

Orange County Public Schools

Kelly Park 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Kelly Park School

4700 JASON DWELLEY PARKWAY, Apopka, FL 32712

[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
Steinke, Kelly	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader at Kelly Park School. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decision-making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II as well as Tier III. The Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Gurgone, Helena	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves with the Principal as an instructional leader at Kelly Park School. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decision-making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II as well as Tier III. The Assistant Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Earnest, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher provides and leads professional development for core curriculum areas. She identifies systematic patterns of student and teacher needs and coaches teachers on instruction best practices. The CRT participates in data collection, progress monitoring, as well as data meetings to monitor student assessment results.
Brooke, Nicole	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components, supports teachers with science and social studies instruction, coaches teachers daily, and facilitates data collection for grades K-8. She administers Tier III instruction to groups of students who have been identified through data analysis. In addition, the Instructional Coach conducts professional development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized in both whole group and small group instruction.
Bartolotta, Kelly	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist assists in decision making for intervention/enrichment and leads MTSS Problem Solving meetings, eligibility, and IEP team meetings to ensure students have a plan in place for their success.

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.

After reviewing state assessment data, Early Warning Systems data, and Panorama survey data, the stakeholders came together to develop the SIP. The group focused on the greatest areas of need and suggested strategies to most effectively address those concerns. The input gathered from the stakeholders was critical in determining the action steps required to ensure that our school's goals are met.

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 SIP will be monitored on a regular basis to ensure effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement. This monitoring will occur after each progress monitoring cycle (beginning, middle, and end of the year) and will be visited during quarterly data chats. In January, the team will reflect on the progress made and revise the plan, if necessary, utilizing the data collected up to that point.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	16	15	10	19	15	23	17	28	145	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	11	16	31	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	15	17	30	27	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	18	15	24	15	11	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	8	10	20	0	0	0	0	44	

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	2	2	3	23	14	16	17	23	100	

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	11	15	14	19	18	14	12	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	23	19	24	25	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	6	21	22	14	17	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	9	23	19	24	25	110
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	6	5	18	15	15	19	78

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	11	15	14	19	18	14	12	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	23	19	24	25	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	6	21	22	14	17	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	10	9	23	19	24	25	110
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	6	5	18	15	15	19	78

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*	57	56	53		57	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	72	59	55		41	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	62	56	52		57	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	79	68	68		63	59			
Middle School Acceleration	65	74	70		52	51			
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	51	55	55		73	70			

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP	46			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	46			

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	57			72			62	79	65			51
SWD	23			44			41	42			5	
ELL	24			48			13	29			6	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67			73			65	89			5	
HSP	36			57			39	52	50		7	52
MUL	64			76							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			82			81	90	62		6	
FRL	40			57			43	65	25		7	52

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	60%	54%	6%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	45%	7%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	47%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	60%	9%	58%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	54%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	38%	15%	48%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	61%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	83%	58%	25%	55%	28%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	44%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	51%	19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	47%	49%	50%	46%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	66%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component showing the lowest performance was English Language Arts, with 57% of our students scoring proficient. One contributing factor to the overall score was the performance of our 8th graders. Only 36% of those students scored proficient.

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

As Kelly Park School opened in August of 2022, we do not have data from the prior year to compare.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 8th Grade English Language Arts. One possible factor that contributed to this gap was the implementation of a new curriculum for our middle schoolers.

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

As Kelly Park School opened in August of 2022, we do not have data from the prior year to compare.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, attendance and ELA level 1 scores are two potential areas of concern. We had 145 students that missed 10% or more of the school year. In ELA, we had 110 students score level 1.

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

Our priorities for the 2023-2024 school year are increasing overall ELA performance, addressing attendance issues, and increasing the performance of our English Language Learners.

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.

Based on Early Warning System data, approximately 17% of our students were absent 10% or more of the school year in 2022-2023. Regular attendance in school has been shown to not only increase achievement but to foster a culture of community among teachers and students. It is the goal of Kelly Park School to create an environment that is positive, supportive, and inclusive.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing strategies and programs to promote regular attendance, we anticipate reducing chronic absenteeism by at least 5%, from 17% to 12%.

Monitoring:

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

Every four to six weeks, we meet in Professional Learning Communities to discuss our students. At these Child Chats, teachers will bring any attendance concerns to the attention of the coach leading the meeting. In addition, our attendance clerk will review attendance daily and initiate interventions for students with excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@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.)

Kelly Park School will continue many of the plans we put in place during our inaugural year to build a culture that promotes a positive atmosphere. Those initiatives include recognizing students for exemplifying character traits associated with our Cambridge School program, celebrating academic successes weekly, and providing numerous opportunities for students to become involved in activities. This year, we are adding two major programs to enhance our positive environment, the House System and peer mentoring. In addition, we have hired a dedicated attendance clerk that will focus on monitoring attendance and reaching out directly to families when absences become concerning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students that feel welcomed, connected, and celebrated will not want to miss even one day of school. We expect to see that increased attendance will lead to increased academic achievement.

