Orange County Public Schools

Eagle Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Eagle Creek Elementary

10025 EAGLE CREEK SANCTUARY BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://eaglecreekes.ocps.net/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cells, Patricia	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 -Oversees high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups
Byrne, Michael	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 -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS
Laliberte, Katherine	Instructional Media	-Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Facilitates professional development -Manages school social media accounts -Assists in planning grade level field trips that align with standards -Manages K-5 Literacy program
Velarde, Sonia	School Counselor	-Provides support for healthy emotional and social development strategies and programs -Assist/ train teachers in resources for the new elementary health course -Conduct individual and small group counseling -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
Dencker, Heather	Staffing Specialist	-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 goals identified in the SIP

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP
Seda Cruz, Luz	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
Emeigh, Danette	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 -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
Morris, Lauren	Instructional Coach	-Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities -Common Planning -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Assists in data analysis -Provides professional development and technical

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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

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 involvement of stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students, and families, as well as business or community leaders, is crucial in the development of a School Improvement Plan (SIP). By actively engaging these stakeholders, a comprehensive and collaborative approach can be adopted to address the specific needs and challenges of the school.

One of the key sources of input in the SIP development process is the Panorama survey, which gathers feedback from students, parents, and the school's staff. This survey provides valuable insights into various aspects of the school environment, including academics, culture, and overall satisfaction. The leadership staff carefully reviews the survey results, analyzing the data to identify patterns and areas of improvement.

In addition to the Panorama survey, student academic testing results are also considered. These results help the leadership staff to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the school's curriculum and instructional practices. By analyzing the testing data, they can identify specific areas that require improvement and tailor strategies accordingly.

The input received from stakeholders is then carefully analyzed and synthesized. The leadership staff looks for common themes and ideas that emerge from the various sources of input, including the Panorama survey, academic testing results, and stakeholder engagement sessions (PTA Meetings, SAC Meetings, etc.). This analysis helps to identify priority areas for improvement and informs the development of the School Improvement Plan.

Throughout the SIP development process, stakeholders' input is given significant consideration. Their perspectives and ideas are integrated into the plan, ensuring that it reflects the collective vision and aspirations of the school community. This collaborative approach fosters a sense of ownership and investment among stakeholders, as they see their voices being heard and their contributions being valued.

Ultimately, the involvement of stakeholders, combined with the analysis of survey results and academic testing data, leads to a robust and comprehensive School Improvement Plan. By engaging all relevant parties in the process, the leadership staff ensures that the plan is responsive to the unique needs and priorities of the school, setting the foundation for meaningful and sustainable improvement.

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))

At ECE, we are dedicated to regularly monitoring the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to increase student achievement in English Language Arts and Math while addressing the achievement gap, especially for students who face greater challenges in meeting state academic standards.

To effectively monitor the SIP, we will implement the following strategies:

Data Collection and Analysis: We will collect and analyze relevant data on student performance in English Language Arts and Math at regular intervals. This data will help us identify areas for improvement and evaluate the effectiveness of our interventions.

Progress Tracking: We will closely track the progress of individual students and specific groups to identify any disparities and measure growth over time. This tracking will allow us to assess whether our interventions are narrowing the achievement gap.

Regular Evaluation Meetings: We will hold frequent meetings involving teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders to review data, discuss trends, and evaluate the impact of the SIP. These collaborative sessions will inform our analysis and guide necessary adjustments.

Feedback and Input: We will actively seek feedback from teachers, students, parents, and the community to gain valuable perspectives on the implementation and impact of the SIP. This input will contribute to our monitoring process and help identify areas requiring improvement.

If during the monitoring process, we identify areas that need improvement, we will revise the SIP through the following steps:

Data Analysis: We will analyze the collected data to pinpoint specific areas where students are not meeting academic standards or where the achievement gap persists.

Root Cause Analysis: A thorough analysis will be conducted to identify the underlying factors contributing to the identified issues. We will assess teaching strategies, curriculum, resources, and other variables affecting student achievement.

Action Planning: Based on our findings, we will develop action plans that outline specific steps, strategies, and interventions to address the identified challenges and improve student achievement. These plans will specifically target the needs of students with the greatest achievement gap.

Implementation and Monitoring: The revised plan will be implemented, and its progress will be continuously monitored. We will closely track the impact of implemented strategies and interventions on student achievement and make necessary adjustments along the way.

