Sun Blaze Elementary School

leadership
analysis
students
Florida
mission
college and career
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
needs assessment
resources
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sun Blaze Elementary

9101 RANDAL PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://sunblazees.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.

Mission:
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.

Vision:
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
Wyatt, Glenna	Principal	-Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement -Manages school social media accounts -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups, including School Advisory Council
Wilson, Tara	Assistant Principal	-Lead Summer School Advisory Council Retreat to analyze data and determine input on goals -Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS
Jesso, Tanner	Assistant Principal	-Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Oversee PBIS implementation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS
Boston, Jacqueline	Instructional Media	-Manages K-5 Literacy program -Provides guidance with K-5 ELA Plan -Assists in data analysis as member of Literacy Leadership Team
Cadogan, Tomicka	Reading Coach	-Provides guidance with K-5 ELA Plan -Facilitates professional development -Assists with management of school social media accounts -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Supports the implementation -Manages K-5 Literacy program -Assists in data analysis as member of Literacy Leadership Team -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met
DiPaolo, Lauren	School Counselor	-Provides support for healthy emotional and social development strategies and programs -Assist/ train teachers in resources for the new elementary health

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		course -Conduct individual and small group counselling -Implement and participate in individual, family, and school crisis intervention -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP
Miller, Kristin	Curriculum Resource Teacher	-Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction -Facilitates all district and state assessments -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Assists in planning grade level field trips that align with standards -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP
Villalobos, Martiza	ELL Compliance Specialist	-Supports ELL students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance -Facilitates and supports data collection activities -Assists in data analysis -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Assists in data analysis as member of Literacy Leadership Team
Worrell, Brittany	Math Coach	-Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction -Facilitates all district and state assessments -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP -Provides guidance with K-12 Math Plan
Sadowsky, Alex	Dean	-Assist with PBIS implementation -Assist/ train teachers in resources for PBIS -Implement and participate in individual, family, and school crisis intervention

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving stakeholders includes input from our school leadership team, teachers/staff, student input, and parent/community. Over the summer, our School Advisory Council met for a "SAC Retreat". Here, members of the School Advisory Council reviewed and analyzed student achievement and school climate data to recommend school improvement goals. These goals were used to determine our action steps for this year's School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be reviewed monthly at our School Advisory Council meetings. It will also be referenced at all Professional Learning Community meetings with teachers and staff throughout the year. Moreover, it will be referenced by our principal in ongoing communication with our parents and community partners. Our students will be familiar with the plan through instructional leadership communication.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
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: 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	8	36	32	38	32	31	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	37	37	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	33	27	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	19	28	42	38	0	0	0	0	128

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	1	7	5	16	42	26	0	0	0	97

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	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	32	37	34	25	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	3	2	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	31	19	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	23	19	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	169	119	63	28	24	0	0	0	403

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	1	23	19	0	0	0	43

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
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	29	32	37	34	25	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	3	2	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	31	19	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	23	19	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	169	119	63	28	24	0	0	0	403

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	1	23	19	0	0	0	43

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
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*	73	57	53	72	56	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				77			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			63		
Math Achievement*	73	60	59	77	46	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				74			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			72		
Science Achievement*	84	63	54	65	61	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	59	59	59			53		

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	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
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	32	Yes	4	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	52			
HSP	69			
MUL	86			
PAC				

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%
WHT	83			
FRL	62			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	80			
HSP	63			
MUL	92			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	64			

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	73			73			84					52
SWD	25			27			33				5	50
ELL	64			65			79				5	52
AMI												
ASN	80			89			78				4	
BLK	60			60							3	
HSP	69			67			82				5	57

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
MUL	89			83							2	
PAC												
WHT	80			80			93				4	
FRL	63			60			72				5	54

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	72	77	59	77	74	61	65					59
SWD	20	50	52	24	47	50	10					
ELL	58	76	58	68	78	60	57					59
AMI												
ASN	76	76		94	86							
BLK	80	76		80	81		85					
HSP	65	74	55	69	71	55	59					57
MUL	89			94								
PAC												
WHT	84	84	70	87	73		68					
FRL	62	76	56	64	70	53	67					63

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	69	63	63	75	69	72	66					53
SWD	20	42		22	33		23					36
ELL	52	70	67	61	73	80	43					53
AMI												
ASN	81			89			80					
BLK	78			78								
HSP	61	62	73	67	70	79	59					54
MUL	83			92								
PAC												
WHT	79	68		89	64		81					

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
FRL	55	46	61	64	63	63	45					53

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	74%	54%	20%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	55%	15%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	51%	28%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Our students with disabilities in grades 3-5 who took the ELA FAST showed the lowest performance during the 2022-23 school year.

