

Orange County Public Schools

Timber Lakes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://timberlakeses.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
Scott, Jared	Principal	District Data Meetings District Initiatives School Data Meetings School Deliberate Practice School PD School Improvement Plan FSSAT Threat Assessment Team Budget Staffing Social Media Weekly Community Newsletter Classroom Observations Monitoring school wide data Learning Community/District Tasks Discipline Title IX-Decision Maker Deputy Superintendent's Newsletter COGNIA
Davis, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Facilities School Data Meetings Discipline-first contact Review Code of Conduct Quarterly Skyward Safety Drills COGNIA Accountability Corrections Safe School Plan Inventory- backup Title IX-Primary Contact Lunch Duty Schedule Culturally Responsive Team Threat Assessment Team Veteran's Day Social Media Internal Newsletter Assist with monitoring school wide data Data Management Calendar Classroom observations Deliberate Practice Other Duties as Assigned
Kearney, Jenene	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing: FAST K-5 PMAs Success Maker CFEs Write Score

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Monitor Schoolwide Data Run ELA Data Meetings Plan with ELA Teams Certification Points Classroom Observations Monitor Walk to Intervention Staff PD Field Trips Lunch Supervision 1 Intervention group Master Schedule Other Duties as Assigned New Teacher Induction/Mentoring PLC Contact for ELA
Bigio-Garcia, Charlotte	Instructional Coach	CAS Expert Run Math Data Meetings Plan with Math Teams Classroom Observations Monitor All FBS Data PLC Contact for Math Staff PD Lunch Supervision 1 Intervention group Tutoring Lead-Acceleration Other Duties as Assigned Good Cause Paperwork Good Cause Testing Attend Instructional Coach Meetings

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 SIP is presented to the School Advisory Council, where they have the opportunity to provide input or ask any clarifying questions about the SIP.

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))

A classroom walkthrough tool is used that documents trends in standard and benchmark aligned instruction. This data is analyzed weekly by members of the leadership team. Student summative data is analyzed after every unit in math, ELA, and science by the academic coaching team.

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	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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	3	22	16	16	18	20	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	7	
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	11	14	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	15	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	10	8	11	0	0	0	0	34	

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	2	3	3	14	5	0	0	0	27

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	8	25	27	20	17	19	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	21	0	0	0	29	
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		

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	7	17	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	0	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	8	25	27	20	17	19	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	21	0	0	0	29	
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		

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	7	17	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	0	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*	71	57	53	77	56	56	76		
ELA Learning Gains				68			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68			44		
Math Achievement*	76	60	59	79	46	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				65			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			27		
Science Achievement*	75	63	54	77	61	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	81			71		

* 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	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70

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	563
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	2	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	59			
HSP	65			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	58			

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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	77			
HSP	63			

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	74			
FRL	65			

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	71			76			75					57
SWD	33			39			17				5	53
ELL	62			73			61				5	57
AMI												
ASN	85			95			85				4	
BLK	62			60			57				4	
HSP	65			68			62				5	57
MUL	84			84							3	
PAC												
WHT	73			80			85				4	
FRL	61			63			55				5	48

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	77	68	68	79	65	48	77					81
SWD	15	27	30	32	31	25						
ELL	64	83	75	77	72	62	53					81
AMI												
ASN	88	86		93	86		91					100

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	79	74		74	77		79					
HSP	68	61	63	70	59	41	67					71
MUL	84			95								
PAC												
WHT	83	71	78	83	62	48	92					
FRL	66	63	64	69	63	53	63					79

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	76	66	44	79	49	27	70					71
SWD	26			33								
ELL	59	50	45	76	38	20	54					71
AMI												
ASN	74	50		89	38		62					60
BLK	85	92		69	17		62					
HSP	71	61	37	75	51	26	60					74
MUL	91			91								
PAC												
WHT	80	66		85	55		81					
FRL	72	70	53	71	43	28	62					70

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	67%	54%	13%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	58%	23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	62%	23%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	55%	16%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	59%	15%	51%	23%

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.

