

Orange County Public Schools

# Hamlin Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Hamlin Elementary

16145 SILVER GROVE BOULEVARD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

[ 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 to lead our students to success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

## School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy Osborne, Angela	Principal	Dr. Angela Murphy-Osborne, Principal: Dr. Osborne provides guidance for the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Through her leadership, the team is able to make decisions about students and then determine and implement best practices based on the needs of the students. Dr. Osborne also ensures that the team is implementing common planning effectively and she provides opportunities for professional development. Additionally, Dr. Osborne conducts classroom walkthroughs daily.
Bradford, Tamara	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Tamara Bradford, Assistant Principal: Mrs. Bradford provides guidance for the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Through her leadership, the team is able to make decisions about students and then determine and implement best practices based on the needs of the students. Mrs. Bradford also ensures that the team is implementing common planning effectively and she provides opportunities for professional development. Additionally, she conducts classroom walkthroughs daily.
Olszewski, Allison	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Allison Olszewski, Instructional Coach: Mrs. Olszewski provides research-based suggestions for instruction while modeling lessons for teachers. She also supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. Additionally, Mrs. Olszewski oversees and participates in 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.

The school leadership team works closely with the School Advisory Council (SAC). At each meeting, the goal is reviewed and updates are given on progress towards the goal. SAC gives feedback and reviews data monthly. The SIP is also discussed during pre-planning with staff and there is an opportunity for feedback and adjustments.

**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 participate in daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure effective instruction is occurring. The leadership team will also participate in common planning, as well as data meetings, to ensure progress is being made towards the goals and that the lessons reflect the student's needs based on current data. Data meetings will focus on proficiency and learning gains for all students, especially looking at progress being made by students with the greatest achievement gaps. Interventions and re-teaching will then be planned to close the gaps based on the information reviewed in the data meetings. Revisions will be made based on walkthroughs and student data.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	48%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	16%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	11	21	14	9	6	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	6	7	8	0	0	0	0	27

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	4	3	9	4	0	0	0	20

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	1	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	13	10	16	11	9	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	8
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	1	2	3	0	0	0	6

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	13	10	16	11	9	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	8
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	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	1	2	3	0	0	0	6

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	80	57	53		56	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	84	60	59		46	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	83	63	54		61	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	59	59						

*\* 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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	84			
HSP	73			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	86			
FRL	83			

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

**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	80			84			83					68
SWD	26			50							2	
ELL	63			69			71				5	68
AMI												
ASN	95			100							2	
BLK	80			87							2	
HSP	72			71			79				5	76
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	83			89			85				4	
FRL	70			90			79				4	

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	78%	54%	24%	54%	24%
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	88%	59%	29%	59%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	84%	55%	29%	55%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	59%	21%	51%	29%

### 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 performance in 2022-2023 was ELA proficiency. On the ELA Fast, 80% of students were proficient. Hamlin Elementary opened in the 22-23 school year so the teachers were new teams. There were also new standards (BEST) and a new assessment (FAST).

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

Hamlin Elementary opened in the 2022-2023 school year. There is no decline, we just have current baseline data.

**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.**

Hamlin Elementary scored above the state average in all subject areas.

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

Hamlin Elementary opened in the 2022-2023 school year. There is no area of improvement, we just have current baseline data.

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

- Attendance (10% or more)
- Students with a substantial reading deficiency

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

- 1 - ELA Proficiency

**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 ELA**

**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.

Student achievement will improve as we focus on ELA proficiency. In 2022-2023, 80% of students were proficient in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

2023-2024 ELA FAST PM 3 ELA achievement scores will increase to 82%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure teachers are differentiating instruction and have targeted instruction. The instructional coach will participate in the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to assist and monitor the planning process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Allison Olszewski (allison.olszewski@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.)

All teachers will participate in PLCs weekly plan lessons collaboratively and focus on the BEST Standards. In these PLC groups, teachers will plan using strategies aligned with the benchmarks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs will help build capacity amongst the staff. The teachers will review the standards and reflect on data, as well as the impact of strategies that were implemented. Teachers can also collaborate to determine any needed changes for future instruction. Complex texts are also chosen based on the needs of the students.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will meet with teachers to determine planning teams and discuss roles and expectations.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Murphy Osborne (angela.murphy-osborne@ocps.net)

**By When:** August 2023

The leadership team will provide professional development to teachers on ELA strategies, as well as the BEST standards. The team will discuss how to find varying levels of complex texts to target the needs of all students in response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities.



**Person Responsible:** Allison Olszewski (allison.olszewski@ocps.net)

**By When:** September 2023

Coaches will model ELA lessons in classrooms.

**Person Responsible:** Allison Olszewski (allison.olszewski@ocps.net)

**By When:** September - October 2023

The leadership team and teacher leaders will offer professional development based on teacher feedback and requests after peer observations on reading strategies and best practices in reading.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Murphy Osborne (angela.murphy-osborne@ocps.net)

**By When:** ongoing

Coaches will provide updates on common planning progress at leadership team meetings (biweekly) and provide ongoing, differentiated support to teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Allison Olszewski (allison.olszewski@ocps.net)

**By When:** ongoing

## #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.

Hamlin Elementary will continue to maintain our positive school climate.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

On the panorama survey, staff rated our school as 96% favorable on school climate. Our goal is to maintain such a favorable rating.

### Monitoring:

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

Surveys will be created every marking period to monitor the perception of the school climate.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamara Bradford (tamara.bradford@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.)

Staff feedback will be provided through Effective Educators, team-building activities will be scheduled monthly, and the OCPS coaching cycle will be followed.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing feedback and coaching teachers, we will be able to strengthen our relationship with teachers, while improving their practice. Team building activities will help to build camaraderie and morale.

### 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.

Inputting feedback in to Effective Educators.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Murphy Osborne (angela.murphy-osborne@ocps.net)

**By When:** September-May

Complete the OCPS Coaching cycle based on student data and walkthrough information.

**Person Responsible:** Allison Olszewski (allison.olszewski@ocps.net)

**By When:** August-May

Team building activities will be done monthly

**Person Responsible:** Tamara Bradford (tamara.bradford@ocps.net)

**By When:** August-May