Sunset Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sunset Park Elementary

12050 OVERSTREET RD, Windermere, FL 34786

https://sunsetparkes.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
Price, Stacey	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Responsible for coordinating all facets of the School Improvement Plan.
Hudson, Jordan	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with instructional leadership of the school. Assist in ensuring all components of the School Improvement Plan are implemented with fidelity.
Geib, Brittany	Instructional Media	Coordinate and manage the Media Center collection. Provide instructional media support for teachers and students. Assist TSR with Digital media responsibilities. Assist teachers with digital resources and tools to support instruction and assessment.
Manzano, Karen	School Counselor	School guidance counselor and mental health designee.
Stanfield, Brittany	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coordinate support for ELL and MTSS programs. Ensure compliance with state and district requirements related to ELL and MTSS.
May, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional coach support for ELA, math, science, and social studies (K-5). Also serves as a lead mentor for new teachers.
Richmond, Tara	Behavior Specialist	Coordinate behavioral supports for the ESE program. Works closely with staff and students to support behavioral needs.
Savja, Zohra	Staffing Specialist	Ensures compliance with ESE and 504 requirements for students. Also provides training and support for teachers and staff regarding accommodations for SWD.
Little, Nandie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Coordinates all assessments, manages curriculum materials, and coordinates professional learning opportunities.

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.

Data from the third progress monitoring assessment was shared with various stakeholder groups (team leads, leadership team, and SAC) in the spring and summer months. Feedback was solicited regarding their concerns and areas for suggested focus to improve student learning outcomes. Opportunities were also provided to allow for teacher feedback regarding needed areas of improvement. The principal met with the SAC Chair in early July to discuss possible focus areas. The leadership team assisted in

finalizing the plan for submission. A review of the focus areas was shared with all faculty and staff during preplanning in August.

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))

Various data elements included in the SIP will be tracked throughout the school year and shared with stakeholder groups (team leads, leadership team, faculty and staff, and SAC). Updates regarding progress on focus areas will be provided after PM1 in September, PM2 in January, and PM3 in May.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	23	29	22	26	33	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	1	3	5	0	0	0	12
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	4	24	27	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	21	21	24	0	0	0	0	73

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	9	7	27	16	0	0	0	60

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	16
	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	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	21

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	3	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	16
	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	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	21

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	68	57	53	66	56	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				65			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			30		
Math Achievement*	71	60	59	70	46	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				64			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			39		
Science Achievement*	73	63	54	66	61	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	59	59	67			64		

* 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
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	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	67			
HSP	63			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	65			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	50			
HSP	59			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	62			

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	68			71			73					52
SWD	20			15			16				5	44
ELL	59			64			63				5	52
AMI												
ASN	83			89							2	
BLK	67			67							2	
HSP	62			66			60				5	53
MUL	83			83							2	
PAC												
WHT	73			76			85				5	45
FRL	63			65			74				5	57

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	66	65	52	70	64	44	66					67
SWD	18	41	38	35	36	21	32					
ELL	55	58	40	63	56	32	60					67
AMI												
ASN	73			73								
BLK	53			47								
HSP	57	60	47	64	62	47	65					68
MUL	75	55		81	27							
PAC												
WHT	76	71	60	78	73	36	73					
FRL	65	70	59	63	65	59	56					58

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	70	59	30	71	61	39	71					64
SWD	31	27		31	18		42					
ELL	61	60	44	61	64	44	63					64
AMI												
ASN	90			90								
BLK	88			81								
HSP	63	51	40	61	62	43	63					66
MUL	64			86								
PAC												
WHT	75	67		76	57	30	78					
FRL	67	52	27	59	53	25	65					62

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	61%	54%	7%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	80%	59%	21%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	51%	19%

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.

Our lowest performing component was ELA and Math for our SWD subgroup (ELA 22%, Math 19%).

Many of our ESE students also receive support for ELL services. In addition, our school has four, self-contained ESE units so we have a very large ESE population.

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

The component with the greatest decline was 4th grade math with a decline of 5 points (76% to 71%). There are still many gaps in learning that need to be filled from the time lost during the Pandemic.

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.

Our students outpaced the state in all components for which data is currently available. Our largest areas of success include:

-3rd grade math 80% / state average 59% (+21 points)
-3rd grade ELA 70% / state average 50% (+20 points)
-5th grade Science 69% / state average 51% (+18 points)

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

Significant improvement was made in the following components:
-3rd grade math, 10-point gain / 70 to 80%
-5th grade science, 9-point gain / 60 to 69%

New actions in math included new curriculum resources and a deeper focus on small-group instruction. In science, there was a strategic focus on the use of resources (Study Island and the science review guide).

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

Potential area of concern: 58 students with substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Support for students with substantial reading deficiency.
2. Closing the achievement gap for SWD in reading and math.
3. Address attendance issues for students with excessive absences.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

Sunset Park Elementary will focus on providing Tier II and Tier III research-based supports through our WIN (What I Need) intervention model. By providing staff with professional learning and appropriate resources and tools, our students will receive instructional interventions in foundational reading skills. During the 2021-22 school year, 52% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA.

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

The measurable goal for this area of focus: 80% of students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency will demonstrate progress in reading as evidenced by researched-based resources utilized during the intervention block.

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

1. Intervention data will be tracked in Google sheets to ensure supports are being provided and adjustments are being made to support student needs.
2. Weekly classroom walkthroughs with timely feedback will be provided to ensure fidelity of intervention resources being utilized.
3. The 58 students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency will be coded on the data sheet so that they can be easily identified when reviewing the data sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Price (stacey.price@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.)

Students will be screened using DIBELS then placed in intervention groups based on their area of need (phonics, vocabulary, HFW, comprehension). Students will participate in a 45-minute, walk-to, reading intervention program four times per week (Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday). All reading intervention programs will be researched-based programs (SIPPS, Being a Reader, Phonics for Reading, Exact Path Reading, or Scholastic Bookroom). Data will be tracked using Google sheets. Adjustments will be made at six-week intervals based on student needs.

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

Providing focused, reading intervention supports using research-based materials based on individual student needs will help build foundational reading skills to close achievement gaps in reading.

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.

Students will be assessed using DIBELS

Person Responsible: Brittany Stanfield (brittany.stanfield@ocps.net)

By When: September 1

Students will be placed in intervention groups based on DIBELS data.

Person Responsible: Brittany Stanfield (brittany.stanfield@ocps.net)

By When: September 11

Groups will be adjusted based on data.

Person Responsible: Brittany Stanfield (brittany.stanfield@ocps.net)

By When: Every six weeks

#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.

Sunset Park Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic monitoring strategies. There is a need to differentiate the small group instruction to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III MTSS support. Historically, students with disabilities have been an under-performing subgroup with a federal index score of 32% in 2020-2021. Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to continuously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces data-driven instruction, students with disabilities' individual needs will be met.

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

The measurable outcome for this goal: 15-point increase in proficiency rate in reading for SWD.

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

Monitoring will include:
1. Weekly usage of SIPPS to build foundational reading skills.
2. Track weekly usage of Exact Path Reading for SWD.
2. Subgroup tracking for standards-based unit assessments through Performance Matters.
3. Data chats during PLC's to review subgroup performance for SWD to make instructional adjustments.
4. Weekly classroom walkthroughs with timely feedback to impact instructional practices to support SWD

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Price (stacey.price@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.)

Students will receive weekly instruction with SIPPS to build foundational reading skills.

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

SIPPS was chosen because it is an evidence-based reading intervention program.

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.

Students will begin the SIPPS program.

Person Responsible: Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

By When: September 4

Create and maintain a weekly tracking sheet for Exact Path reading data.

Person Responsible: Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

By When: September 15

Track subgroup data for SBUAs

Person Responsible: Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

By When: September and ongoing

#3. 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.

In order to create a positive culture and environment, Sunset Park Elementary will utilize positive behavior supports to enhance the school experience for our students. Stakeholder survey data for our parents indicated a concern regarding school fit (65% favorable responses).

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

The measurable goal for this outcome: 75% of parents will score "school fit" as favorable for their student.

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

Monitoring activities will include:
1. Sunset Park Student Support Plan developed collaboratively with multiple stakeholder groups
2. All classrooms and common areas of the school will have SOARing behavioral expectations posted
3. Weekly positive behavioral referrals will be awarded to students
4. Eagle bucks will be awarded to students demonstrating SOARing behaviors
5. School store for students to spend earned Eagle Bucks
6. Discipline data will be monitored quarterly for possible adjustments to support plan

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey Price (stacey.price@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.)

A school-wide Student Support Plan, utilizing evidence-based positive behavior support practices, will be implemented to enhance school climate and culture.

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

Evidence-based positive and proactive practices that support and respond to students' social, emotional and behavioral needs is critical to student success.

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.

Develop and implement Student Support Plan.

Person Responsible: Jordan Hudson (jordan.hudson@ocps.net)

By When: August 18

All classrooms and common areas will have SOARing expectations posted.

Person Responsible: Jordan Hudson (jordan.hudson@ocps.net)

By When: August 25

Discipline data will be reviewed quarterly for possible adjustments to the support plan.

Person Responsible: Jordan Hudson (jordan.hudson@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly beginning in October.

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).

Not applicable

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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

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?

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?

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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Not applicable

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

NA

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

NA

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No