

Orange County Public Schools

Panther Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Panther Lake Elementary

10151 SUMMERLAKE GROVES STREET, 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
Szymanski, Christine	Principal	Instructional observations Teacher and classified staff evaluations Personnel hiring and professional standards issues Progress monitoring and data analysis Monitor and evaluate Deliberate Practice plans Manage school budget and internal accounts SAC and PTO liaison Oversee professional development for the leadership team Public relations leader Monitor staff and student attendance Communicate and implement district initiatives Monitor PLCs and instructional planning
Shaw, Susan	Assistant Principal	Instructional observations Teacher and classified staff evaluations Personnel hiring (instructional and classified) Progress monitoring and data analysis Monitor and evaluate Deliberate Practice plans Monitor FTE Facilities manager/school safety plans and drills Monitor PLCs and instructional planning Student scheduling
Gray, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Participates in classroom walk-thrus to identify trends Provides teacher and staff professional development Progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations Testing coordinator Educator Access + grading system contact Organizing and managing school field trips Facilitates school participation in district academic competitions Organizes and manages all instructional materials Manages content and delivery of parent newsletter Manages the school website and social media content
Musselman, Elsie	ELL Compliance Specialist	Conducts coaching observations for teachers Participates in classroom walk-thrus to identify trends Provides teacher and staff professional development Progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations MPLC facilitator Monitors ELL certify Manages ELL plans and accommodations Facilitates ELL testing Imagine Learning Contact

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Organizes and facilitates parent conferences for ELL students
Hoffman, Peggy	Staffing Specialist	ESE staffing Monitors ESE Certify errors Conducts ESE annual reviews Manages behavior plans Assists with ESE accommodations Gifted screenings Manages health care plans ESE transportation contact 504 plan facilitator MTSS process facilitator
De La Torre, Carida	School Counselor	Provides guidance lessons K-5 Provides Child Safety Matters lessonsK-5 Conducts SEDNET referrals Facilitates DCF calls and visits Coordinator for the Threat Assessment Meetings McKinney Vento contact Title IX coordinator Social worker liaison
Perrucci, Christine	Instructional Coach	Conducts coaching observations Provides teacher and staff development Progress monitoring and data analysis Organizes peer to peer observations Coordinates grade-level ELA collaborative planning Monitors ELA instruction MTSS documentation Third grade exemption documentation Lead mentor supervisor Coordinates reading deficiency and retention letters.

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.

Achievement data from the previous school year is presented to the teachers and staff at the start of the school year as well as the previous year's SIP. Input is taken from teachers and leadership team members regarding areas of strength and areas of growth. This information is also presented to the SAC. Input from the stakeholders is used to write the goals of the SIP.

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 monitoring of SIP goals will be addressed monthly during school leadership team meetings, PLC meetings, Faculty meetings and trainings as well as SAC meetings. During these meetings classroom observation data will be shared along with progress monitoring data.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
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	19	16	17	12	23	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	19	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	16	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	18	18	13	0	0	0	0	58

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	4	6	9	14	10	0	0	0	43

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	27	15	21	26	16	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	16	16	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	11	0	0	0	27
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	16	9	0	0	0	26

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	1	27	15	21	26	16	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	16	16	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	11	0	0	0	27
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	16	9	0	0	0	26

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*	71	57	53		56	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	75	60	59		46	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	79	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	66	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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	44			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	66			
HSP	72			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	57			

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				

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				
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	71			75			79					66
SWD	33			50			67				4	
ELL	63			76			76				5	66
AMI												
ASN	67			95							2	
BLK	68			64							2	
HSP	70			73			81				5	67
MUL	86			79							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			76			85				4	
FRL	60			54			64				5	56

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												

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												
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	70%	54%	16%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	60%	10%	58%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	78%	59%	19%	59%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	55%	21%	55%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	51%	22%

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 that showed the lowest performance on the spring FAST Assessment was achievement in English Language Arts. Only 74% of our students in grades 3-5 scores a level 3 or above. Teachers needed to implement more close reading strategies and small group differentiated instruction along with purposeful center rotations that addressed the ELA BEST standards.

