Orlando Gifted Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Orlando Gifted Academy

1121 N FERN CREEK AVE, Orlando, FL 32803

[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
Maguire, Sean	Principal	Orlando Gifted Academy principal, Sean Maguire, is an instructional leader who ensures rigorous, standards-based instruction takes place daily. He leads the school and ensures faculty and staff work towards the vision and mission OCPS has established and set forth. Additionally, he ensures that academically appropriate challenges are provided to all students. Sean Maguire supports continuous professional development for all teachers and staff. He oversees schoolwide safety and efficient operations and collaborates with the surrounding community and its stakeholders.
Hale, Andrea	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (AP) provides teachers with observations and feedback to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. She oversees student scheduling, discipline, and campus safety to create a safe learning and working environment for all staff and students. The AP provides support to students, staff, and parents with a variety of needs.
Patten, Tamera	Dean	Ms.Patten is OGA's Dean, Behavior Designee, and MTSS lead. Ms. Patten is an instructional leader who supports all of the principal's initiatives. She implements student behavior plans and monitors utilizing the MTSS process. She develops and maintains our school-wide discipline and behavior plan with the members of our leadership team.
Crandell, Carolyn	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Crandell, as the Instructional Coach, provides professional development on research-based instructional practices. Additionally, Mrs. Crandell provides teachers feedback using the Marzano Framework and collaborates with them during planning to provide strategies to enhance their pedagogy. She works closely with teachers to ensure the resources adequately address rigorous instructional goals. Mrs. Crandell also serves as OGA's testing coordinator, ensuring compliance with district and state assessment requirements.
Gentry-Michelson, Cynthia	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist coordinates all student staffing documentation, progress monitoring, and meetings. Ms. Gentry is our Section 504, Individualized Educational Plan (IEP), and Educational Plan (EP) manager. She serves as an ambassador for our school with constant communication with the families of our students.
Carr, Alex	Magnet Coordinator	Dr. Carr is an instructional leader who is responsible for recruitment and compliance with our district Magnet agreement. He supports the principal's initiatives for local, state, and national recognition that aids in recruiting students and teachers aligned with the school's philosophy to support Gifted Learners.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cybulski, Zhen	ELL Compliance Specialist	Dr. Cybulski is a teacher leader that aids in our school's compliance with State and District ELL requirements. Additionally, she leads our Elementary Enrichment program through instruction in Mandarin and MakerSpace.
Lineberry, Amber	Instructional Media	Ms. Lineberry is our Media Specialist and is charged with organizing and tracking the distribution of textbooks and digital resources to students and staff. Additionally, she oversees the compliance of the texts utilized to support literacy across our campus to meet state regulations.
White, Zenia	School Counselor	Ms. White provides individual and group counseling to students. Additionally, she is the mental health designee and oversees the Threat Assessment Team. Ms. White also provides classroom guidance lessons and assists teachers with understanding students with social and emotional concerns.

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.

Needs Assessment Data was shared with PTSA on May 2, 2023, and the School Advisory Committee assembled on May 11, 2023. These support organizations, including parents, staff, and students reviewed and made recommendations for developing the SIP goals regarding the climate and culture present at our school.

The SAC again met on July 10, 2023, to review student performance data on state assessments to provide recommendations on developing academic goals that drive professional development and instructional practices.

On August 2, 2023, The OGA instructional team met and reviewed student achievement and needs assessment data to provide analysis and recommendations to be included in the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan.

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))

Review progress monitoring data from state and district resources, including FAST, quarterly interim assessments, and unit exams, to ensure that academic goals are met. Surveys will be sent to stakeholders each semester to monitor cultural 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)	Combination School 2-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
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) 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
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	0	0	3	6	5	3	8	5	12	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	2	3	17
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	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	4

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	0	0	0	4	8	8	3	12	10	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	6
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4
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	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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) 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	0	0	0	4	8	8	3	12	10	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	6
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4
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	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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*	95	56	53	96	57	55	96		
ELA Learning Gains				70			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				78			79		
Math Achievement*	96	59	55	95	41	42	92		
Math Learning Gains				73			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				80			70		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	93	56	52	89	57	54	94		
Social Studies Achievement*	100	68	68	98	63	59	98		
Middle School Acceleration	88	74	70	75	52	51			
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress		55	55		73	70			

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	95
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	754
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	89			
ELL	100			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	77			
HSP	96			
MUL	100			
PAC				
WHT	95			
FRL	92			

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	90			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	77			
HSP	81			
MUL	88			
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	82			

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	95			96			93	100	88			
SWD	85			92							2	
ELL	100			100							2	
AMI												
ASN	100			100			100				3	
BLK	77			93			67		70		4	
HSP	97			94			96	100	95		5	
MUL	100			100							2	
PAC												
WHT	96			97			95	100	86		6	
FRL	91			96			85	100	88		6	