FAST proficiency data is strong. Historically (on FSA), SWD and learning gains for our lowest quartile of students in math is an opportunity for growth. There are several factors that contribute this:

1. Ensuring that our ESE students are receiving the appropriate services.
2. Reading comprehension-being able to fully comprehend the question that is being asked.
3. Deficiencies in number sense and fact fluency are also contributing factors.

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

We did not have significant declines from the previous year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math learning gains of the lowest quartile had the greatest gap when compared to state data.

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

Our SWD increased from 27% to 36% based on FAST ELA. We hired a new ESE teacher. This year we were extremely intentional about class placements for these students to ensure they were placed with

strong classroom teachers and scheduled so that our ESE teacher is able to meet their needs more effectively.

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

The two areas of focus are students missing more than 10% of the school year and students that have been labeled with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Improve proficiency for SWD.
2. Improve lowest quartile learning gains for math.
3. Decrease the number of students labeled as having a substantial reading deficiency.
4. Improve attendance for the 95 students that missed more than 10% of the school year.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We will focus on our SWD subgroup. This subgroup was selected because we are performing below 41% (should be noted we improved from 27% to 36% year over year). Our goal is for 41% of our students with disabilities to earn proficiency or higher on FAST ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our SMART goal is 41% of students with disabilities to earn proficiency on the ELA FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will use several tools to monitor the progress of this group of students, which includes: FAST data, summative assessment data, IXL data, MTSS data, Exact Path data, and progress on IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenene Kearney (jenene.kearney@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 serve students with a walk to intervention model during the FBS block. Resources we will use: SIPPS, Reading A-Z, Wonders Tier 2 Interventions, FCRR, and Exact Path.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are researched based interventions that have been prescribed by our district as appropriate for Tier 2.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

PDs based on improving Tier I instruction will be implemented.

Person Responsible: Jenene Kearney (jenene.kearney@ocps.net)

By When: On going through PLCs.

Planning with the ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Jenene Kearney (jenene.kearney@ocps.net)

By When: On going throughout the year.

#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.

We will have an intense focus on morale and positivity to build a positive culture and environment. In this area, we will work to increase morale and decrease negativity within the school building and community. The focus on increasing morale and encouraging a positive culture that is palpable within the school building will lead to an increase of our students desire to learn.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on our Panorama Cognia survey the last two years, school climate has increased over the years from a 60% in the Spring of 2022 to 63% in the Spring of 2023. While this is an increase, we would like to see this increase even more during the Spring of 2024 survey. We would like to see the survey results show an increase of 7% to bring our percentage up to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

We will use several different tools to monitor the effectiveness of this initiative. End of the year survey data, discipline and attendance data will be used to measure our success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jared Scott (jared.scott@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.)

Shared decision making, supporting teachers with parents/students/behaviors, removing barriers, providing ample resources, planning time, guidance, and feedback, treating staff as professionals, planned faculty fun events, themed weeks, working to create a light atmosphere that is centered on students, and providing opportunities for the staff to give back to the community are all tools that will be used to improve morale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Over the last couple of years we have noticed a decrease in School Climate on our Panorama Cognia survey and based on that information and results, we believe that a positive environment within the school will lead to improved outcomes as measured by the end of the year survey. We also believe that a positive environment will show dividends on state tests.

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.

We have specific events planned to help build comradery as a team for the school. Events include a white elephant staff meeting, after school meet ups, feeding the homeless during the holidays, baking contests, potlucks.

Person Responsible: Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

By When: On going throughout the year.

Implementation of a CHEER committee.

Person Responsible: Patricia Davis (patricia.davis2@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023.

Create opportunities for teachers to provide input on decisions affecting the school.

Person Responsible: Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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).

SAC and other parent engagement opportunities will have specific time slots created for families to be updated on decisions being made at the school in regards to the SIP goals. The staff and faculty will receive this information through professional developments, PLCs, and newsletters.

District provided PD will be utilized by the staff and encouraged.

Funds will also be used to purchase instructional materials for all levels of instruction.