

Orange County Public Schools

Summerlake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Summerlake Elementary

15450 PORTER ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://summerlakees.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.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

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
Bender, Delaine	Principal	Duties include serving as the instructional leader responsible for high academic achievement for all students, developing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, and monitoring curriculum and instruction.
Pinckney, Karen	Assistant Principal	Duties include implementing school-wide CHAMPS behavior expectations, monitoring MTSS behavior data, and assisting classroom teachers with behavior strategies, as well as, providing support to teachers for student achievement based on data-based decision-making.
Salinsky, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Duties include serving as the Instructional Coach for teachers to assist them with implementing rigorous lessons, leading the planning for all content areas, and serving as the lead mentor for beginning teachers and interns.
Williams, Chaneiqua	Staffing Specialist	Duties include monitoring compliance with all IEP, Section 504 plans, and ELL meetings with teachers and parents. Coordinating meetings with the Speech and Language Pathologist and school psychologist to review data and provide recommendations for instructional support, and closely monitoring ESE and ELL student progress and the accommodations to support student success.
Witman, Brandi	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Duties include overseeing the implementation of curriculum and assessments, ensuring implementation of the MTSS process, identifying appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, and assisting teachers with curriculum resources.
Cox, Angela	Instructional Media	Duties include overseeing and managing the media center, planning literacy events for the school, and leading the Digital Curriculum Team, and Literacy Leadership Team. Also, supporting teachers with digital lessons and resources, and promoting literacy throughout the school campus. She is also responsible for the inventory of digital devices, curriculum materials, and all media center books.
Escobar, Stephanie	School Counselor	Duties include being a member of the Threat Assessment Team, serving as the mental health designee, and providing small group social skills and counseling for students as needed.

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.

During pre-planning results from the FAST assessment were shared with all staff. After analyzing the FAST results, all staff provided their input on the data analysis questions, determined the area focus, and listed potential action steps for each area of focus. The leadership team compiled all of the staff input and narrowed down the area of focus to include small group instruction and improving substantial reading deficiencies of identified students. At the end of the 22-23 school year, the School Advisory Council comprised of staff, parents, and community members reviewed FAST results and identified trends and patterns that mirror the area of focus that staff identified.

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 Summerlake School Improvement Plan will be routinely monitored by the leadership team to ensure all action steps are implemented as intended to improve the reading proficiency of all students specifically ELL students. Through analysis of school data, action steps will be revised as needed in order to ensure academic gains are achieved.

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	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	10	10	16	13	10	0	0	0	61	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	11	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	13	3	8	0	0	0	0	30	

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	3	1	1	8	3	0	0	0	16

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	1	0	0	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) 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	4	21	19	15	16	16	0	0	0	91	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	8	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	15	
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	5	5	0	0	0	10

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	4	21	19	15	16	16	0	0	0	91	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	8	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	15	
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	5	5	0	0	0	10

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*	82	57	53	77	56	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				55			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			62		
Math Achievement*	88	60	59	82	46	50	84		
Math Learning Gains				56			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			64		
Science Achievement*	87	63	54	72	61	59	83		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	45	59	59	68			74		

** 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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	65			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	54			
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	65			

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	46			
HSP	59			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	45			

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	82			88			87					45
SWD	62			79							3	
ELL	63			86			75				5	45
AMI												
ASN	74			89							2	
BLK	46			62							2	
HSP	78			87			83				5	42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	87			90			91				5	46
FRL	66			76			69				5	37

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	77	55	40	82	56	42	72					68
SWD	38	29	21	43	34	28	21					
ELL	66	54	31	76	56	33	71					68
AMI												
ASN	82	69		86	54							
BLK	60	40		55	27							
HSP	71	53	34	78	54	42	69					70
MUL	79			79								
PAC												
WHT	83	57	57	87	61	54	77					63
FRL	61	33	18	67	42	29	41					71

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	81	64	62	84	68	64	83					74
SWD	55			73								
ELL	76	72	67	89	68	80	75					74
AMI												
ASN	67	69		85	77		64					
BLK	62			57								
HSP	82	76		87	71	77	81					72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	52	55	86	63		87					76
FRL	73	38		72	52		74					75

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	82%	54%	28%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	60%	22%	58%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	50%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	93%	59%	34%	59%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	89%	62%	27%	61%	28%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	51%	35%

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 state FAST assessment, ELL student proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) dropped from 66% to 42%, and from 76% to 70% in math. The lowest 25% also dropped from 28% to 25% proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and dropped from 47% to 44% proficiency in math. Factors contributing to the decline in ELL proficiency include a focus on primary grade-level foundation skills and intervention versus providing support for ELL students in grades 3-5. ELL paraprofessionals focused on emergent language newcomers. Other contributing factors include new State benchmarks, materials, and moving from a paper-based assessment to a computer-based assessment.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELL student proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) dropping from 66% to 42%. The factors that contributed to the decline were a focus on bubble students and a lack of resources for ELL students.

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.

All grade levels surpassed state average proficiency for English Language Arts, Math, and Science. Science proficiency improved from 72% to 86% from the prior year and is 35% higher than the state average. Factors that contributed to the increase in proficiency include teacher-led Professional Learning Communities, walk-to intervention models, district and school-provided professional development focusing on processing, scaffolding, and monitoring, and benchmark-focused resources. Specifically in science, teachers focused on critical content, used resources to track progress, and students completed hands-on inquiries.

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

The subgroup of Students With Disabilities showed an increase from 38% to 61% proficiency and an increase from 43% to 79% proficiency in math. The most improved data component was Students With Disabilities which increased from 21% to 80% proficiency in science. New actions taken during the school year include multiple learning methods that met all learners' needs including hands-on learning, digital learning, critical content focused on revising knowledge, and tracking of data to drive instruction.