Our unwavering commitment to effective monitoring and continuous improvement remains steadfast. By incorporating insights from SAC meetings, PLC meetings, classroom walk-throughs, faculty meetings, and data reviews, we are poised to ensure the SIP positive influence on student achievement. Our dedication to providing comprehensive support to all students, particularly those bridging the achievement gap, underscores our mission to empower every individual to attain their highest potential in ELA and Math.

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	30%
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	23	19	18	15	24	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	11	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	13	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	21	11	0	0	0	33

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	16	9	0	0	0	26

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	23	19	18	15	24	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	11	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	13	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	21	11	0	0	0	33

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	16	9	0	0	0	26

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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	80	56	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				75			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			65		
Math Achievement*	80	60	59	80	46	50	76		
Math Learning Gains				67			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			53		
Science Achievement*	83	63	54	75	61	59	69		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	59	59	73			75		

** 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
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	72

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	78			
HSP	70			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	64			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	75			
HSP	70			

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%
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	67			

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			80			83					67
SWD	32			48			41				5	31
ELL	56			69			77				5	67
AMI												
ASN	85			89			93				4	
BLK	77			77			80				3	
HSP	67			75			82				5	64
MUL	93			79							2	
PAC												
WHT	77			88			80				4	
FRL	63			67			68				5	62

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	75	65	80	67	60	75					73
SWD	27	36	36	50	47							43
ELL	67	75	66	64	63	52	57					73
AMI												
ASN	83	83		89	89		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
BLK	81	71		89	59							
HSP	74	76	68	72	63	55	75					73
MUL	90			90								
PAC												
WHT	88	70		89	68		81					
FRL	71	73	53	67	67	60	70					74

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	73	69	65	76	67	53	69					75
SWD	25			56			40					59
ELL	51	67	70	62	65	59	47					75
AMI												
ASN	91			91								
BLK	61			76			60					
HSP	67	72	70	71	64	54	63					75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	86	68		83	79		83					73
FRL	63	72	66	69	66	58	56					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	75%	54%	21%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	62%	20%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	55%	22%	55%	22%

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.

The data component that exhibited the lowest performance was the achievement level in English Language Arts (ELA). Over the past year, the percentage of students scoring 3 or higher dropped from 80% to 76%. This decline in ELA achievement indicates a concerning trend in student performance, potentially reflecting challenges in the curriculum or instructional strategies.

Florida's adoption of a new measurement methodology adds complexity to interpreting these results. The introduction of this new measurement could have influenced the reported achievement levels, making direct year-to-year comparisons less straightforward. The adjustment in measurement might encompass changes in standards, testing formats, or scoring criteria, potentially affecting the apparent decline in ELA performance. Hence, it's important to consider the impact of this measurement change on the reported drop in achievement.

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic had an undeniable impact on student attendance and learning outcomes. With 3rd-grade students having missed the most foundation years of learning (K-1) due to the pandemic, it's reasonable to assume that these disruptions could have affected their performance levels. The sudden shift to remote and hybrid learning models, along with the challenges of adapting to new formats, could have contributed to the reduced achievement in ELA.

In conclusion, while the data shows a decline in ELA achievement, it's essential to approach the

interpretation with caution due to Florida's new measurement approach and the unique circumstances faced by the 3rd-grade students. The pandemic-induced disruptions undoubtedly played a role in the decreased attendance and learning experiences of these students. By considering all these factors together, teachers can gain a more comprehensive understanding of the underlying causes of the lower performance observed in the ELA achievement data of Eagle Creek Elementary.

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

The data component that exhibited the greatest decline in performance was the achievement level in English Language Arts (ELA). Over the past year, the percentage of students scoring 3 or higher dropped from 80% to 76%. This decline in ELA achievement indicates a concerning trend in student performance, potentially reflecting challenges in the curriculum or instructional strategies.

Florida's adoption of a new measurement methodology adds complexity to interpreting these results. The introduction of this new measurement could have influenced the reported achievement levels, making direct year-to-year comparisons less straightforward. The adjustment in measurement might encompass changes in standards, testing formats, or scoring criteria, potentially affecting the apparent decline in ELA performance. Hence, it's important to consider the impact of this measurement change on the reported drop in achievement.