Grade 3 ELA proficiency overall was 72% but 25% of our SWD, which is four of 16 students, were proficient.
Grade 4 ELA proficiency overall was 70% but 20% of our students, which was four of 20 students, were proficient.
Grade 5 ELA proficiency was 80% overall, but 25% of our students, which was three of 12 students, were proficient.

A contributing factor that may have had an impact on last year's low performance was related to our human resources.

An example of this factor is impact of our 2 ESE pull out teachers who support our population of students with disabilities. One of these positions were vacant until the teacher returned from medical leave. We created a schedule to support this subgroup, but with limited human resources this was a challenge that reflected with this subgroup growth to proficiency.

Another example is with the introducing new benchmarks for grades 3-5, teachers were tasked with learning the depth of the benchmarks as they were teaching them. Building teacher capacity with the focus on the BEST benchmarks is critical to moving our students into proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was FAST Math Grades 3-5 proficiency. Math FAST 3-5 achievement decreased 3 percentage points overall from 77% (2021-22) to 74% this year.

Note that it is not a direct comparison (FSA to FAST).

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.

During the 2021-22 school year, the mathematics achievement gap for students with disabilities (25%) who took the Mathematics state achievement test was 30 percentage points lower than students without disabilities (55%). The gap trend data for 2022-23 has not yet been released by the FLDOE but our preliminary data shows a potential 42% gap because our proficiency for all grade 3-5 students was 74% for math FAST whereas 32% of our SWD were proficient. This preliminary overall proficiency data has not been disaggregated so we anticipate the official gap to be lower than 42%.

Source: https://edudata.fldoe.org/StrategicPlan/reports/ClosingTheGap.html

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

2023-24 Science Achievement went up 20% compared to the previous school year:
85% 2022-23
65% 2021-22
66% 2020-21

This year when looking at our PMA2 & PMA3 science data, we tiered our students into four groups based on how they have been doing on the SBUAs and PMAs. We then used the "OCPS 5th Grade Science Standards Practice Book" that the science department provided to support the students in the

different groups. Our math & science coach pulled 30 minutes groups for about 60 of our high bubble students once a week for the month of April. The science teachers, then used the booklet in the classroom pulling groups to support the lower two tiers of students.

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

Two potential areas of concern include our students who scored a level one on their ELA FAST last school year. We are intentionally tracking these students to monitor their progress throughout the school year. Further, we are noticing an increase in students with absenteeism and low socioeconomic status which also might contribute to the need for additional supports.

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

MTSS process
Standards-aligned core instruction
Behavior intervention

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Our first area of focus is to increase ELA proficiency for all students. Our 2022-23 overall ELA achievement was 73%, which is a 1% increase from the previous 2021-22 school year (72%).

We want to implement action steps for all students to lessen this gap. Our action steps include growth monitoring, feedback, & intensive instruction.

It is important to mention that our students with disabilities are included in our goal to increase proficiency for all students. We feel this is important to note because our students with disabilities had the largest gap in ELA achievement as compared to all of our ESSA subgroups.

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

ELA proficiency on the Grade 3-5 FAST will increase by at least 7 percentage points for all students, including our students with disabilities. This means we will have 80% achievement by May 24, 2024, as compared to 73% in 2023.

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

We will track student achievement growth for all students in grades 3-5 and take the ELA FAST. We will monitor performance on PMI and then track growth once PM2 and PM3 have been taken. We will use the data to determine the professional development support needed for teachers, the most appropriate FAPE for students, and MTSS's next steps. We will also gather data during instructional walk-throughs to ensure that students are receiving research-based standards-aligned instruction with pull-out interventions. Moreover, we will reference accommodation implementation and tracking as well as the fidelity of BIP implementation, if applicable.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenna Wyatt (glenna.wyatt@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.)

We will ensure that students are receiving intensive, individualized instruction through MTSS, instructional walkthroughs by certified coaches and observers, ongoing analysis of student interventions, and tracking of accommodation implementation.

