Keenes Crossing Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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), (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 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	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. The principal will lead and collaborate with instructional leadership team members to address student and staff needs and ensure implementation of all educational initiatives. - SAC Member - Facilitator of PLC - Instructional Leader of PD - Data Review of Student Performance - Oversee Operation and Campus Safety
Stribling, Joy	Assistant Principal	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. 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. Responsibilities include: - SAC Member - Safety Supervisor - PLC Facilitator
Hammer, Amber	Instructional Coach	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: - Tiered content professional development - presentation & collaboration of the BEST standards - facilitate collaborative planning to ensure rigorous standards aligned resources are implemented - co-teaching support to address implementation of the CRMs - provide coaching feedback for reflective teacher conversations - promote reading/math best practices - plan and meet with the Assistant Principal and Principal to align coaching support. - review of all data to best inform instruction.

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	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	25%
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	

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 Ponts 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. SIPPs 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
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No