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

Potential areas of concern include students with a substantial reading deficiency and students absent 10% or more during the school year.

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

The highest priorities include planning for small group instruction and utilizing strategies that support all students including ELL students.

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 Early Warning System**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.

By focusing on a positive culture and environment, we aim to create an environment where students feel motivated to attend school regularly, engage actively in their learning, and develop the necessary skills to become proficient readers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on creating a positive culture and environment, we will decrease the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency from 31 students to 12 students.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the desired outcome by conducting weekly classroom walkthrough observations, during English Language Arts and intervention blocks, providing teachers with actionable feedback, conducting data conversations with students to discuss progress, and monitoring attendance records.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will implement a Life Skills and Resiliency Learning program to help students develop skills to manage emotions, make responsible decisions, and resolve conflict peacefully. A Life Skills and Resiliency Learning program will increase students' ability to improve social skills allowing them to positively impact their ability to focus, collaborate, and learn effectively. We will also develop an attendance tracking system that allows teachers and administrators to identify students with chronic absenteeism and provide timely interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing on creating a positive culture and environment, the collaborative efforts of all stakeholders will play a crucial role in increasing student reading proficiency, increasing attendance rates, and fostering a school community that values academic achievement and student well-being.

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.

Identify students with a substantial reading deficiency and attendance rates below 90%.

Person Responsible: Karen Pinckney (karen.pinckney@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023.

Conduct child study meetings with parents to review student academic progress, and daily attendance, and establish a communication plan and conference schedule to involve parents in their child's education.

Person Responsible: Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023.

Provide professional development opportunities for teachers to learn about best practices for creating an inclusive and positive classroom environment.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Escobar (stephanie.escobar@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023.

Schedule Life Skills and Resiliency Learning lessons that focus on 14 characteristics of resilient students to assist students in overcoming obstacles and fostering a sense of support.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Escobar (stephanie.escobar@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023.

Utilizing the leadership team, establish a reading incentive program for students who are identified with a substantial reading deficiency that celebrates their growth and incorporates interactive tools such as Sora to enhance student engagement and comprehension.

Person Responsible: Nicole Salinsky (nicole.salinsky@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023.

#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.

The Students with Disabilities subgroup is an area of focus in order to close the achievement gap in English Language Arts between overall proficiency and proficiency of Students with Disabilities. Results from the 2022 FSA assessment showed Students with Disabilities decreased from 55% to 38% proficiency in English Language Arts. Results from the 2023 FAST state assessment showed the subgroup Students With Disabilities increased from 38% to 61% proficiency in English Language Arts with overall proficiency increasing from 77% to 82%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of focusing on small-group instruction, we expect 64% proficiency among our Students with Disabilities subgroup on the FAST state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting weekly classroom walkthrough observations during English Language Arts small group instruction, providing teachers with actionable feedback, conducting data conversations with teachers to discuss progress, monitoring data monthly, and students will track their progress on common assessments during periodic data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@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.)

Teachers will effectively utilize small group instruction during the reading block to meet the needs of their students. They will use collaborative lesson planning to focus on benchmark-based instruction and effective reading strategies. We will utilize results from the Progress Monitoring 1 FAST assessment and results from Exact Path to identify deficiencies, create instructional groupings, and monitor student progress. We will provide classroom teachers and the ESE teacher collaborative planning time every nine weeks to ensure the use of differentiated resources in reading to support Students With Disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because teaching is focused on what students need to become proficient in reading. Using data to determine small groups will ensure that students will continue to make gains in their reading abilities for all students. Collaboration in lesson planning combined with progress monitoring assessments enables teachers to create instructional groupings based on student needs.

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.

Develop a schedule with protected time for grade-level teams to collaboratively plan with the instructional coach, and share best practices for Students With Disabilities, ELL students, and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

Analyze student performance data on the FAST Progress Monitoring 1 assessment and Exact Path in order to identify areas of weakness and strength to create balanced and targeted small groups based on similar needs of students.

Person Responsible: Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Provide professional development opportunities on how to utilize Exact Path resources, and ongoing modeling and training for implementation of Being a Reader.

Person Responsible: Nicole Salinsky (nicole.salinsky@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

Review tiered interventions monthly to ensure students with varying levels of reading deficiency receive appropriate support to become proficient readers.

Person Responsible: Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Create a School Literacy Team to assist grade-level teams in disaggregating data from common assessments on an ongoing basis in order to assess the effectiveness of small group instruction and make informed decisions and instructional adjustments.

Person Responsible: Angela Cox (angela.cox@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Provide a planning day with the general education teachers and ESE teacher to review data of ESE students compared to overall student performance, make changes to instructional calendars, and determine adjustments to tiered interventions.

Person Responsible: Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023 and ongoing through the 2023-2024 school year.

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).

Results from the 2022-2023 FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment #3 showed an increase from 38% to 61% proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and an increase from 43% to 79% proficiency in math. The most improved data component was Students With Disabilities which increased from 21% to 80% proficiency in science. For the 2023-2024 school year, small group instruction will be an area of focus in order to address the needs of all students in ELA. In order to meet the needs of Students With Disabilities, we will implement a Literacy Leadership Team that will regularly review common assessments and Exact Path results on an ongoing basis. After reviewing the results this team will determine ELA interventions to put in place and share

with grade-level teams. The team will also review the resources to use and determine if additional resources need to be purchased to address students' needs. Professional Development will be provided to assist teachers with small-group instruction and the Literacy Leadership Team will continually monitor the effectiveness of interventions in place and adjust as needed in order to meet the goal of increasing ELA proficiency for Students With Disabilities.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

Yes