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	96	70	78	95	73	80	89	98	75			
SWD	90			90								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	96	71		96	88							
BLK	83	72	73	88	60	62	76	100				
HSP	97	69	69	95	62	79	88	94	73			
MUL	100	70		100	82							
PAC												
WHT	99	70	86	96	79	86	93	100	77			
FRL	92	74	76	94	69	76	88	92	73			

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	96	74	79	92	62	70	94	98				
SWD												
ELL												

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	100			100								
BLK	91	75		87	60							
HSP	96	69	64	92	54		80					
MUL	100			100								
PAC												
WHT	97	78	86	92	71	67	100	100				
FRL	93	70		90	45			100	100			

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	96%	54%	42%	54%	42%
07	2023 - Spring	95%	45%	50%	47%	48%
08	2023 - Spring	90%	46%	44%	47%	43%
04	2023 - Spring	97%	60%	37%	58%	39%
06	2023 - Spring	92%	44%	48%	47%	45%
03	2023 - Spring	98%	52%	46%	50%	48%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	98%	53%	45%	54%	44%
03	2023 - Spring	100%	59%	41%	59%	41%
04	2023 - Spring	97%	62%	35%	61%	36%
08	2023 - Spring	96%	58%	38%	55%	41%
05	2023 - Spring	96%	55%	41%	55%	41%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	85%	50%	35%	44%	41%
05	2023 - Spring	99%	59%	40%	51%	48%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	47%	51%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	66%	34%

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.

Science Achievement was our lowest-performing category. 8th-grade scores (85% proficient) were 14 percentage points lower than 5th-grade scores (99% proficient).

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

8th Grade Science Achievement decreased from 89% in 2022 to 85% in 2023.

This data indicates potential gaps in instructional alignment for our grades 6-8 science courses. The courses offered at Orlando Gifted Academy are MJ Life Science Advanced (6th Grade), Earth/Space Science Honors (7th Grade), and Physical Science Honors (8th Grade). The scope and sequence of the two high school honors courses may not precisely align with the M/J Comprehensive Science Standards assessed on the SSA at the end of 8th grade.

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.

Orlando Gifted Academy was significantly higher than the district and state average in all categories.

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

Middle School Acceleration category showed the most improvement, with a 14% rise. (2022- 75%: 2023-89%). Although the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 and above on the Algebra I EOC was similar (2022-100%, 2023- 98%), Orlando Gifted placed a higher percentage of 7th and 8th-grade students in Algebra I than the previous year, increasing the denominator, resulting in the gains.

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

Being a magnet school in which transportation is not provided to any student, Attendance is a potential area of concern.

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

1. 8th Grade Science Achievement
2. Learning Gains in ELA and Math
3. Increasing PD opportunities for the acquisition and alignment of teacher resources
4. Student Attendance

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 Differentiation

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.

All students who attend Orlando Gifted Academy are gifted; however, students perform at various academic achievement levels. To meet the needs of all students, teachers will utilize differentiation strategies to accommodate learning styles to maximize student achievement.

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

-8th Grade Science Achievement will meet 90% proficiency.
-Student Learning Gains in ELA and Math will meet or exceed 75%.

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

- 8th Grade Science SBUA and PMA data
- FAST data
- During weekly collaborative planning, school administrators and coaches will collaborate with teachers to discuss lessons and differentiation strategies; additionally, the leadership team members will conduct classroom observations and walkthroughs to ensure differentiation strategies are being implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Andrea Hale (andrea.hale@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.)

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

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.

Schedule weekly collaborative planning for the school year for Thursdays 8:00am.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Crandell (carolyn.crandell@ocps.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Review unit assessment and quarterly progress monitoring data quarterly to identify gaps in instruction and create plans to fill the gaps.

Person Responsible: Andrea Hale (andrea.hale@ocps.net)

By When: April 1, 2024

Review FAST Reading and Math data to identify students that require reteaching/reinforcement of skills and plan to address those needs through tutoring.

Person Responsible: Andrea Hale (andrea.hale@ocps.net)

By When: January 31, 2024

#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.

Ensure that the teachers at Orlando Gifted Academy have the necessary resources and training to implement
high-level instructional strategies that promote a positive school culture and climate, committed to creating an enriching environment for all.

On Panorama teacher survey data, OGA scored below the average of other K-8 schools at 40% of the adequacy of the School Resources component. OGA scored below the average of other K-8 schools at 40%. This was a 19-point decrease from the 2021-2022 survey data.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, we intend to increase the score on the Resource component. of the Panorama Teacher survey by 10%.

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

1. Bi-annual surveys of teacher needs.
2. Professional development sign-in.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Maguire (sean.maguire@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.)

Implement professional development opportunities Kagan Structure implementation and further study in differentiation through attendance of teacher leaders at NAGC National Conference.

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

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.

Create and distribute bi-annual surveys to collect information on resources and professional development needs.

Person Responsible: Amber Lineberry (amber.lineberry@ocps.net)

By When: January 31, 2024

Set aside funding for professional development and student/teacher resources, including Kagan Structures, NAGC National Conference, classroom technology, and instructional resources.

Person Responsible: Sean Maguire (sean.maguire@ocps.net)

By When: January 31, 2024