

Orange County Public Schools

Wedgefield 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Wedgefield School

3835 BANCROFT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32833

<https://wedgefieldk8.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
Pritts, Matthew	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of databased decision-making. - Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. - Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. - Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. - 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. - Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities
London, Amy	Assistant Principal	Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Develops documents to monitor data and address areas of need. - Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. - Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. - Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. - Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.
Markley, Christine	Assistant Principal	Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Develops documents to monitor data and address areas of need. - Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. - Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. - Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. - Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.
DiVito, Juliana	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met. - Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies. - Facilitates grade level common planning. - Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. - Provides support and assistance to teachers
Blackwell, Robin	Staffing Specialist	Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning. - Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

Math Plan to ensure student needs are met. - Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies. - Facilitates grade level common planning. - Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. - Provides support and assistance to teachers

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.

School stakeholders are surveyed and two-way communication occurs throughout the year to identify areas for growth and to collaborate on ways to create and maintain a positive school culture. We recognize and celebrate teachers, students, and staff members, and invite members of the community in to share on these occasions. Teacher and staff input is sought when making decisions for the school, and SAC and FAC provide opportunities for voices to be heard.

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))

All stakeholders are included in the creation of the SIP and therefore have ownership of all parts. Stakeholders will continue to examine school data (formative and summative, provided by the district to ensure the data is research-based and created with the standards/benchmarks in mind). Stakeholders will make data-based decisions to support, monitor, and modify the plan throughout the year.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	11	14	17	19	9	16	23	18	129	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	13	9	38	
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	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	18	14	21	20	21	96	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	7	14	7	6	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	13	

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	5	23	9	18	15	11	86	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	5	8	11	11	9	14	12	9	80	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	2	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	3	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	11	1	24	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	23	12	12	24	20	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	21	8	14	12	10	85	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	21	

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	2	2	4	8	3	20

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	1	5	8	11	11	9	14	12	9	80	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	2	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	3	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	11	1	24	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	23	12	12	24	20	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	21	8	14	12	10	85	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	21	

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	2	2	4	8	3	20

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*	59	56	53	62	57	55	58		
ELA Learning Gains				61			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			45		
Math Achievement*	70	59	55	70	41	42	58		
Math Learning Gains				78			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				82			48		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	70	56	52	71	57	54	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	68	68	82	63	59	80		
Middle School Acceleration	92	74	70	91	52	51	86		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	33	55	55	50	73	70	57		

* 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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	695
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	56			
HSP	61			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	60			

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	41			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	64			
HSP	67			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	73			
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	59			70			70	77	92			33
SWD	14			33			38	40			5	
ELL	39			49			63				4	33
AMI												
ASN	43			79							2	
BLK	58			67			43				3	
HSP	55			63			65	62	88		7	33
MUL	68			55							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			75			77	87	94		6	
FRL	51			61			61	63	88		7	35

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	62	61	48	70	78	82	71	82	91			50
SWD	16	33	28	37	67	72	26	45				
ELL	33	54	48	46	74	65	20					50
AMI												
ASN	71			92								
BLK	63	64	50	64	75		67					
HSP	56	58	47	65	77	78	64	85	81			54
MUL	67	82		78	75							
PAC												
WHT	64	60	49	72	78	84	75	81	93			
FRL	51	57	48	59	76	80	62	73	87			53

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	58	52	45	58	51	48	58	80	86			57
SWD	12	41	40	17	43	44	21	40				
ELL	18	30	31	23	30	14						57

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												
BLK	60	48		57	45		67					
HSP	49	49	46	47	48	42	47	77	83			52
MUL	63	70		56	70							
PAC												
WHT	62	52	44	64	52	53	64	79	86			
FRL	46	45	44	48	49	48	49	63	88			57

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	61%	54%	7%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	54%	45%	9%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	47%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	44%	11%	47%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	54%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	51%	38%	13%	48%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	62%	10%	61%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	83%	58%	25%	55%	28%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	67%	50%	17%	44%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	51%	21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	47%	42%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	45%	51%	48%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	66%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile is lowest at 48%. Data displays this as a consistent trend over the last three years. Contributing factors include ELA intervention time being implemented consistently and effectively across grade levels. Middle school lacked an intensive reading course in 2022-23.