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

Panther Lake Elementary was new for the 2022-2023 school year. We do not have the previous year's data on which to determine an area that showed the greatest decline. However, we will continue to review the previous year's progress monitoring data for our individual students and create a plan that will increase the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in both English Language Arts, Math and Science..

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.

On the 2023 FAST English Language Arts assessment, 74% of the students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency. This exceeds the state average of 53% on the FSA English Language Arts assessment taken in 2022 by 21 points. On the 2023 FAST Math assessment, 78% of the students in grades 3-5

demonstrated proficiency. This exceeds the state average of 53% on the 2022 FSA Math exam by 25 points.

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

Panther Lake Elementary was new for the 2022-2023 school year. We do not have the previous year's data on which to determine an area that showed the greatest the most improvement. However, the most significant growth during the course of the year was shown in 5th grade math. Only 11% of the students in 5th grade demonstrated proficiency on the first progress monitoring assessment in August. This increased to 81% on the spring FAST assessment.

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

One area of concern is that 89 students were absent 10% of the time or greater. Another area of concern is that 58 students have a substantial reading deficiency.

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

Our first priority is to increase the attendance rate for all grade levels. The second priority is to decrease the number of students that have demonstrated a substantial reading deficiency and to increase the overall percentage of our students demonstrating proficiency in English Language Arts.

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.

The spring 2023 FAST ELA assessment indicated that only 74% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient in reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The spring 2024 FAST ELA progress monitoring data will indicate 77% or higher proficiency on the spring assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data will be reviewed regularly during the weekly PLC meeting with all teachers as well as during the weekly leadership team meeting. Additionally, weekly classroom walk-through data will be collected and analyzed to instruction is tied appropriately to the BEST standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will plan for instruction that focuses on the science of reading and instruction that is appropriately aligned to the Florida BEST standards

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An intense focus on the science of reading will help target instruction for students that are less proficient readers and increase the overall percentage of proficient readers on the spring FAST English Language Arts assessment.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development regarding the DIBELS assessment and the use DIBELS fluency passages.

Person Responsible: Melissa Gray (melissa.gray@ocps.net)

By When: This task will be completed by August 31, 2023

Teachers will receive professional development regarding the science of reading, the OCPS K-2 Literacy plan and standard-aligned whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Christine Perrucci (christine.perrucci@ocps.net)

By When: This task will be completed by September 30, 2023

The leadership team (Administrators and coaches) will meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review common assessment data and progress monitor the growth of our students throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Susan Shaw (susan.shaw@ocps.net)

By When: August 15, 2023 through year end

#2. 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 the early warning system data, 89 students had an attendance rate of less than 90%. By creating a positive culture and school environment, it is our goal to increase the student attendance rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students that have attendance less than 90% will be decrease by 20%

Monitoring:

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

Monthly attendance reports will be reviewed and parents will be contacted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Szymanski (christine.szymanski@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.)

A positive culture and environment will be created by implementing a student behavior reward system and focusing on student life skills, peer-to-peer relationships, and student/teacher relationships

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By creating a positive culture where students feel connected and supported, students will attend school more regularly.

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.

Implement a behavior management system where students receive Panther Bucks for demonstrating behavior expectations including being present and prepared for school.

Person Responsible: Susan Shaw (susan.shaw@ocps.net)

By When: This task will be completed by August 31, 2023

Teachers will implement life skills lessons as part of the health curriculum that focus on relationships with peers and adults

Person Responsible: Carida De La Torre (carida.delatorre@ocps.net)

By When: This will be implemented by September 30, 2023

A cross age buddy program will be implemented in which 3rd, 4th and 5th grade classes will be paired with kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade classes to build relationships and promote a positive school culture. Classes will meet for a combined activity at least 4 times during the year.

Person Responsible: Carida De La Torre (carida.delatorre@ocps.net)

By When: This task will implemented by October 30, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Panther Lake Elementary has not been identified as an ATSI, TSI, or CSI school.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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