Sunridge Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sunridge Elementary

14455 SUNRIDGE BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://sunridgees.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: - Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   - Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   - Have a school grade of D or F; or   - 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
Greer, Diana	Principal	Responsible for ensuring high academic achievement for all students. Monitors curriculum and instruction and assesses all instructional personnel. Coordinates school site strategic planning, and communication of the school improvement plan with the School Advisory Committee. Coordinates and supports staff development on campus to support strategic goals.
Elmore, Adasha	Assistant Principal	Principal's designee for Skyward. Responsible for scheduling and creation of class rosters. Facilitates all Emergency Drills on campus and trainings. Responsible for implementation of school-wide discipline, PBIS, on campus and handling discipline referrals. Coordinates bus arrival and dismissal and serves as liaison with transportation. Works closely with custodians and maintenance on needs for school. Monitors curriculum and instruction and assesses designated personnel.
Smith, Lori	Instructional Coach	Provides resources and materials for teachers to use for targeted intervention skills and works with targeted students throughout the day. Assists teachers in collecting progress monitoring data. Coordinates staff development on campus to support strategic goals. Serves as lead mentor on campus and coordinates all induction activities on campus.
Dariso, LaRita	ELL Compliance Specialist	Responsible for monitoring the progress and compliance of ELL students on campus. Serves as the school's testing coordinator.
Sanford, Crystal	Staffing Specialist	Responsible for monitoring compliance with all IEPs and plans on campus. Coordinates meetings with SLP and school psychologist to review data and provide recommendations for instructional support. Closely monitors ESE students' progress and the accommodations to support learning gains.
Matthews, Barbara	School Counselor	Conducts individual, group and crisis counseling for students, parents, and staff. Conducts classroom guidance lessons and Bully Prevention on campus. Coordinates Panorama survey on campus. Serves as 504 coordinator.

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.

Teachers and Staff were provided access to subgroup and school-wide spring assessment results. Teachers collaborated during preplanning to provide input on possible focus areas for improvement and barriers related to these. SAC members will be providing input on selected focus areas identified by school administration based on data and give input on how to improve these areas.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Principal and school leadership team will review data monthly with teachers and SAC. Identified subgroups will be highlighted during data meetings and progress monitoring through Tiered Interventions will be reviewed at monthly PLC meetings. The school principal will revise the plan as needed every quarter to ensure that progress toward the identified focus areas is achieved.

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	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	28	26	21	14	27	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	8	16	4	0	0	0	36
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	1	0	0	31	20	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	0	0	29	27	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	22	24	32	0	0	0	0	92

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	10	7	10	37	22	0	0	0	86

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	2	0	1	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	5	32	28	27	26	32	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	6	3	7	0	0	0	24
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	24	22	31	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	24	35	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	7	21	24	35	0	0	0	90

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	1	0	22	19	32	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	27
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	5	32	28	27	26	32	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	6	3	7	0	0	0	24
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	24	22	31	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	24	35	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	7	21	24	35	0	0	0	90

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	1	0	22	19	32	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	27
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*	52	57	53	50	56	56	57		
ELA Learning Gains				54			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			44		
Math Achievement*	54	60	59	54	46	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				58			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			35		
Science Achievement*	66	63	54	52	61	59	55		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	70	59	59	48			60		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	2
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	55			
HSP	51			
MUL	29	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	48			

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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	52			54			66					70
SWD	13			27			25				4	
ELL	29			39			50				5	70
AMI												
ASN	72			72							2	
BLK	49			52			68				4	
HSP	46			46			47				5	70
MUL	38			19							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			72			90				4	
FRL	42			42			54				5	63

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	50	54	37	54	58	35	52					48
SWD	10	15	14	18	46	40	31					
ELL	30	44	30	34	49	32	32					48
AMI												
ASN	67	55		78	60							
BLK	32	41	36	40	49	27	20					
HSP	42	53	38	45	52	36	47					48
MUL	43			36								
PAC												
WHT	72	67		78	76		79					
FRL	34	42	32	38	47	33	27					45

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	57	60	44	54	52	35	55					60
SWD	20	37	42	23	40	45	13					
ELL	39	46	40	44	42		40					60
AMI												
ASN	73			77								
BLK	46	47		32	38		50					
HSP	49	50	38	51	53	40	44					59
MUL	33			38								
PAC												
WHT	73	70		69	55		64					
FRL	43	49	33	41	49	40	38					56

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	47%	54%	-7%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	51%	12%

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.

ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners showed the lowest performance, falling below 41% proficiency. Based on FAST 2023 PM3 reading results Students with Disabilities scored at 11% proficiency and English Language Learners scoring at 26% proficiency. This has been a trend for the last three years for our Students with Disabilities. Contributing factors to this low performance for both of these subgroups include the students' deficits in decoding, fluency, and comprehension. Students developing oral language skills is also a factor. These deficits and lack of scaffolded instruction make it difficult for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners to proficiently read grade-level text.

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

ELA proficiency for English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) continue to show the greatest decline overall. FAST 2023 PM3 reading results showed ELL students proficiency declining from 30% to 26% and SWD only increasing from 10% to 11% proficiency. Lack of understanding of effective ELL strategies by classroom teachers, Differentiation using best practices in

inclusive education, and limited paraprofessional support contributed to this decline in these subgroups the past year.

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.

ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities and English Language learners has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Understanding and implementation of best practices in inclusive education by general education teachers, implementation of ELL strategies, and structured facilitative support by Exceptional Education teachers contributed to this gap.

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

Science proficiency on the state assessment showed the most improvement with an increase of over 10%. This was due to intentional planning to include embedded science content during the ELA block and the use of additional resources such as Study Island modules for additional practice for students.

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

Potential areas of concern as identified in the early warning systems include students with 10% or more days absent and students identified with significant reading deficiencies. Both of these areas showed over 100 students meeting the criteria in these categories.

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

Focus on ELA proficiency for all
Differentiated Instruction to support ELL and ESE students

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

FAST state assessment data for PM3 shows that ELA proficiency is at an overall 53%, with significant gaps for our Students with disabilities at 11% proficiency and ELL students with 26% proficiency. Focusing on reading proficiency for all students, while differentiating instruction for these subgroups, should increase reading proficiency and the overall federal index for these two subgroups.

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

Focus on ELA proficiency and differentiation should result in an increase in the ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index for Students With Disabilities from 25 to 41 and for ELL students from 37 to 41.

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

We will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting classroom observations during the ELA block to ensure small group structure and accommodations for Students with Disabilities and ELL Students. Lesson plan checks for specific planning, noting BPIE strategies and ELL structures will be checked weekly. Structured
time for collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers during common planning and Professional Learning communities monthly to ensure the use of targeted and differentiated resources in reading to support Students with Disabilities. ELL compliance teacher will structure ELL paraprofessional schedules to support students. The grade level tracking tool will be used to monitor common assessment data for Students with Disabilities and ELL students compared to grade-level performance and reviewed at monthly data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diana Greer (diana.greer@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.)

Differentiated Instruction will be used to provide explicit and targeted instruction for students in a reduced group setting. Instructional personnel will increase the systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports for Students with Disabilities and ELL students during whole group instruction. This will include using graphic organizers, chunking content, and highlighting vocabulary. Professional Development opportunities for instructional personnel on Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) will be embedded throughout the school year.

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

Using data to differentiate instruction will ensure that Students with Disabilities and ELL students are provided accommodations and scaffolded instruction to experience success. Collaboration in common planning between the ESE teacher and general education teacher will ensure planning and use of necessary supports that provide Best Practices in Inclusive Education in all of our classrooms. Scaffolded supports will provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of 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.

Provide monthly structured Professional Learning Community time and common planning for ESE teachers, ESOL Compliance Teacher and classroom teachers to discuss effective differentiated strategies and resources to support Students with Disabilities and ELL students.

Person Responsible: Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning in September 2023 and provided monthly through May 2024.

Provide Professional development through the Instructional Coach and Staffing Specialist on Best Practices in Inclusive Education.

Person Responsible: Lori Smith (lori.smith@ocps.net)

By When: The initial Professional Development will be in October 2023 and follow up in February 2024.

Provide strategies and support to classroom teachers on the use of effective strategies to support ELL students during monthly data meetings.

Person Responsible: LaRita Dariso (larita.dariso@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning in September 2023 and provided monthly through May 2024.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

SunRidge Elementary had over ten teachers leave for reasons other than retirement this past school year. Providing a positive school culture in which teachers feel valued and have opportunities to collaborate will empower them to succeed. Experienced teachers who are familiar with the needs of a school and its students are more effective in their ability to support the individual needs of students.

