Vista Pointe Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Vista Pointe Elementary

6900 MARKET PLACE DR, Orlando, FL 32822

[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
Suggs, Lisa	Principal	The principal facilitates instructional resource team meetings to discuss instructional practices across campus. The principal also meets weekly with the entire resource team to discuss issues that impact the school as a whole and to discuss Family Engagement Activities. Weekly, the principal collaborates with the instructional resource team as well as grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted to ensure instructional practices are aligned with the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.
Doster, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Ms. Doster monitors and coaches teachers on the use of the core reading program and collaborates with grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes.
Rivera, Maira	Dean	The Dean offers support in the area of behavior. She collaborates with the guidance counselor, the behavior specialist, and individual teachers as well as grade-level teams, to implement positive behavior support systems.
Soutas, Beverly	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor offers support in the area of behavior and social-emotional well-being. She collaborates with the Dean, Leadership Team, individual teachers as well and grade-level teams to implement positive behavior support systems.
Dimery-Anderson, Gemma	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach works closely with new teachers. She collaborates with grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. The instructional coach collects the weekly data from each teacher on their common assessments. She assists them with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.

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.

Prior to the development of the School Improvement Plan, the school Leadership team reviewed the community Panorama data results and identified areas of growth for the 23-24 school year. Then, a school improvement team at the school level attends the SAC meetings regularly to gain input from the SAC. The school also has a parent concern and recommendation form in the office for parents or community member input.

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 leadership team will plan biweekly with grade-level teams for planning and conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs. During Data PLCs teachers and admin will progress monitor student achievement. We have a data wall to monitor K-5 in ELA, MTSS (T2/T3), and Math. As we periodically evaluate schoolwide and grade-level data we will make changes to instruction as needed. The leadership team meets weekly to discuss school systems. The coaching cycle will be implemented with identified teachers.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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) 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	9	30	25	21	15	7	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	6
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	6	22	13	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	13	14	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	11	20	22	0	0	0	0	65

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	6	3	9	22	14	0	0	0	54

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	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	8	35	22	21	27	26	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	15	19	15	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	31	23	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	29	29	0	0	0	60
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	3	27	24	0	0	0	54

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	8	35	22	21	27	26	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	15	19	15	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	31	23	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	29	29	0	0	0	60
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	3	27	24	0	0	0	54

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*	59	57	53	55	56	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				68			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			64		
Math Achievement*	69	60	59	67	46	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				79			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			82		
Science Achievement*	70	63	54	63	61	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	59	59	58			68		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

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	511
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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	59			

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	42			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	63			

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	79			
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	59			69			70					65
SWD	22			17							4	67
ELL	56			71			68				5	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			45							3	
HSP	57			71			73				5	65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			92							2	
FRL	51			60			66				5	67

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	55	68	57	67	79	64	63					58
SWD	28	60	38	29	47		43					46
ELL	53	65	57	71	78	63	66					58
AMI												
ASN												

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	44	69		56	81		45					
HSP	54	66	54	67	77	60	65					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76			82								
FRL	48	65	48	54	75	58	57					48

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	52	69	64	57	64	82	49					68
SWD	26			19								57
ELL	54	77	70	64	77		48					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			38								
HSP	50	73	64	59	73	82	51					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47	70		51	68	90	45					64

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	55%	54%	1%	54%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	48%	52%	-4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	51%	6%

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 lowest subgroup in performance was SWD in ELA with a proficiency of 28%. We have determined the goals within the IEPs lack rigor and are weakly aligned to standards-based instruction. This makes it difficult to close the achievement gap for this subgroup.

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

The ELL subgroup for proficiency in ELA decreased 8% from 53% proficient to 45% proficient. In math, there was a decrease of 12% from 71% proficient to 59% proficient. A contributing factor could be that we had about a 50% increase in our ELL population, many of whom were newcomers to the US with very limited English.

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.

Our Math Achievement 3+ has the greatest positive gap when compared to the state average with Vista Pointe at 73% proficient and the state at 53% proficient. Our Math Achievement data component has been steadily increasing since Vista Pointe opened. High teacher retention and an overall increase in teacher efficacy have contributed to an increase in student achievement.

