

Orange County Public Schools

# Keenes Crossing 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>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>22</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>22</b> |

# Keenes Crossing Elementary

5240 KEENES PHEASANT DR, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://keenescrossinges.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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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 to 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   |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Webley, Tracy  | Principal           | <p>As the instructional and operational leader, the principal oversees the daily operation of the school. Other duties include hiring and retention of teachers, promoting a positive school culture and climate for all staff and students and ensuring best teaching practices are known and used for improvement of student achievement.</p> <p>The principal will lead and collaborate with instructional leadership team members to address student and staff needs and ensure implementation of all educational initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SAC Member</li> <li>- Facilitator of PLC</li> <li>- Instructional Leader of PD</li> <li>- Data Review of Student Performance</li> <li>- Oversee Operation and Campus Safety</li> </ul>  |
| Stribling, Joy | Assistant Principal | <p>The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader. She will collaborate with the principal and other leadership team members to ensure that our school-wide vision remains the focus for the school year.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal will lead and inspire our teaching staff to use best teaching practices, positive behavior strategies, and effective interventions that lead to scholar academic growth.</p> <p>Responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SAC Member</li> <li>- Safety Supervisor</li> <li>- PLC Facilitator</li> </ul>   |
| Hammer, Amber  | Instructional Coach | <p>Instructional coaches at Keene's Crossing Elementary will serve an integral role in the success of both staff and scholars. The work of the instructional coach will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tiered content professional development</li> <li>- presentation &amp; collaboration of the BEST standards</li> <li>- facilitate collaborative planning to ensure rigorous standards aligned resources are implemented</li> <li>- co-teaching support to address implementation of the CRMs</li> <li>- provide coaching feedback for reflective teacher conversations</li> <li>- promote reading/math best practices</li> <li>- plan and meet with the Assistant Principal and Principal to align coaching support.</li> <li>- review of all data to best inform instruction.</li> </ul> |

**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.

Annual surveys are sent 2022 - 2023 to all stakeholders (staff, families, and students) for input into the school's progress toward high academic achievement. These survey results were reviewed by administrators when proposing necessary plans of action for the following year. The results and school FAST data were shared with staff members and input as to how the identified challenges can be targeted and improved upon is gathered. This progress is also shared at SAC meetings with all stakeholders. Input from the community and families is then gathered and brought back to staff members on site to continue to adapt instruction to best meet student needs.

**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))

Beginning of the year data for each grade level was collected so triangulation could be analyzed and interventions/enrichment groups were developed. Weekly PLC meetings and data tracking meetings will focus on student progress in unit Standards Based Assessments. Monitoring and adjustments to the intervention/enrichment schedule will be fluid.

After-school tutoring will be offered to students who continue to show a large achievement gap even with additional interventions in place. Targeted focus on the progress of subgroups (ELL, SWD) will occur weekly to ensure that student needs are being met through either small group instruction in the classroom or through additional ESE support, if appropriate.

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 50%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 25%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT) |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <p><b>School Grades History</b><br/>                 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p> | 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   | 11          | 21 | 23 | 23 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 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  | 0  | 23 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 10 | 11 | 18 | 23 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62    |

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           | 4 | 2 | 3 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38    |

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

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

**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           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5     |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |
| Course failure in 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 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49    |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**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 | 5 | 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) 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           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5     |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |
| Course failure in 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 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49    |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 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*                | 78     | 57       | 53    | 80     | 56       | 56    | 82     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 64     |          |       | 74     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 56     |          |       | 68     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 80     | 60       | 59    | 77     | 46       | 50    | 79     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 68     |          |       | 74     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 62     |          |       | 72     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 83     | 63       | 54    | 75     | 61       | 59    | 80     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 66       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 51       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 55       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 61     | 59       | 59    | 76     |          |       | 84     |          |       |

\* 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           | 75   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 374  |
| 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           | 70   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 558  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| 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                                | 45                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                | 69                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 87                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 82                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 72                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 89                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 79                              |                    |   |   |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL                                | 69                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 38                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| ELL                                | 66                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 90                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 67                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 66                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 79                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 70                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 78       |        |             | 80        |         |              | 83       |         |           |                   |                     | 61           |
| SWD  | 46       |        |             | 54        |         |              | 38       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  | 68       |        |             | 78        |         |              | 76       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 61           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 86       |        |             | 93        |         |              | 100      |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| BLK  | 84       |        |             | 79        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  | 74       |        |             | 76        |         |              | 75       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 63           |
| MUL  | 89       |        |             | 89        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 78       |        |             | 80        |         |              | 83       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 83           |
| FRL  | 71       |        |             | 68        |         |              | 78       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 60           |

| 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                                   | 80       | 64     | 56          | 77        | 68      | 62           | 75       |         |           |                   |                     | 76           |
| SWD  | 46       | 31     | 28          | 42        | 47      | 47           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 73       | 66     | 57          | 78        | 65      | 69           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     | 76           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 90       | 88     |             | 96        | 92      |              | 83       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 81       | 75     |             | 57        | 50      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 78       | 58     | 54          | 73        | 64      | 60           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     | 75           |
| MUL  | 79       |        |             | 79        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 79       | 63     | 51          | 77        | 68      | 62           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     | 83           |
| FRL  | 59       | 52     | 48          | 51        | 52      | 41           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 82       | 74     | 68          | 79        | 74      | 72           | 80       |         |           |                   |                     | 84           |
| SWD  | 54       | 50     |             | 55        | 88      |              | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 67       | 70     | 62          | 69        | 67      | 75           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     | 84           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 82       | 67     |             | 82        | 62      |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 78       |        |             | 75        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 75       | 71     | 62          | 71        | 68      | 60           | 71       |         |           |                   |                     | 93           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 85       | 77     | 70          | 82        | 80      | 87           | 88       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 74       | 69     | 60          | 66        | 62      | 55           | 69       |         |           |                   |                     | 77           |

**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 | 81%    | 54%      | 27%                        | 54%   | 27%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 86%    | 60%      | 26%                        | 58%   | 28%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 68%    | 52%      | 16%                        | 50%   | 18%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 73%    | 59%      | 14%                        | 59%   | 14%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 88%    | 62%      | 26%                        | 61%   | 27%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 84%    | 55%      | 29%                        | 55%   | 29%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 84%    | 59%      | 25%                        | 51%   | 33%                     |

**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 Federal Percent of Points Index is below the state average for Keene's Crossing Elementary Schools Students With Disabilities (SWD). The state expectation is 41% and SWD at Keene's Crossing is 38%. Also, the learning gains for the L25 have dropped to 56% in ELA and 62% in Math compared to prior years. Discussions with the leadership and the instructional staff indicate professional development is needed for small differentiated grouping.

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

The L25 in ELA declined 12 percentage points (68% - 56%) in 2022 - 2023 compared to the prior year. Also, the L25 in Math decreased 10 percentage points (72% - 62%) in 2022 - 2023 compared to the prior year. Small differentiated grouping is the main factor.

**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.**

All Keene's Crossing data components were higher than the state average.

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

The ELA proficiency in third grade increased from 83% to 87%, well above state average. As a school, and district, teachers were able to utilize district-created resources aligned with the new state standards. With these resources, teachers were able to focus increasing proficiency and improving overall professional practice.

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

Attendance - Number of students absent 10% or more days  
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency

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

Students with Disabilities  
Learning gains in ELA  
Learning gains in Math

### **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.

Assessment data from FAST 2022 -2023 school year, showed Students with Disabilities (SWD) performed below state index in ELA (38%). Standards-based planning (PLCs) with a focus on standards-based instruction for ELA/Math/Science with on-going data monitoring for small groups will be more robust than prior years.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

As a result of PLC and data meetings, Keene's Crossing Elementary School will increase ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities (SWD) to 41% or higher by the end of 2023 - 2024 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Adjustments to instruction will be made in response to classroom data, progress monitoring assessment data, and student's learning progress in Exact Path. These data points will guide the adjustment to small group instruction as well as MTSS groups. In looking at continued areas of weaknesses of students with learning disabilities, MTSS groups will be formed to target the greatest gaps in student learning. Classroom walkthroughs will occur to address instructional delivery, student engagement, and the planning process through PLCs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@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 student achievement for our students with disabilities, instruction will be monitored for alignment to the grade level standards. Students with disabilities will receive instruction from the Exceptional Student Education teacher through a combination of support facilitation in their own classroom as well as additional pull out time, if needed. The majority of instruction will take place alongside the ELA teacher to ensure consistency in the grade level standards instruction for both classroom teacher and support facilitation teacher. Teachers will collaborate during common planning to ensure instruction for Students with Disabilities is comprehensible and meets their needs. For students with greater need, small group instruction can occur where students will learn to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Grade level standards based instruction ensures that both students and teachers have a clear understanding of the standards. Teachers are able to provide instruction that is aligned to the mastery of skills students are expected to learn. For students of greater need, small group instruction will occur to better scaffold student learning and continued monitoring will accrue.