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

By providing a positive school culture, opportunities to collaborate in PLCs and mentoring opportunities we will reduce the rate of teacher turn over per school year for non-retiring personnel from 10 to 2.

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

The Panorama Spring Survey for teachers will be used to monitor teacher's perceptions of positive school culture through the school climate indicator on the survey. Results will show teachers answering favorably to the school climate section of the survey with an average of 80%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diana Greer (diana.greer@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.)

Differentiated Instruction during Professional Development and Effective strategies that will be implemented to improve teacher retention include collaboration, mentorship, and professional development.

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

Teachers being provided common planning and PLC scheduled time for collaboration provides a structure for them to work in teams. Mentoring by the instructional coach and teacher leaders assists with navigating challenges. Professional Development provides opportunities to develop and apply educational strategies effectively.

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.

Master Schedule will reflect common planning and PLC time for teachers to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

By When: In place by August 2023

New teachers and teachers needing support will be assigned a mentor to support throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Lori Smith (lori.smith@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

Professional Development will be provided to support School Improvement goals and individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: Lori Smith (lori.smith@ocps.net)

By When: Professional Development calendar developed in August and will provide monthly training through May 2024.

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

All school improvement funding will be used to support our two areas of focus: ESSA subgroups relating to outcomes for our ELL and ESE students and Positive Culture and Environment related to retention.
Funding will be used to provide targeted resources for teachers to use to scaffold instruction and provide targeted instruction for ELL and ESE students. Funds will also be used to provide after school tutoring for identified students in reading in these subgroups to close gaps and frontload instruction.
Planning days will be provided for teachers and covered by substitutes to increase opportunities for collaboration, mentoring and planning.
The Principal will review the allocation and funding with the School Advisory Committee (SAC) and update the committee on progress toward targets monthly.

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

The 2022-2023 PM3 STAR standardized ELA assessment showed the following:
50% of Kindergarten students did not score proficient.

50% of 1st grade students did not score proficient
35% of 2nd grade students did not score proficient.

Instructional practices specifically relating to Reading/ELA to address Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding include:
Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

The 2022-23 PM3 Fast standardized ELA assessment showed the following:
51% of 3rd grade students did not score proficient.
36% of 4th grade students did not score proficient.
53% of 5th grade students did not score proficient.

Instructional practices specifically relating to Reading/ELA to provide reading interventions include:
Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.
Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.
Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read
Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text.
Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

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

STAR 2023 PM3 reading assessment showed the following results:

K 50% students scored level 3+, while 26% scored a level 1
1st 50% students scored level 3+, while 18% scored a level 1
2nd 64% students scored level 3+, while 13% scored a level 1

Goals for 2024 Plan:

K 55% of students scoring level 3+, while reducing level 1 to 21%
1st 55% of students scoring level 3+, while reducing level 1 to 13%
2nd 69% of students scoring level 3+, while reducing level 1 to 8%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

FAST 2023 PM3 reading assessment showed the following results:

3rd 49% of students scored level 3+, while 30% scored a level 1
4th 64% of students scored level 3+, while 17% scored a level 1
5th 47% of students scored level 3+, while 27% scored a level 1

Goals for 2024 Plan:

3rd 54% of students scoring level 3+, while reducing level 1 to 25%
4th 69% of students scoring level 3+, while reducing level 1 to 12%
5th 52% of students scoring level 3+, while reducing level 1 to 22%

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.

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators
Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

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

Greer, Diana, diana.greer@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade include:
Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they
link to letters;
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.
Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.
Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text.

Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read.
Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text.
Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

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

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

The below resources and practice programs will be used to address the identified need:

-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
-Use of the comprehension pieces of the optional daily slides (Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)
-Heggerty (Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)
-SIPPS (Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words and to build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)
-Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum (Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words;
Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text)
-OCPS Multisensory Kits (Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
-Exact Path (Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; Build students' decoding
skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words; Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly; Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

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
Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Greer, Diana, diana.greer@ocps.net
Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc… to fit area(s) of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Smith, Lori, lori.smith@ocps.net
Schools develop their professional learning plans based on the needs of their schools. These plans include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options available include the Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings,K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.	Smith, Lori, lori.smith@ocps.net
Use and analysis of: -FAST -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2) -DIBELS (K-1) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5) Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students	Greer, Diana, diana.greer@ocps.net