

Orange County Public Schools

# Village Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Village Park Elementary

12253 LAKE NONA GATEWAY RD, Orlando, FL 32827

[ no web address on file ]

### 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
Morosetti, James	Principal	<p>The principal will be responsible for cultivating, shaping, and ensuring rigorous academic goals for all staff and students. He will problem solve, coach, and build capacity in the team to create a positive and influential school culture. The principal will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support to ensure the school's mission and vision are achieved. The principal will also monitor data to provide needed adjustments to close the achievement gap, assure building safety, and maintain and deepen current educational best practices to support the positive and influential school climate.</p>
Malek, Denise	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal is responsible for assisting the principal in cultivating, shaping, and ensuring rigorous academic goals for all staff and students. She will problem solve, coach, and build capacity in the team to create a positive and influential school culture. Mrs. Malek will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support to ensure the school's mission and vision are achieved. The Assistant Principal will also monitor data to provide needed adjustments to close the achievement gap, assure building safety, and maintain and deepen current educational best practices to support the positive and influential school climate.</p>
Freiberger, Randolyn Brooke	Instructional Coach	<p>As the Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Mrs. Freiberger will provide materials and content knowledge to ensure equity among all students and classrooms. She will support the math instructional coach in monitoring the teacher and student's use of curriculum and access to culturally responsive texts. As the ELA instructional Coach, Mrs. Freiberger will maintain knowledge of curriculum and instruction to develop staff and build capacity. As the MTSS coach, Mrs. Freiberger will manage, monitor, and ensure the fidelity of the MTSS system throughout the school. She will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful in all academic areas and be a resource for all teachers on various instructional strategies to meet the needs of all student learners.</p>
Pancorbo Guzman, Anabelle	Instructional Coach	<p>The Math and Science Coach will assist in data collection for MTSS student eligibility. They will monitor the implementation of mathematics Florida BEST Standards and coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts in mathematics. They will provide instructional guidance during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to ensure planning is rigorous and targeted to each tier of students. She will also facilitate the new teacher induction program and provide coaching and guidance to ensure their success during their first years as classroom teachers.</p>
Rivera, Johnny	School Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor will maintain an understanding of all communication skills, decision making, relationship skills, conflict resolution, and goal setting to ensure students receive support and reduce all barriers to academic success. The Guidance Counselor will confer with teachers to</p>

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

provide interventions, preventions, and behavior modifications that will allow all students to succeed and participate in rigorous instruction.

### 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.

Modeling is key to understanding anything in school buildings. School leadership and staff are the ones that lead by example. We set the tone for our school building by showing and modeling how we want our students to behave and react to situations daily.

Every stakeholder from administration, teachers, staff, students, parents, and the community is responsible for ensuring that our school traditions and expectations are followed—these guide our culture, climate, and vision of what we want our school to become.

Our stakeholders provide input through our SAC meetings. We present them with data and goals and they are able to make suggestions for improvement based on the data presented.

### SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored each 9 weeks through data meetings. Based on students needs and trends, the plan will be revised. Students with the greatest achievement gap will receive the necessary tier 3 interventions.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	80%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	44%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No



<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	1	32	31	15	14	15	0	0	0	108	
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	11	24	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	32	31	15	14	15	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	1	32	31	15	14	15	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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*	66	57	53	67	56	56			
ELA Learning Gains				66					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50					
Math Achievement*	79	60	59	76	46	50			
Math Learning Gains				82					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74					
Science Achievement*	74	63	54	63	61	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	84	59	59	68					

\* 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	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
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	28	Yes	2	1
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	73			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	64			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	81			
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	60			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	66			79			74					84
SWD	20			36							2	
ELL	52			75			66				5	84
AMI												
ASN	69			94							2	
BLK	67			79							2	
HSP	58			74			66				5	85
MUL												

## 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
PAC												
WHT	81			88			95				4	
FRL	50			66			63				5	91

## 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	67	66	50	76	82	74	63					68
SWD	10	38	40	20	54	58						30
ELL	58	63	43	71	84	75	52					68
AMI												
ASN	94	70		100	80							
BLK	70	92		70	91							
HSP	60	62	46	72	80	74	62					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	65		90	95		73					
FRL	58	64	50	61	79	73	42					52

## 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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

**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	60%	54%	6%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	62%	18%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	55%	14%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	51%	13%

### III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**

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

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

Our SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance. One of the contributing factors is teacher turnover. We need to support teachers with professional development opportunities to grow SWD.