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic had an undeniable impact on student attendance and learning outcomes. With 3rd-grade students having missed the most foundation years of learning (K-1) due to the pandemic, it's reasonable to assume that these disruptions could have affected their performance levels. The sudden shift to remote and hybrid learning models, along with the challenges of adapting to new formats, could have contributed to the reduced achievement in ELA.

In conclusion, while the data shows a decline in ELA achievement, it's essential to approach the interpretation with caution due to Florida's new measurement approach and the unique circumstances faced by the 3rd-grade students. The pandemic-induced disruptions undoubtedly played a role in the decreased attendance and learning experiences of these students. By considering all these factors together, teachers can gain a more comprehensive understanding of the underlying causes of the lower performance observed in the ELA achievement data of Eagle Creek Elementary.

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.

The comparison between school and state data in English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, and Science reveals notable differences in proficiency rates. According to the most recent available data, Florida's overall proficiency rate for students in these subjects stands at 53%. In contrast, Eagle Creek Elementary displays significantly higher proficiency rates, with 76% in ELA, 81% in Mathematics, and 84% in Science.

These statistics underscore the school's exceptional performance across all three subjects when compared against the state's average. Eagle Creek outperforms the state average by 23% in ELA, 28% in Mathematics, and 31% in Science. This substantial discrepancy suggests that the school's curriculum, teaching methods, and student engagement strategies might be more effective in fostering academic growth and achievement.

Several factors could contribute to Eagle Creek's higher proficiency rates. Firstly, the school's instructional approach might be tailored to meet the needs of its student population more effectively. This includes differentiated instruction, personalized learning, or additional support for struggling students. Furthermore, the quality of educators at Eagle Creek, along with their dedication and expertise, play a pivotal role in enhancing student learning outcomes.

It's important to note that school-level data tends to reflect a more controlled environment, where educators can directly influence teaching strategies and resource allocation. State-level data, on the other hand, encompasses a broader range of schools with varying resources, demographics, and educational approaches. This makes it challenging to draw direct comparisons between individual schools and the entire state.

In conclusion, the comparison between school and state data in ELA, Mathematics, and Science highlights the significant difference in proficiency rates. Eagle Creek's notably higher performance in these subjects indicates the potential effectiveness of its educational strategies and the dedication of its educators.

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

From the previous year, the achievement rate in Science observed a significant advancement, as indicated by the increase from 75% to 84% proficiency among 5th-grade students. This growth underscores the efficacy of the implemented strategies in promoting better learning outcomes.

One noteworthy strategy that contributed to this improvement was the utilization of common planning times by teachers to collaboratively design lesson plans. This collaborative approach allowed educators to pool their insights and expertise, resulting in more well-rounded and effective instructional plans. By coordinating efforts and sharing ideas, teachers could tailor their lessons to address students' needs more comprehensively, thereby contributing to the overall improvement in Science achievement.

Additionally, the incorporation of Science labs within lessons emerged as a key driver of enhanced engagement. Hands-on experiences and interactive learning have been consistently linked to increased student interest and understanding. The use of labs not only made the lessons more captivating but also provided students with practical, real-world applications of the theoretical concepts they were studying. This approach not only fostered curiosity but also facilitated a deeper grasp of scientific principles, contributing to the overall rise in proficiency.

Furthermore, the intentional focus on teaching key vocabulary proved to be instrumental in bridging the gap between abstract concepts and student comprehension. By ensuring that students had a solid grasp of the fundamental terminology associated with the subject matter, teachers enabled them to better connect ideas and synthesize information. This approach facilitated a more holistic understanding of the subject matter and likely played a role in the observed increase in proficiency.

In conclusion, while all the mentioned strategies played a role in improving Science education, the incorporation of Science labs within lessons showcased the most significant improvement in student achievement. The combination of collaborative lesson planning, interactive learning experiences, and targeted vocabulary instruction contributed to a substantial increase in the proficiency of 5th-grade students. This success highlights the importance of engaging, hands-on learning approaches in promoting deeper understanding and better outcomes in Science education.

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

The data analysis of Early Warning Signs highlights a significant area of concern: student attendance. Out of a total of 793 students, a troubling number of 102 students were absent for 10% or more of the school year. This absenteeism rate is a red flag, signaling potential issues that need to be addressed promptly.

The most immediate implication of this absenteeism is the substantial loss of instructional time for the students. When students miss school, they miss out on valuable lessons, classroom interactions, and

opportunities for hands-on learning. This absence from the learning environment can have a detrimental impact on their academic progress and overall understanding of the curriculum.

Furthermore, the burden of addressing this absenteeism falls not only on the absent students but also on the teachers. Teachers are faced with the challenging task of trying to help students catch up on missed material. This puts additional strain on educators who are already juggling numerous responsibilities, potentially affecting the quality of instruction for the rest of the class.

However, the consequences of high absenteeism extend beyond just academics. Socially, students who are frequently absent may struggle to form meaningful connections with their peers. Regular school attendance fosters a sense of belonging, collaboration, and the development of interpersonal skills. When students are consistently absent, they miss out on opportunities to engage with their peers, potentially leading to feelings of isolation or detachment.

In conclusion, the data concerning student attendance raises a critical area of concern. With a notable portion of students being absent for a significant portion of the school year, there is a clear need to address this issue promptly. Not only does absenteeism result in missed instruction and increased demands on teachers, but it also has broader social and academic implications for the students themselves. By implementing targeted interventions to improve attendance and address the underlying causes, Eagle Creek Elementary can strive to create a more inclusive, supportive, and effective learning environment for all students.

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

Supporting the Lowest 25% of Students in Grades 3-5 in English Language Arts and Math: This should take precedence as it directly addresses the needs of struggling students. Offering targeted interventions, such as small group instruction or personalized learning plans, can significantly boost academic performance and overall confidence.

Strong Focus on Reading Instruction in Grades Kindergarten through 2nd Grade: Devoting attention to reading instruction during formative years will establish a strong basis for learning in subsequent grades. Implementing research-based teaching methods and providing adequate resources can make a substantial impact.

Focus on Improved Attendance: Regular attendance is essential for student engagement and achievement. Aiming to improve attendance rates will contribute to a more consistent learning environment. Consider implementing strategies like positive reinforcement, clear communication with parents, and addressing any barriers to attendance that may exist.

By prioritizing these areas, Eagle Creek Elementary can create a well-rounded improvement plan that targets struggling students, strengthens foundational skills, and ensures consistent participation in the learning process. It's important to regularly assess progress and make adjustments as needed throughout the year.

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

#1. 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.

The 58% favorable score for teachers and staff on the Panorama survey under the topic of Resources, indicates a concerning area of focus within our educational institution. This score reflects a significant portion of our workforce expressing concerns, and addressing this Resource issue is critical for several reasons.

Firstly, a low favorable score can have a detrimental impact on staff morale and overall job satisfaction. When educators and support staff feel disheartened or unheard, it can lead to decreased motivation, productivity, and ultimately hinder their ability to provide a high-quality education to students.

Secondly, staff satisfaction is closely linked to student outcomes. Content and motivated teachers and staff are more likely to engage students effectively, create a positive learning environment, and contribute to better academic results. Thus, improving staff satisfaction can directly benefit the educational experiences and success of our students.

Furthermore, the survey's findings may have implications for staff retention. Discontented educators and staff are more likely to seek employment elsewhere, potentially leading to high turnover rates, recruitment challenges, and disruptions in the continuity of education.

In summary, the 58% favorable score under the topic of Resources in the Panorama survey underscores the importance of addressing staff satisfaction and well-being as a strategic priority. By doing so, we can enhance morale, support student success, and create a more harmonious and effective educational environment.

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

The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is an increase in our favorability score of 3% in the Resources domain of the Panorama survey with our Teachers and Staff. The school looks to move from a 58% favorability score to a 61% favorability score on the spring 2024 Panorama survey.

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

Monitoring staff satisfaction and needs will involve a comprehensive approach that integrates surveys, meetings with team leaders, and regularly scheduled faculty/staff meetings.

Firstly, surveys will be a pivotal tool. Regular surveys will assess staff need for resources. These surveys can be tailored to capture specific feedback on professional development, communication, and workplace environment.

Meetings with team leaders are crucial for a more nuanced understanding of individual and departmental needs. These leaders can serve as conduits for gathering feedback, identifying trends, and advocating for necessary improvements.

Regular faculty/staff meetings will provide a platform for open communication and collaboration. These gatherings will facilitate the sharing of survey results, discussions on proposed changes, and the opportunity for staff to voice concerns or ideas directly to leadership.

By combining these approaches, it will allow us to make informed decisions and enact meaningful improvements to enhance the overall work environment and educational experience.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sonia Velarde (sonia.velarde@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented to improve staff satisfaction centers on enhancing communication channels within the organization. Research consistently shows that open and transparent communication positively impacts workplace satisfaction.

Teachers/staff will have the opportunity to express their needs and thoughts through a multi-tiered approach:

Surveys: Regular surveys will be conducted to gather quantitative data on staff needs.

Team Leaders: Meetings with team leaders will serve as a qualitative feedback mechanism. Leaders will actively engage with their team members to understand their needs/challenges, ensuring their voices are heard at a more personal level.

Faculty Meetings: Regularly scheduled faculty/staff meetings will create a platform for open dialogue. Here, employees can share their thoughts, ideas, and concerns directly with leadership and colleagues.

By combining evidence-based practices with these communication channels, we aim to foster an environment where teachers/staff feel empowered to express themselves, ultimately leading to a more satisfying and productive work environment.

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

The strategy for addressing the low favorable rating on school resources is rooted in a data-driven and pragmatic rationale. First and foremost, school resources play a pivotal role in the quality of education. Research consistently shows that well-equipped schools positively impact student learning outcomes. Therefore, addressing resource concerns is essential for the holistic improvement of our educational institution.

Moreover, by addressing resource deficiencies, we directly respond to the specific concerns expressed by teachers/staff in the survey. This demonstrates a commitment to their well-being and needs, which can boost morale and job satisfaction.

Additionally, focusing on resources aligns with broader educational goals. Adequate resources can facilitate innovative teaching methods, improve student engagement, and enhance overall school performance. This strategy, grounded in empirical evidence and staff feedback, offers a practical and impactful approach to elevate the quality of education and the overall work environment.

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 3 - Promising 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 regular opportunities for team leaders to meet with their grade level teams to discuss needs at their grade levels.

Person Responsible: Lauren Morris (lauren.morris@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Survey teachers on their needs.

Person Responsible: Lauren Morris (lauren.morris@ocps.net)

By When: 4/30/2024

Team leader meetings with the Principal and Faculty meetings throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Patricia Cells (patricia.cells@ocps.net)

By When: 6/1/2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Addressing the needs of Students with Disabilities (SWD) is crucial for improving educational outcomes in an environment where only 40 percent of students are scoring proficient on state testing. By focusing on SWD, Eagle Creek Elementary can promote inclusivity, diversity, and equity, leading to enhanced overall academic performance.

Firstly, inclusivity fosters a positive learning atmosphere. When SWD are provided with tailored support, it creates an environment where all students feel valued and understood. This inclusivity can encourage collaborative learning, allowing SWD to interact with their peers, share perspectives, and gain a broader understanding of subjects.

Secondly, addressing SWD needs aligns with principles of diversity. Embracing diverse learning styles and abilities can lead to innovative teaching methods that benefit all students. Educators who tailor their approaches for SWD often discover creative strategies that engage students across the board, resulting in improved teaching techniques for the entire class.

Moreover, prioritizing SWD promotes equity. Tailored support addresses individual challenges, allowing SWD to access education on a level playing field. This commitment to equity demonstrates a dedication to providing every student with an equal opportunity to succeed, regardless of their abilities.

Lastly, improved outcomes for SWD positively impact the educational community as a whole. As schools invest in specialized training and resources for SWD, educators gain skills that can benefit all students, regardless of their abilities. These investments can drive systemic change, leading to an overall increase in academic proficiency.

In conclusion, addressing the needs of Students with Disabilities is a strategic move to improve educational outcomes. Inclusivity, diversity, equity, and the potential for enhanced teaching methods make catering to SWD an essential step towards lifting the proficiency of all students beyond the current 40 percent mark on state testing.

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

Eagle Creek Elementary aims to enhance the proficiency levels of students with disabilities by raising their proficiency rate from 40% to 43% on the FAST ELA state test. This measurable outcome signifies a targeted 3% improvement in academic performance. The focus on students with disabilities demonstrates a commitment to inclusive education and personalized support. By achieving this goal, the school aims to promote equitable educational opportunities and ensure that all students can effectively engage with the curriculum. Through tailored interventions, adaptive teaching methods, and comprehensive assessment strategies, the school endeavors to empower these students to reach their full potential, thereby contributing to their overall academic success and fostering a more inclusive and diverse learning environment.

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

Monitoring the goal of increasing the percentage of proficiency in students with disabilities by three percentage points involves a multifaceted approach. Data analysis will play a key role, with regular assessments tracking student progress and identifying areas needing improvement.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will provide targeted training to educators, enabling them to develop tailored strategies and interventions. These PLCs will foster collaboration among teachers, aiding in the implementation of effective teaching methods.

Administration and the leadership team will conduct classroom observations to assess instructional practices, offer feedback, and ensure alignment with the standards.

Adjustments based on data insights and observations will guide ongoing refinements to teaching techniques. By combining data-driven insights, targeted training, and active involvement from leadership, the initiative aims to foster an inclusive educational environment that empowers students with disabilities and facilitates their academic growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Dencker (heather.dencker@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.)

SIPPS, or Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words, is an evidence-based intervention designed to help students with disabilities improve their reading skills. It focuses on three key areas: phonological awareness (recognizing and manipulating sounds), phonics (connecting sounds to letters), and sight word recognition.

SIPPS employs a structured approach, breaking down reading skills into smaller, manageable steps. It incorporates direct instruction, providing students with explicit explanations, guided practice, and independent practice. This approach supports students in mastering foundational reading skills.

The program's effectiveness lies in its personalized approach, allowing educators to tailor instruction to individual students' needs. Progress monitoring and ongoing assessment help track students' development and adjust instruction accordingly. By addressing specific areas of difficulty, SIPPS aims to enhance reading fluency, decoding, and comprehension for students with disabilities, ultimately improving their overall reading abilities and academic success.

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

SIPPS, or Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words, is a comprehensive reading program designed to aid students, particularly those with disabilities, in improving their reading skills. The rationale behind using SIPPS lies in its evidence-based approach that addresses diverse learning needs. It offers explicit instruction in crucial areas such as phonological awareness, phonics, and sight word recognition, which are fundamental for reading success. For students with disabilities, SIPPS provides structured and differentiated instruction, accommodating various learning paces and styles. The program's systematic nature ensures gradual skill development, boosting confidence and mastery for struggling learners. Its multisensory techniques cater to different learning modalities, enhancing engagement and retention. By tailoring instruction to individual needs, SIPPS aims to bridge reading gaps, empower students with disabilities, and foster their overall literacy growth, contributing to their academic achievement and future 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.

Initial Assessment and Individualized Goals: Conduct a comprehensive assessment of each student's current reading level, strengths, and areas needing improvement for ESE students in the lowest 25 percentile. Based on this assessment, create individualized reading goals that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). These goals will serve as a benchmark to track the progress of each student over time.

Person Responsible: Heather Dencker (heather.dencker@ocps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

Regular Progress Monitoring: Implement a structured system for regular progress monitoring. This will involve regular assessments using SIPPS or other suitable tools to measure the students' reading skills. Analyze the data to identify trends, areas of improvement, and potential challenges. Regularly discuss progress reports with teachers, special education staff, and administration to keep everyone informed about the students' advancements and areas that require additional support.

Person Responsible: Heather Dencker (heather.dencker@ocps.net)

By When: April 30, 2023

Data-Driven Instruction and Support: Use the collected data to inform instructional decisions. Adjust teaching strategies, materials, and interventions based on the students' progress. Collaborate with special education teachers, reading specialists, and other relevant staff members to design targeted interventions that address specific reading challenges faced by students with disabilities. Continuously review and refine the intervention plans based on the latest progress data.

Person Responsible: Heather Dencker (heather.dencker@ocps.net)

By When: May 15, 2023

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 Eagle Creek 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. Eagle Creek 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 and inclusion of students with disabilities. 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.

Additionally, the principal's budget committee, consisting of faculty and staff representatives, contributes significantly to the allocation process. This committee reviews various proposals, examines budgetary constraints, and seeks consensus on where funds should be allocated. This collaborative approach ensures that the distribution of resources aligns with educational objectives, teaching requirements, and support services for students.

Throughout the allocation process, transparency is maintained, and feedback is actively sought from teachers, parents, and students. This not only fosters a sense of ownership within the school community but also ensures that the decisions made reflect a deep understanding of the student's needs.

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, Eagle Creek 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.