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

ELA Achievement declined by 2% from 58% to 56%. Contributing factors include new benchmarks, change to digital assessment and practice, ELA intervention time being implemented consistently and effectively across grade levels, middle school lacked an intensive reading course in 2022-23 and district-provided curriculum in middle school was not benchmark-aligned.

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.

Data not available. Pending state review.

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

Lowest percentile in Math went from 43% to 82% from 22 to 23. Data-based interventions were provided through push-in, pull-out, and through teacher-led groups.

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

Student attendance and ELA Achievement

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

ELA Achievement, ELA lowest 25%, school culture and climate, Math Achievement, Math lowest 25%

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.

Student achievement in our middle school ELA courses was less than in our elementary grade levels. 56% of students in middle school ELA courses scored Level 3+ on FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

60% of our students in middle school ELA courses will achieve proficiency on statewide year-end assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Student outcomes on unit assessments and statewide progress monitoring assessments will be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy London-Tauriello (amy.london-tauriello@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.)

Backwards design planning process from culminating assessment through the preceding lessons will be implemented to ensure lessons and student practice opportunities are appropriately aligned and rigorous and plentiful. Students below proficiency in ELA will receive increased opportunities for small group instruction, targeted writing support, and participate in tutoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student achievement is positively impacted when students have ample practice opportunities to demonstrate what they know, and when teachers can provide targeted feedback on-the-spot to address misconceptions.

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.

During weekly PLCs, teachers will collaborate and plan for instructional practices that align with standards to increase student achievement. Planning will include reading block format, scope/sequence, common assessments, CRMS, and differentiated instruction (small groups).

Person Responsible: Amy London (amy.london@ocps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023 Weekly PLC meetings- scheduled with Admin &/or Resource

Teachers will become familiar with Exact Path and IXL with ELA focus. Teachers will learn reports, assigning lessons, and monitoring techniques. PD will be used within team levels for understanding/modeling of new ELA based digital resources.

Person Responsible: Juliana DiVito (juliana.divito@ocps.net)

By When: October 30, 2023

Data Chats will be used to share multiple data sources with instructional personnel throughout the year focusing on proficiency levels. Data used will be Common Assessments and FAST PM1 and PM2.

Person Responsible: Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@ocps.net)

By When: December 15, 2023

#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.

School climate for both teachers and students was low according to the Panorama survey taken at the culmination of the year, 54% and 46%, respectfully. Faculty, staff, parents, students and community members all have a voice and are all important members of our school community. Through a shared sense of purpose and values, we will collaborate to create a positive school culture that is focused on student success and the social-emotional well-being of students and staff.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers and students will rate school climate at 65% and 55%, respectfully, on the Panorama survey.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers, staff, and student input will be surveyed when making decisions for the school. SAC and FAC provide opportunities for voices to be heard. A positive student behavior system will be implemented, celebrating students weekly and quarterly throughout the school year. Data will be monitored weekly and decisions will be modified based on data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Pritts (matthew.pritts@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.)

A PBIS framework for teacher and student incentives for positive behavior and attendance

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School culture is positively impacted when teachers and students are present and celebrated, creating a sense of belonging across the campus.

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.

Guidance and Deans will develop school based system to reinforce positive student behavior and share system with staff from kg to 8th grade.

Person Responsible: Christine Markley (christine.markley@ocps.net)

By When: August 25, 2023

Behavioral team will design incentive monitoring system for all grade levels in addition to a specific incentive for middle school levels.

Person Responsible: Christine Markley (christine.markley@ocps.net)

By When: September 10, 2023

Behavioral team will survey teachers on implementation of schoolwide system for adjustments to increase positive behaviors within the school environment.

Person Responsible: Amy London (amy.london@ocps.net)

By When: November 10, 2023

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