Wetherbee Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wetherbee Elementary

701 E WETHERBEE RD, Orlando, FL 32824

https://wetherbeees.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
Hamann, Jacqueline	Principal	The Principal (Jacqueline Hamann): Sets the vision, mission and expectations for the school; oversees digital implementation, provides supervision of all instruction and accelerates the momentum by setting high expectations for the use and success of the MTSS process. She ensures the baseline outlook for the development of MTSS and the successful implementation of the process. The principal also ensures support and documentation to increase academic/behavioral instruction at the various tiers. In addition, the principal examines MTSS plans and activities with parents and stakeholders.
Pares, Christine	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (Christine Pares): Mrs. Pares will work with the principal to develop and facilitate school initiatives, monitor student achievement and instructional delivery of the standards, conduct coaching and evaluative observations, provide effective actionable feedback that promotes teacher growth and expertise, and facilitate discussions focused on progress monitoring data.
Suarez, Edmali	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The ELA Coach (Edmali Suarez): Provides guidance on K-5 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. Keeps an inventory of core curriculum and intervention materials. Supports in coordination of all testing for the school.
Rivera, Monica	Math Coach	The Math and Science Coach (Monica Rivera): Provides guidance on K-5 math and science plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. Keeps an inventory of core curriculum and intervention materials. Coordinates all district and state testing for the school.
Felix, Lymarie	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ESOL Curriculum Compliance Teacher (Mrs. Felix) : Monitors school for compliance with Florida State mandates, conducts and coordinates ELL Committee Meetings, conducts aural/oral language testing on students entering the school and follows-up on students needing the Reading/Writing assessment, assesses, evaluates, and monitors the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program and serves as the liaison for the Dual Language Program.
Cotto Lopez, Edna	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Resource Teacher (Edna Cotto): Provides support to ESE students, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Londono, Priscilla	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The MTSS Coach (Priscila Londono): Provides guidance on K-5 reading and math intervention plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based decisions, and supports tiered intervention plans. Provides coaching and training to colleagues on MTSS implementation. Supports teachers in identifying student needs and provides appropriate interventions as needed. Works with students that are receiving Tier 3.
Thomas, Kristin	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist, Kristin Thomas, oversees the Accelerated Reader program. She provides incentives to increase the amount of books and time students spend reading. She also coordinates inventory of textbooks and student devices.

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.

We meet as a leadership team and leaders of each grade level to discuss our data and where the needs are. We also present it to our SAC and PTO to obtain their input and support.

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))

Through weekly leadership team meetings as well as data meetings the school will analyze current data to determine if the plans for improvement are being effective. The team will revisit goals and action steps established and revise as needed to ensure a high level of student achievement.

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	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No

ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	31	32	18	30	31	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	9
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	1	27	27	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	31	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	8	14	27	0	0	0	0	57

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	1	6	30	28	0	0	0	69

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	13	43	39	20	29	45	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	26	23	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	23	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	8	24	17	36	0	0	0	85

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	1	0	21	19	0	0	0	41

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	0	0	0	0	1
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	13	43	39	20	29	45	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	26	23	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	23	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	8	24	17	36	0	0	0	85

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	1	0	21	19	0	0	0	41

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	0	0	0	0	1
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*	68	57	53	68	56	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				70			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			46		
Math Achievement*	71	60	59	72	46	50	69		
Math Learning Gains				76			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			51		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	81	63	54	69	61	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	67			56		

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)	N/A
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	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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%
2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	66			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	64			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	44			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	66			
HSP	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	72			
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	68			71			81					64
SWD	38			35			20				4	64
ELL	61			64			79				5	64
AMI												
ASN	72			84			92				5	71
BLK	57			58			85				4	
HSP	68			69			78				5	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			80							3	
FRL	58			63			78				5	61

| **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	68	70	59	72	76	73	69					67
SWD	18	60	57	27	57	53	10					69
ELL	59	71	64	66	73	74	61					67
AMI												
ASN	75	69		94	88		94					64
BLK	60	75	62	55	84	82	47					
HSP	67	69	61	71	73	70	67					68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	70		74	79		71					
FRL	60	69	57	66	71	62	58					69

| **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	64	46	69	63	51	70					56
SWD	9	17	18	17	33	30						20
ELL	58	60	60	66	69	59	61					56

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
AMI												
ASN	74	54		79	62		93					50
BLK	57	47		52	53		41					
HSP	69	69	56	69	66	56	71					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			78			67					
FRL	60	51	15	63	56	38	60					48

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	63%	54%	9%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	62%	6%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	51%	24%

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 area of ELA showed the lowest performance at 70%. Contributing factors include new state standards and assessment programs as well as attendance rates. There was also a lack of differentiated instruction for differernt groups of students as well.

