-based instruction alignment to student tasks.
- Pre-teach vocabulary.
- Effectively use of common assessment data.
- Progress monitor data collected throughout the year.

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

Edmentum Exact Path utilizes adaptive diagnostic assessments paired with individualized learning paths to promote academic growth. The program is focused on understanding where our students are academically and then taking that data a step further to provide just-in-time instruction aligned to your goals.

SuccessMaker is a only continuously adaptive K-5 math intervention program. Through adaptive motion, the program personalizes learning paths for mastery of essential math concepts and delivers outcome-based data to inform educational decision-making.

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.

Continue to provide training on the B.E.S.T. Standards in ELA and Math as well as training on small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Johnson (jennifer.johnson@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing - August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024

During pre-planning and PLCs, provide training on how to enhance lessons to ensure teachers are pre-teaching vocabulary, adding scaffolding questions to lessons, and activating prior knowledge through anchor charts and frontloading activities.

Person Responsible: Margarita Zizza (margarita.zizza@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing - August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024

Identify our bottom 30% for ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Michelle Vidal Llado (37319@ocps.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Use ELA and Math common assessment data to identify trends and create instructional groups for reteach/intervention and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Michelle Vidal Llado (37319@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing - August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024

Examination of collaborative planning agendas, common assessments, and teacher delivery of instruction to ensure alignment of common assessments to the intent and rigor of the B.E.S.T. Standards.

Person Responsible: Margarita Zizza (margarita.zizza@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing - August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024

Monitor our SWD subgroup data to ensure interventions are in place and resources are being utilized with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Margarita Zizza (margarita.zizza@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing - August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Our spring 2023 Panorama survey data stated that 49% of our teachers felt that they receive feedback often.
By building and establishing a culture for social and professional learning at our school with staff, academic learning will be enhanced. We will address this need by having purposeful and effective coaching feedback. This will help to foster a supportive environment where staff members feel safe to reflect and engage in positive interactions.

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

We will increase our percentage of teachers who feel that they do receive feedback often from 49% to 52% on the 2024 Spring Panorama survey.

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

Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of classroom observations and common assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Vidal Llado (37319@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.)

Use distributive leadership to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. It is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. We will also provide more frequent coaching feedback to staff using the classroom walkthrough tool, written feedback, emails, and opportunities to celebrate successes during professional development and staff meetings.

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

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.

Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school in order to understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Velena Brooks (velena.brooks@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing, August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024.

Implementing rounds of classroom walkthroughs with teacher feedback.

Person Responsible: Michelle Vidal Llado (37319@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing, August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024.

Celebrations at PLCs and staff meeting.

Person Responsible: Michelle Vidal Llado (37319@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing, August 10, 2023 - May 25, 2024.

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).

We will monitor the implementation of the school improvement plans and our areas of concern which are instructional practice, specifically relating to benchmark-aligned instruction, and positive culture and environment. We will monitor the increase in proficiency in both reading and math, specifically with our ESSA subgroups targeting our SWD subgroup. We will also ensure that small group instruction is aligned with benchmark-aligned instruction. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of our instruction with our common assessment data, progress monitoring data, and classroom walkthrough data. We will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on our 2022-2023 FAST(STAR) ELA Scores, our first graders scored 49% Proficient for ELA, and now they are our second-grade students for the 2023-2024 school year. Students in second grade this school year will develop an awareness of vocabulary in order to grow in their ELA proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

We will provide purposeful vocabulary instruction with vocabulary-building activities to build students' word knowledge so they can make sense of the text. Second-grade (previously first graders) will increase their proficiency level in ELA from 49% from their end-of-year FAST(STAR) score to 52% second-grade end-of-year FAST(STAR) score.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Monthly data meetings, with second grade, including the leadership team, to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, second grade progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments, to monitor proficiency growth

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Vidal Llado, Michelle, 37319@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will be using Exact Path to monitor student learning for our now second graders who scored 49% proficient in their end-of-year FAST(STAR) assessment in first grade.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Exact Path program will help to develop awareness of vocabulary in the passages and how it relates to the meaning of what they are reading. It will also provide purposeful vocabulary-building activities to help students read effortlessly. Teachers will use Exact Path lessons during intervention time and small group time.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Team: Literacy leadership team meetings, where FAST and standard unit assessment data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Vidal Llado, Michelle, 37319@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching: The coach will use data to identify personnel and areas of need. In addition, the coach will implement coaching cycles, modeling, and PLC planning support.	Johnson, Jennifer, jennifer.johnson@ocps.net
We will develop our professional learning plans based on the needs of our schools. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. We will provide training on how to enhance lessons to ensure teachers are pre-teaching vocabulary, adding scaffolding questions to lessons, and activating prior knowledge through anchor charts and frontloading activities. District PD options have been offered to our staff to include K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD, and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.	Vidal Llado, Michelle, 37319@ocps.net

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$155,468.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	2110	Resource Teacher	1741 - Wyndham Lakes Elementary	General Fund	1.0	$77,734.00
	2110	Instructional Coach	1741 - Wyndham Lakes Elementary	General Fund	1.0	$77,734.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$77,734.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	2110	Counselor	1741 - Wyndham Lakes Elementary	General Fund		$77,734.00
					Total:	$233,202.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes