

Orange County Public Schools

# Wolf Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Wolf Lake Elementary

1771 W PONKAN RD, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://wolflakees.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
Barton-Buggs, Tamara	Principal	Classroom walkthroughs, instructional feedback, monitoring of data, managing the school budget, supervising grade-level team leaders, providing regular feedback to the community, parents, and school staff regarding vision and school improvement, and establishing and maintaining a school climate of rigor, student-centeredness, and professionalism.
Wolfe, Wendy	Assistant Principal	Classroom walkthroughs, instructional feedback, monitoring of data, assisting with behavior, supervising paraprofessionals, and enforcing the Code of conduct
Thomas, Deborah	Staffing Specialist	ESE staffing and support, supporting the success of ESE students, monitoring the academic progress of ESE students, and conference with students as needed, assuring accuracy and compliance of student IEPs.
Tindell, Marlena	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL monitoring and support.
Vinson De La Cruz, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Classroom walkthroughs, instructional feedback, monitoring of data, providing in-service training and follow-up coaching to assist classroom teachers in the use of reading/learning strategies in their classrooms, observing and providing feedback to teachers on instruction related to math/science development and content area knowledge, participate in district-level in-service meetings and assist in the coordination of district-level in-service offerings.

**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 development is a collaborative process. The school leadership team meets to review the school data and end-of-the-year survey data from staff, parents, and students. This information is combined with observational data from the classroom walkthroughs to develop the goals and action steps for the SIP. The SIP is then 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 SIP will be reviewed at the midpoint of the year and an update is given to the SAC for progress towards goals after the school-wide testing in December. This information is used to reflect on the goals and make adjustments as needed.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	62%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	52%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	24	20	9	6	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	8
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	15	14	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	17	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	17	22	15	0	0	0	0	65

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	6	10	15	8	0	0	0	41

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	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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



Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	3	1	5	1	7	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	5	8	0	0	0	18
	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	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	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	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	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	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	3	1	6	5	9	0	0	0	24

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	3	1	5	1	7	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	5	8	0	0	0	18
	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	
	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	
	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	
	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	
	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	

**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	3	1	6	5	9	0	0	0	24

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	57	53	64	56	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				66			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			49		
Math Achievement*	72	60	59	74	46	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				74			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			55		
Science Achievement*	77	63	54	68	61	59	64		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	59	59	81			38		

*\* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	524
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	19	Yes	4	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	60			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	77			
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	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	64			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	60			

**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	64			72			77					50
SWD	15			28			26				4	
ELL	33			45			54				4	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			57			67				4	
HSP	59			69			70				5	44
MUL	80			93							2	
PAC												
WHT	71			81			85				4	
FRL	54			60			72				5	50

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	64	66	40	74	74	57	68					81
SWD	10	27	25	31	50	43	19					
ELL	34	44		55	78	62	64					81
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	53	24	66	69	60	53					
HSP	54	64	50	67	78	61	61					79
MUL	70	80		74	60							
PAC												
WHT	72	71	42	81	75	55	81					
FRL	48	59	37	57	75	61	60					80

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	68	68	49	68	66	55	64					38
SWD	19	43	47	20	33	33	15					
ELL	44	60		42	67		36					38
AMI												
ASN	81			94								
BLK	54	52	47	47	52	53	39					
HSP	62	66	50	55	58	54	53					38
MUL	79			79								
PAC												
WHT	77	79	53	81	80	64	81					
FRL	58	58	48	51	54	50	46					41

**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	69%	54%	15%	54%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	51%	24%

### III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**  
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA with proficiency of 66% for grades 3 - 5. It should be noted that this is an increase of 2% in proficiency from the 2022-2023 school year. Some of the contributing factors were the consistency and fidelity of small-group instruction.