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

ELA, math, and science achievement increased overall by 7, 6, and 7 percentage points respectively. ELA increased from 55% to 62% proficient, Math increased from 67% to 73% proficient, and Science increased from 63% to 70% proficient. A contributing factor to improvement in proficiency included the delivery of standards-based instruction. We used iReady diagnostic data to develop instructional groups and provide scaffolded support to close gaps in learning or provide enrichment. Another contributing factor is our high teacher retention across the school which enabled content areas to further develop their instructional practice together.

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

Our first potential area of concern is our students showing a significant reading deficiency. Our second area of concern is our attendance throughout the grades.

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

1. Increase achievement for SWD subgroup.
2. Maximize learning gains and proficiency in ELA and math.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 data showed this area had the greatest need for improvement. Compared to proficiency within the other subgroups, the SWD subgroup did not trend positively overall.

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

50% of the students in the SWD subgroup will show proficiency on the FAST Math assessment.
50% of the students in the SWD subgroup will show proficiency on the FAST ELA assessment.
Meeting these goals will also help us to achieve our overall school goal of 65% proficiency in ELA and 75% proficiency in Math.

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

Use DuFour's PLC model to conduct planning PLCs. These biweekly meetings will be guided by the instruction coaches, in order to review lessons and ensure alignment and rigor to the standard. Furthermore, Data PLCs, guided by instructional coaches and admin, will be held to conduct data analysis of common assessments and FAST PM1, and PM2 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@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.)

In order to increase achievement, we will monitor instruction and growth on both Success Maker and Exact Path. Students will complete at least 45 minutes on each program weekly and teachers will track individual student progress to determine where additional supports are needed.

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

The use of digital personal learning platforms, like Success Maker and Exact Path, allows both teachers and school-based leadership team members to monitor the instruction and success that students are having in realtime. Professional Learning Communities can spend time focusing on the interpretation of the data and use it to identify which students are at-risk learners and provide more intense instruction to those identified.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Weekly school-wide monitoring of the use of the Successmaker Math and Exact Path for ELA programs. Students will complete a minimum of 45 minutes per week in each program.

Person Responsible: Gemma Dimery-Anderson (gemma.dimery-anderson@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the school year.

Common Assessment data and Program reports will be used to identify trends and create instructional groups for reteaching and intervention to drive our instruction.

Person Responsible: Gemma Dimery-Anderson (gemma.dimery-anderson@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the school year.

Monitoring of PLCs and instruction through classroom walkthroughs to ensure lessons align to and demonstrate the rigor of the B.E.S.T standards.

Person Responsible: Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Across the district, there is a need for retaining highly effective educators to support our students in the classroom. While looking at the school district Panorama data collected from staff, there is a need to maintain high percentages at our school site to retain and recruit educators for future years.

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

Our Staff Panorama data will be above 80% favorable in every section of the survey.

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

We will meet with staff at various points of the year to clarify the questions' intent and explore ways to address any areas of concern related to the survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@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.)

According to research conducted by the Michigan Department of Education released in 2021, there are two supports associated with teacher retention that can be intentionally planned for at the school level. This school year we will focus on further developing our mentoring program and ensuring that there are sufficient instructional resources to meet the needs of all of our learners.

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

By placing intentionality and purpose on exploring how to meet the needs of all staff members, the Leadership Team will be better able to discuss how to create a more positive culture and environment for all staff.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Categorize teachers into instructional tiers to determine the needs of our staff.

Person Responsible: Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

By When: October 1, 2023

Use the instructional tier list to set up a mentoring program including OCPS induction program participants and veteran teachers.

Person Responsible: Gemma Dimery-Anderson (gemma.dimery-anderson@ocps.net)

By When: October 15, 2023

Conduct biweekly meetings for induction members and additional professional development to meet the instructional needs of staff members.

Person Responsible: Gemma Dimery-Anderson (gemma.dimery-anderson@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the year.