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

Our SWD in ELA also showed the greatest decline because of teacher turnover and a need to better support teachers in order for them to support SWD.

**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.**

N/A

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

Our Math data showed the greatest improvement with 82% proficiency. Here were the actions taken in the area.

- A. Using the CRM's with Fidelity
- B. Using Reflex Math with Fidelity
- C. Ensuring students mastered math facts (Number Sense)
- D. Incorporate review of trailing standards with math centers.
- E. Center Rotations focused on standards needing improvement.

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

Last year grades 1 (32 students) and 2 (31 students) had the highest level of attendance concerns with absences of 10% or more days. This is a concern when the foundational reading skills and knowledge on number sense and use of math solving strategies are higher in these grade levels.

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

- 1.SWD achieving increasing proficiency in reading and math
- 2.ELL achieving increasing proficiency in 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. 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.

Positive Culture and Environment is very important to our community. It was identified as a critical need because the community has stated how amazing our culture is and they want it to remain the same. Mr. Morosetti will be meeting with stakeholders to promote school collaboration on opportunities for growth often.

Our school invests in the adults on campus by building capacity, teaching them how to practice mindfulness, and creating an influential culture of relationships and connections between educators, students, and the community.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Last year, 11 staff members responded to our staff survey. Eighty nine percent of them responded that the school had a positive climate. For this school year, we would like to double the numbers of staff that take the survey (or better) to 22 and maintain this same score. However, only 59% of staff responded that the school gave high quality and coaching for growth in their teaching, this year we would like to see 75% respond favorably to this.

**Monitoring:**

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

This will be monitored by the School Survey and our desired outcome is for all stakeholders to be invested and satisfied with environment and culture.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Morosetti (james.morosetti@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.)

Support for teachers with feedback. The leadership team will provide coaching observations on a weekly basis. Feedback will focus in on specific teaching strategies for improvement. Support in classrooms will also be provided to those that observations indicate improvement is not taking hold for this specific feedback.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Feedback that is fast and focused produces results the quickest in the classroom. Teachers that need additional support beyond observation feedback will be supported by coaches through modeling strategies and the coaching cycle.

**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.

Provide support for teachers on specific skills, procedures, and content. This support will vary from side by side teaching, full coaching cycle, in the moment coaching, and team planning. Classroom walkthrough data, teacher request, and student data will determine the amount and type of support.

**Person Responsible:** Randolyn Brooke Freiburger (randolyn.freiberger@ocps.net)

**By When:** August 23-May 24

Targeted professional development opportunities will be given to teachers. The topics will be determined by what is offered from the district, classroom walkthrough data, and teacher request.

**Person Responsible:** Denise Malek (sharonda.malek@ocps.net)

**By When:** August 23-May 24

**#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.

SWD is an area of focus. Based on FAST Data, there is crucial need for improvement. We have 36 percent on target and we would like to meet a goal of 41 percent.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The achievement gap of SWD subgroup will be reduced and the SWD will increase their proficiency We aim to increase our ESSA Component from 36% to 41%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The ESE Resource teacher, and Staffing Specialist will report weekly to the principal on the outcome of weekly instruction for our SWD students. The AP will be responsible for conducting discussions with the classroom teachers regarding SWD instruction, how students are receiving specific accommodations if needed, and how they monitor student progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Denise Malek (sharonda.malek@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.)

Being a Reader, SIPPS, Exact Path, SuccessMaker, and Number Worlds will be the intervention programs used with our students to support the Tier 1 instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are programs supported by the district via professional development, alignment to Tier 1 instructional materials, and purchased from the district. The resources are outlined in the district K-12 reading plan written with collaboration from the ESE department.

**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.

For SWD, we are doing in house training and support provided by our ESE staff. We give them support with goal tracking, behavior and instructional accommodations. These students also receive pull out push in services in math, ELA, and social skills.

While in the mainstream classroom, teachers incorporate accommodations into the students daily tasks. They receive additional Tier 3 support during intervention time. During common planning, teachers

discuss students struggles and success and adjustments are made based on student need so that our SWD student can be successful in the classroom.

**Person Responsible:** Denise Malek (sharonda.malek@ocps.net)

**By When:** This will be monitored year round and we will review the results during PM3.