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

The area with no decline but the least growth was ELA proficiency. Contributing factors include new state standards and assessment programs as well as attendance rates. There was also a lack of differentiated instruction with small group rotations as well.

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.

No data component was below the state average, all were above.

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

The area of science showed the most improvement. There was an increased focus on STEM as well as additional resources made available from a district level. There was also a stronger emphasis placed on professional development to provide teachers with a deeper understanding of standards and expectations for our students. Additionally, a Spring break camp was provided.

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

An area of concern is students with 10% or higher absences. School climate and culture areessential for student learning and their desire to attend school regularly.

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

Increase ELL student proficiency, increase SWD student proficiency, and increase proficiency in the lowest quartile in both reading and math.

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.

In the 2023 FAST, Wetherbee showed the least growth in overall proficiency in ELA from 68% to 70% (a 2% increase when compared to the 2022 FSA data). ELL was the subgroup with the least amount of students meeting proficiency. In the 2023 FAST, ELL for 3rd and 4th grades (this year our 4th and 5th) subgroups had 40% proficiency in ELA, which was a 19% decrease for lowest 25% (majority ELLs) from FSA 2022.

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

Wetherbee's goal is to achieve 60% proficiency in ELA for the ELL subgroup on the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.). This correlates to a 20% increase in proficiency for the ELL subgroup in ELA according to the 22-23 FAST data for 3rd and 4th grade students.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through analyzing both common assessments and progress monitoring assessments during PLC data meetings, as well as through focus walks conducted by school based coaches and administration, focusing on the small group and rotation resources being utilized.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Edmali Suarez (49769@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.)

Teachers will effectively implement standards-aligned whole group instruction and small group instruction. Small group instruction will be focused on closing the achievement gaps to increase proficiency for the ELL subgroups, utilizing best practices for all students.

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

This strategy was selected to ensure student deficiencies are addressed during intervention and small group instruction to close the achievement gap of subgroups in ELA.
We will use evidence-based interventions such as: Imagine Learning, Exact Path, and MAO Acceleration program.

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.

Monitor and analyze subgroup data during monthly data meetings using common assessment and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data

Person Responsible: Monica Rivera (56517@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Structure 'Level Up' or intervention/enrichment time and resources to strategically address achievement gaps.

Person Responsible: Christine Pares (christine.pares@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Teachers will utilize Heggerty, SIPPs, Multisensory Kits, Exact Path in their classrooms during the ELA and intervention blocks, utilizing best practices for all students.

Person Responsible: Edmali Suarez (49769@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will utilize Imagine Learning to support ELL. A before/after school Imagine Learning Lab will be available.

Person Responsible: Lymarie Felix (lymarie.felix@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

Teachers and the leadership team will conduct teacher and student data chats.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Hamann (jacqueline.hamann@ocps.net)

By When: quarterly

#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.

During the 2023 school year, there were 34 discipline referrals issued to 24 students. This seems to indicate a need to address the overall culture and environment of the school to create a positive learning environment in
which all students feel safe and know how to use strategies to verbalize their needs appropriately and calm and self-regulate-BeeCalm Zone.

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

Wetherbee plans to reduce the amount of referrals to no more than 30 for the year.

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

Discipline data will be monitored during monthly behavioral meetings. In addition, early warning indicator reports will be monitored in order to determine which students might need behavioral intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nayla Alejandro (118236@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.)

Wetherbee will implement Conscious Discipline for teaching appropriate social behaviors.

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

By developing a way to teach positive social behaviors we will be able to create a safe working environment where students and adults are seen, valued, and heard.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will begin each day by greeting students at the door and by having a morning meeting/routine.

Person Responsible: John Stiles Williams (john.stileswilliams@ocps.net)

By When: By end of first quarter. Monitor Weekly

Professional development on discipline procedures with classroom management strategies based on the Conscious Discipline program.

Person Responsible: John Stiles Williams (john.stileswilliams@ocps.net)

By When: By end of 2nd quarter.

Hire Guidance Counselor to assist/support with student behaviors and teach de-escalation strategies to students.

Person Responsible: John Stiles Williams (john.stileswilliams@ocps.net)

By When: By end of 2nd quarter.

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).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No