**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.

Administration will engage in weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor for alignment to the grade level standards and appropriate accommodations in place for students with disabilities.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Teachers will collaborate during common planning to ensure instruction for students with disabilities is comprehensible and meets their needs.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

## #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.

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture and environment, we will address the following school needs: Reading Learning Gains for the lowest 25%, Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25%, and improved attendance.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Reading Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will be 61% as evidenced by the FAST PM 3 state assessment completed in the Spring of 2024.

Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will be 67% as evidenced by the FAST PM 3 state assessment completed in the Spring of 2024.

Students with 10% or more absent days will decrease to less than 10 students per grade level.

### Monitoring:

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

Students in the L25% ELA and Math group will be identified and targeted for after-school tutoring and Tier 3 interventions. Student groups will be created through Performance Matters, Exact Path, and SuccessMaker to monitor progress in unit assessments and through district approved computer programs. Students will be identified to be placed in Tier 2 and / or Tier 3 groups if data shows the need. Discussion during planning and PLC data review will focus on instructional strategies that will support growth and success of our lowest 25% of students. Attendance will be monitored through weekly reports provided by the registrar. Patterns in individual student attendance will be reviewed and meetings will be held with parents, social worker, and select members of the leadership team to ensure students attend school routinely.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@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.)

Using distributive leadership to invest in the collective capacity of all staff members and the school community. Providing our staff, parents, and students with opportunities to engage and provide suggestions on how to improve the culture and climate of the school makes them invested in the success of all. Leadership team members and classroom teachers will work together to establish positive relationships with students and parents. This will help to reduce chronic cases of absenteeism and in turn increase student academic growth.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for collaborative learning and resiliency, we will equip students to effectively interact and collaborate with others to increase their achievement. SIPP's reading program and Imagine Learning for ELL.

### 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.

Teachers will receive professional development to implement SIPPS and Imagine Learning programs with students. Leadership team will progress monitor student learning with teachers and make instructional adjustments to meet the needs of students.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** August-May

Teachers will receive professional development to implement Exact Path and SuccessMaker programs with students. Data collected from these programs will be analyzed throughout the year to monitor and adjust to meet the needs of students.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** August-May

Attendance will be monitored through weekly reports provided by the registrar.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** August-May

Patterns in individual student attendance will be reviewed and meetings will be held with parents, social worker, and select members of the leadership team to ensure students attend school routinely.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** August-May

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

#### 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 L25% data decreased over the last three state assessments.

ELA L25% - (2019 67%) - (2021 74%) - (2022 64%)

Differentiation is needed with focus on small group instruction.

New Strategies to Improve ELA -Math

Standard Specific PLC Common Planning focusing on rigor and high order questions

Common formative/Summative Assessments

Targeted Interventions with fluid grouping

Targeted Tutoring

Small group differentiated instruction focusing on re-teaching standards, preview, current standard.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning gains as measured by PM1 - PM3 ELA will increase 5%

Learning gains as measured by PM1 - PM3 Math will increase 5%

Instructional Leadership Team will attend professional learning communities to support data-driven planning. Administration will track/share content data to influence planning/professional development.

#### Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthrough data focusing on small group instruction and intervention/enrichment groups. PLC notes and lesson plans will be monitored weekly.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@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.)

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T./NGSSS Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Imagine Reading

SIPPs

Standards based monitoring data to reteach/preteach

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards-based data (2022-2023 FAST Data) collected from 2022-2023 school year showed scholars (L25%) performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a need for consistent opportunities to be

successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers need support in accessing effective techniques to support learning mastery. Teachers need support in small group instruction.

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 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.

Dr. Webley will attend all PLCs and have data meetings focusing on small group instruction. Monitoring data each unit assessment will be discussed at PLCs and data meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Webley (tracy.webley@ocps.net)

**By When:** Sept.- December

**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).

Keene's Crossing administrative team reviews the budget allocations to determine funds for the 2023-2024 school year. Funds are allocated to programs designed to help all students in our areas of focus through a shared process, including stakeholders, to ensure we meet student's needs.

**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 | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other   | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation   | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

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

No