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

There have been no data components that showed a decline compared to the previous year. Reading proficiency increased from 64% to 66%, math proficiency remained the same at 73% and science proficiency increased from 68% to 78%. Factors that contributed to these proficiency rates include additional small group instruction provided by the leadership team in both reading and math, the implementation of a STEM rotation in collaboration between our media specialist and science teachers in 3rd – 5th, and increased implementation of district resources for science.

**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.**

In ELA, all grade levels are above the state average proficiency. Reading proficiency increased from 64% to 66% and is 12% above the state average. Factors that contributed to this increase in proficiency included an increase in the use of district curriculum materials, designating specific intervention materials to be utilized during the intervention, and the use of ESSER planning days to specifically plan out small group instruction in reading.

Historically the proficiency of the lowest 25% of students in ELA has been ten points or lower than the district and state averages. Factors that contribute to this trend include a lack of interventions implemented daily with fidelity, missing MTSS infrastructures, and delayed response to changes in student data for intervention.

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

According to our school data, our science proficiency increased ten percent from 68% to 78%. A new action that was implemented was STEM lab rotation for our 3rd - 5th grade classes. Each class visited the lab once every two weeks. Instruction was designed to support the classroom lessons and provide hands-on experience with the science standards. Another action was the consistent implementation of supplemental materials provided by the district. Finally, the teachers planned cross-curricular lessons that included more science content in the ELA block.

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

As we reflect on the EWS data from Part I, areas of concern are the absentee rate of 10% or higher and the number of students with substantial reading deficiency.

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

- 1) ESSA subgroup- Students with Disabilities
- 2) ELA Proficiency
- 3) Student feeling of belonging
- 4) Differentiated Instruction for Gifted students

**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.

As part of a positive culture and environment, we want to focus on student sense of belonging. Our Panorama data shows an increase in this score from 72% to 73% favorable and this score is above the district elementary average of 68%. Further analysis of the data indicates that two subareas to focus on are students treating each other with respect and students feeling that their peers understand them as a person.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By Spring 2024, the internal student survey results for students in grades 3 - 5 will reflect an increase in the sense of belonging category from 73% to 80% favorable.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored utilizing the internal student survey results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@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.)

SEL (Social Emotional Learning) activities will be implemented in the classrooms. This curriculum has been proven to help students make connections at the school by increasing positive interactions leading to a greater sense of belonging to the school community.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected to involve multiple staff members on campus in the efforts to enhance student sense of belonging by focusing on connections between the students and the students and teachers.

**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.

SEL activities will be implemented in the classrooms during the first 5 minutes.

**Person Responsible:** Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

**By When:** Daily - ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

The guidance counselor will implement in-class character education lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

**By When:** October 2023

Cross-grade level activities will be implemented (House activities, STEM days) to build connections between students across grade levels.

**Person Responsible:** Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

**By When:** September 2023

## #2. 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.

The percentage of our students with disabilities making gains is an area of concern. Currently, the SWD subgroup is 29% proficient in reading. This is a large disparity from our overall reading proficiency data. The proficiency level has been below 41% for four years consecutively.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring 2024, the reading proficiency levels of our Students with Disabilities will increase from 17% to 42%.

### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through analysis of the FAST PM1 and PM2 and common assessments.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@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.)

In order to increase the following pillars of reading, comprehension, phonics, and phonemic awareness, SIPPS and Haggerty reading programs will be utilized during Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction for our SWD subgroup daily.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPS and Haggerty have proven to close the gap in reading comprehension and allow students to engage in grade-level content. The programs also align with the MTSS framework.

### 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.

Conduct data meetings with teachers working with Students with Disabilities to monitor progress.

**Person Responsible:** Tamara Barton-Buggs (tamara.barton@ocps.net)

**By When:** Quarterly for the 2023-2024 school year.

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

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

The executive leadership team meets to review the available funds and the requests of the teachers for resources and materials at least quarterly. The current school needs are also reviewed and matched to the teacher's requests. The allocations are prioritized to provide resources and materials to address the needs of the students that cannot be funded from other areas. Special consideration will be taken for our SWD subgroup to close the gap in reading comprehension.