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.

We will implement a House System to create a strong sense of community and belonging. Students will be grouped into Houses and work collaboratively with their House members toward common goals. Houses will also meet periodically throughout the year in order to build bonds among members of the group.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Earnest (jennifer.earnest@ocps.net)

By When: The House System will be implemented by November 2023.

Selected Middle Schoolers will participate in our Peers as Partners program. These mentors will work with targeted elementary students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Earnest (jennifer.earnest@ocps.net)

By When: The Peers to Partners program will start in August of 2023.

Our Attendance Clerk will reach out to families as soon as attendance issues arise. This communication will help us proactively work to solve any problems before absenteeism becomes chronic.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bartolotta (kelly.bartolotta@ocps.net)

By When: The monitoring of absences will commence at the beginning of the school year and continue throughout.

#2. 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.

Increasing proficiency in students' reading performance was identified as a critical need based on data analysis. Fifty-seven percent of our students demonstrated proficiency in English Language Arts. By focusing on differentiated small-group instruction and approved supplemental programs, we can ensure that our students are receiving rigorous instruction tailored to their individual needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing differentiated small-group instruction and using approved supplemental programs, we anticipate seeing proficiency at Kelly Park School increase by at least five percentage points from 57% to 62% in English Language Arts.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, review of formative data, and input from coaches during PLCs. Feedback on all of these areas will be provided in a timely manner so any changes needed can be implemented quickly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Steinke (kelly.steinke@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.)

Strategies that we will implement include differentiating small group instruction, utilizing approved supplemental programs (Exact Path, SIPPS, Read 180, and multisensory phonics lessons) during small group instruction, and continuing our data analysis. We will closely monitor these strategies to determine their effectiveness by meeting every four to six weeks to examine student data (progress monitoring data, formative assessment data, and diagnostic data). Small group and intervention group instruction will be monitored weekly via classroom walkthroughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiating instruction is key to increasing performance among all students. Our focus on differentiated small-group instruction targeted to meet individual student needs will ensure that students are engaged in rigorous activities that will increase their capacity. Through the data analysis process, we will collectively determine how students are progressing on the standards. These research-based strategies will lead to an increase in student achievement.

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.

Once students' needs have been determined, differentiated small-group instruction will be implemented using standards-based lessons, approved supplemental programs, and, if necessary, placement in Tier II or Tier III intervention groups. Interventions will be progress monitored either weekly or bi-weekly in order to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bartolotta (kelly.bartolotta@ocps.net)

By When: Grouping decisions will be made during the first Child Chat meeting (data review) in mid-September after all FAST ELA testing is complete.

Teachers will become familiar with the approved supplemental programs (Exact Path, SIPPS, Read 180, and multisensory phonics lessons) in order to more effectively differentiate instruction for their students.

Person Responsible: Nicole Brooke (nicole.brooke@ocps.net)

By When: Training will be provided to teachers on supplemental programs throughout the year in PLC meetings.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

Increasing proficiency in Reading among our English Language Learners was identified as a critical need based on data analysis. According to our raw data, 12% of our students identified as English Language Learners (ELLs) scored a level 3 or higher on the end-of-year FAST ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing evidence-based strategies, we anticipate that at least 25% of our ELL students in grades 3-8 will score a level 3 or higher on the end-of-year FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

After the first FAST Progress Monitoring assessment, the team will analyze the data and make instructional decisions regarding our students identified as ELLs. These decisions may include being placed in a Tier II /Tier III group or working in a small group with a bilingual paraprofessional. In addition, this Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and input from coaches during PLCs. Feedback on all of these areas will be provided in a timely manner so any changes needed can be implemented quickly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Bartolotta (kelly.bartolotta@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 the classroom, we will implement effective instructional strategies to reach our ELL students, such as using comprehensible input and collaborative structures. Assessments will be used to drive differentiated instruction. For our newcomers, we will utilize the online program Imagine Language. Teachers will monitor student progress in this program and intervene when necessary. For our students targeted for more intensive instruction, we will use the SIPPS program, which focuses on a systematic approach to learning phonological skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing effective instructional strategies focused on language acquisition will help our English Language Learners become more proficient in all academic areas. Collaborative structures will facilitate communication among all of our students and afford our ELL students opportunities to practice their language skills.

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.

Effective ELL instructional strategies will be reviewed and planned for during Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.

Person Responsible: Nicole Brooke (nicole.brooke@ocps.net)

By When: By September, all teachers will become knowledgeable about the most effective instructional strategies for English Language Learners.

Collaborative structures will be shared and practiced during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Nicole Brooke (nicole.brooke@ocps.net)

By When: By September, all teachers will be able to utilize collaborative structures in their classrooms.

Data from the first FAST ELA Progress Monitoring assessment will be analyzed and, if necessary, students will be placed into tiered intervention groups based on need.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bartolotta (kelly.bartolotta@ocps.net)

By When: Grouping decisions will be made during the first Child Chat meeting (data review) in mid-September after all FAST ELA testing is complete.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$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