Castleview Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Castleview Elementary

9131 TABORFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32836

https://castleviewes.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 to 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
Rasmussen, Jonathan	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Knickerbocker, Courtney	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment and a positive behavior system; overseeing the exceptional student education program; and other duties as assigned by the principal.
Crooks, Mackenzie	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach supports new teachers (those who are new to the profession as well as those who are experienced, yet new to the school). She provides instructional support to teachers through professional development in the form of workshops, planning, and coaching cycles. She assists teachers with reviewing data from common assessments to inform the next steps for instruction.
Grosso, Valerie	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist ensures that students with disabilities receive the supports necessary to be successful. She also ensures that all testing, paperwork and meetings are held in order to meet federal and state requirements.
Kaufman, Simone	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Compliance Specialist ensures that all English Language Learners are properly supported so that they have access to comprehensible instruction. She also ensures that all testing, paperwork and meetings are held in order to meet federal and state requirements.
Perez-Fernandez, Barbara	School Counselor	The guidance counselor works with students and teachers to provide a safe and welcoming learning environment to support student success.
Wasielewski, Kara	Instructional Media	The media specialist supports classroom instruction by identifying digital, print, video, etc. resources for teachers to utilize in standards based 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.

School leadership team and and team leaders work together to analyze data and develop the SIP. Administration presents SIP to staff and then the School Advisory Council for input and feedback.

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

Through a stocktake procedure leadership team will analyze data monthly and monitor progress toward achieving school improvement goals. During collaborative team meetings, data will be analyzed and team will monitor progress toward school goals.

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	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
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	1	33	28	23	23	22	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	38	28	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	23	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	22	35	38	0	0	0	0	103

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	11	14	41	19	0	0	0	89

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	28	28	26	25	21	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	26	18	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	16	16	0	0	0	34
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	1	2	18	17	0	0	0	38

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) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	28	28	26	25	21	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	26	18	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	16	16	0	0	0	34
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	1	2	18	17	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70	57	53	74	56	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				68			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			64		
Math Achievement*	75	60	59	75	46	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				67			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			46		
Science Achievement*	82	63	54	74	61	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	59	59	68			48		

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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	73			
HSP	64			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	67			

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	62			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	43			
HSP	64			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

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	70			75			82					67
SWD	25			29							3	67
ELL	58			64			72				5	67
AMI												
ASN	83			90							2	
BLK	73			73							2	
HSP	59			67			70				5	67
MUL	73			100							2	
PAC												
WHT	80			81			93				5	64
FRL	64			67			78				5	68

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	74	68	46	75	67	51	74					68
SWD	39	47	30	35	53	40	50					31
ELL	63	70	53	67	64	53	59					68
AMI												
ASN	92	85		86	75		90					

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	58	36		42	36							
HSP	65	69	54	71	65	53	64					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	64	25	80	70	53	82					82
FRL	60	62	35	64	59	39	66					70

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	75	64	64	75	58	46	74					48
SWD	25			29								25
ELL	63	71	72	68	58	50	57					48
AMI												
ASN	92			92								
BLK	58			50								
HSP	66	63	67	65	63	47	58					45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	67		84	56		87					55
FRL	64	59	62	65	59	38	58					46

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	65%	54%	11%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	62%	11%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	51%	22%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data components needing the most improvement are Students With Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups in ELA and mathematics. Also, the percentage of 3rd grade students achieving below grade level was 36%.

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

ELA Level 3-5 achievement dropped from 74% in 2022 to 71% in 2023.

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.

Castleview ES outperformed the state on all measures.

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

Math levels 3-5 achievement increased from 75% in 2022 to 77% in 2023.

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

Our potential areas of concern are first-grade attendance and the amount of fourth-grade students earning ELA level 1 with at least one EWS indicator.

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

1) Increase third-grade ELA proficiency.
2) Increase math and ELA proficiency for ESSA Subgroups: African American students, ELL, and SWD.
3) Facilitating positive culture and environment specifically relating to life skills.

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.

We will continue to work on strengthening our culture and environment specifically relating to Resilience at our school with adults and students. Student Panorama data indicated that school safety is an area for potential growth, with 69% of students responding favorable to this domain.

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

By June of 2023, the percentage of third through fifth grade students favorably answering the Panorama survey question, "How often do you worry about violence at your school" will increase from 57% to 75%.

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

We will monitor the number of bullying and harassment discipline referrals that are completed at school as well as the number of threat to others discipline referrals that are written. As students gain resilience and cooperative skills and understand the impact they have on the feelings of others, the number of bullying or harassment and threat referrals will be reduced.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latasha Nickelson (latasha.nickelson@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.)

This school year we will increase the delivery of lessons focused on empathy as well as problem solving skills in all grade levels. We will also implement a school-wide PBIS program.

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

Students indicated on the Panorama survey that violence is a concern at school, and the majority of discipline referrals are a result of a threat. Often times, threats are made as a joke or when a student is angry. Using strategies that help students understand how their words impact others will reduce the amount of threats that we have. Additionally, teaching problem solving strategies to our students will encourage students to use their words when they become angry or frustrated.

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.

Teach specific life skills lessons focused on resilience, empathy and problem solving skills.

Person Responsible: Barbara Perez-Fernandez (barbara.perezfernandez@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Provide life skills lessons and activities for teachers to infuse in daily lessons to assist students with self awareness and relationship skills.

Person Responsible: Barbara Perez-Fernandez (barbara.perezfernandez@ocps.net)

By When: November 1, 2023

Explicitly teach expectations through PBIS program with an emphasis on how to interact appropriately with peers.

Person Responsible: Latasha Nickelson (latasha.nickelson@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly

Monitor progress toward the goal of reducing discipline referrals each quarter.

Person Responsible: Courtney Knickerbocker (courtney.knickerbocker@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

While we saw growth in the SWD, ELL and Black/African-American subgroups on the 22-23 FAST, the groups still performed below their peers.

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

We will increase the percentage of SWD, ELL and Black/African-American students scoring proficient or above by 10 percentage points on the 2023-24 Spring ELA, Math, and Science state assessments.

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

Common Formative Assessment, end of unit assessments, and progress monitoring assessment data will be reviewed a minimum of twice monthly to determine student needs and identify additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Rasmussen (jonathan.rasmussen@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.)

Collaborative teaming through the PLC process, common formative assessments, and differentiated instruction will all be implemented.

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

Through regularly monitoring student performance/growth, collaborating on appropriate differentiated supports, and implementing said supports, our staff will meet the needs of all students.

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.

Continuously review multiple measures of data to determine students' needs for instruction.

Person Responsible: Mackenzie Crooks (mackenzie.crooks@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Ensure that all support systems remain fluid such that as students improve or regress, they are provided the level of support that they need.

Person Responsible: Mackenzie Crooks (mackenzie.crooks@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Provide training and materials for differentiated instruction in ELA and math.

Person Responsible: Mackenzie Crooks (mackenzie.crooks@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).