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

According to Hattie's research, MTSS that is implemented with fidelity can yield an effect size of 1.29 (Hattie, J., 2008, Visible Learning, Routledge).

Research supports that many SWDs can make large gains when they are provided intensive, individualized instruction (D. Fuchs et al., 2012, as cited in Gilmour, A. F., Fuchs, D., & Wehby, J. H. (2019). Are students with disabilities accessing the curriculum? A meta-analysis of the reading achievement gap between students with and without disabilities. Exceptional Children, 85(3), 329-346).

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.

Professional development support for all teachers monthly during PLCs, optional pop-up morning PDs, coaching with feedback, and Wednesday faculty meetings

Person Responsible: Glenna Wyatt (glenna.wyatt@ocps.net)

By When: May 24, 2024

Intentional focus on early literacy instruction as a long-term focus on achieving our goal

Person Responsible: Tara Wilson (tara.wilson@ocps.net)

By When: May 24, 2024

Equitable MTSS process for SWD, accommodation implementation and tracking, and teacher coaching

Person Responsible: Brittany Worrell (brittany.worrell@ocps.net)

By When: May 24, 2024

Research based curriculum for pull-out interventions and standards-based CRM implementation for all subjects

Person Responsible: Tanner Jesso (tanner.jesso@ocps.net)

By When: May 24, 2024

#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.

Our area of focus is for all students at Sun Blaze, which includes our students with special education status, to increase their ability to self-manage emotions and behaviors. We believe that increasing students' ability to self-manage will improve our culture and environment and students' concerns regarding school safety. Our focus includes students with special education status as this is our ATSI subgroup.

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

All students at Sun Blaze, which includes our students with special education status, will increase their ability to self-manage emotions and behaviors.

On the 2022-23 Panorama survey, 74% of students responded "yes" to how well they managed their behaviors, thoughts, and emotions in different environments. Out of that 74%, 14% less of students with special education status responded "yes". We want our students with special education status to have equally high response rates to their peers.

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

Through the use of the Panorama survey data from 2022-23, we will measure growth on upcoming Panorama surveys this Fall 2023 and Spring 2023. We will track the implementation of our PBIS system, BIP fidelity for students is specifically focusing on self-management, and utilization of the sensory room as a preventative strategy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Glenna Wyatt (glenna.wyatt@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.)

Through the implementation of our school-wide PBIS, we will use common language across the school to reinforce expectations regarding students' self-management of behaviors and emotions.

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

PBIS is an evidence-based strategy that can be tracked and monitored for effectiveness in this area of focus.

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.

Each month, the school counselor will provide character education videos aligned with the DeSantis Resiliency curriculum. Our focus on self-management will be embedded within all of the videos, to be shown during circle time meetings in the classrooms across campus.

Person Responsible: Lauren DiPaolo (lauren.dipaolo@ocps.net)

By When: May 24, 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).

Reviewing Sun Blaze Elementary school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on needs is a critical aspect of maintaining an effective and equitable educational environment. This process involves several key steps to enhance the educational experience for all students, including those with disabilities.

Firstly, the identification of specific needs within the school community serves as the foundation for the allocation process. Sun Blaze Elementary assesses student performance data, identifies areas requiring improvement, and considers factors like student demographics, special needs, and curriculum gaps.
In response to the growing need to support students with disabilities, an additional teacher specializing in this area has been introduced to the school. This teacher collaborates with existing staff, attends training sessions, and develops tailored strategies to facilitate the learning of all students. The allocation of resources for this purpose is based on the principle of providing equal opportunities and individualized support for all students.

Regular communication with stakeholders is crucial in this process. The school administration consistently engages with the School Advisory Council (SAC) to discuss budget matters. SAC, comprising parents, community members, and school staff, offers diverse perspectives on resource allocation. Their input helps ensure that funding decisions align with the broader needs and priorities of the school community.

In conclusion, the process of reviewing school improvement funding allocations and resource allocation based on needs is multifaceted. It involves identifying specific needs, introducing specialized support, involving stakeholders like the SAC and the principal's budget committee, and maintaining transparency throughout. By continually refining this process, Sun Blaze Elementary can create a learning environment that effectively addresses diverse needs, including those of students with disabilities, and equips them with the tools they need to succeed.