Water Spring Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Water Spring Middle School

10393 SEIDEL ROAD, 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 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
Sanchez Corona, Brian	Principal	Oversee safety and security, Testing, Budget and Funding. Whole school operations.
Mutters, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, School Improvement, FTE, Students with a Disability, English Language Learners, Accountability, Student Services, Technology, English Language Arts, Social Studies, CTE
Heidelberg, Arnetta	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security, Facilities, Discipline, School Safety Plan, Science and Math
Spangler , Elizabeth	Staffing Specialist	Exceptional Student Education Compliance. SWD, IEP's, Gifted EPs,
Williams, Kesha	Instructional Coach	Resource for Core Content. Professional Learning Communities, MTSS/RTI, Mentoring
Nesbitt, Erin	Other	Curriculum and Testing
Brown, Leisa	Dean	Discipline and MTSS
Gaetan , Antonio	Dean	Discipline, MTSS and Supervision

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 SIP development was based on the school needs as identified by the leadership team. The School Advisory Committee reviewed the SIP and made adjustments based on each stakeholder.

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 have quarterly reviews based on data to evaluate its effectiveness. The impact should show a closing of the achievement gap for our ESSA subgroup, SWD as well as a positive culture and environment with our focus on the parent and family involvement.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	45	38	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	35	37	74
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	56	53	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	15	32	89
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	

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	0	0	0	0	28	33	50	111

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	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) 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	0	0	0	0	0	45	34	36	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	28	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	41	109
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	29	33	103
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	3	2	5

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	31	41	104

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	0	0	0	0	0	45	34	36	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	28	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	41	109
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	29	33	103
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	3	2	5

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	31	41	104

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*	62	48	49	60	49	50			
ELA Learning Gains				57					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51					
Math Achievement*	70	57	56	60	36	36			
Math Learning Gains				55					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54					
Science Achievement*	59	53	49	65	55	53			
Social Studies Achievement*	84	64	68	84	61	58			
Middle School Acceleration	64	77	73	73	52	49			
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	54	43	40	62	79	76			

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	2	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	62			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	58			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	64			
HSP	60			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	55			

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	62			70			59	84	64			54
SWD	28			26			25	38			4	
ELL	51			66			50	76	61		6	54
AMI												
ASN	84			84			75		73		4	
BLK	38			48			31				3	
HSP	57			66			56	79	60		6	52
MUL	67			88				100			3	
PAC												
WHT	69			75			67	89	70		5	
FRL	50			58			52	73	50		6	63

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	60	57	51	60	55	54	65	84	73			62
SWD	11	50	52	16	40	36	27	50				
ELL	47	58	55	56	55	44	58	84	72			62
AMI												
ASN	59	50		94	82							
BLK	59	58		58	64		62	80				
HSP	54	57	48	54	54	56	64	83	73			60
MUL	65			65	70							
PAC												
WHT	67	60	60	63	51	46	65	89	70			
FRL	54	54	34	52	51	52	59	78	64			

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
07	2023 - Spring	57%	45%	12%	47%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	47%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	78%	53%	25%	54%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	38%	-3%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	44%	10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	47%	42%	50%	39%

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	78%	61%	17%	66%	12%

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.

ELA proficiency scores showed the lowest performance last year. Proficiency dropped 6% from 60% to 54% in 22-23. Contributing factors include a staff member who went on extended leave in the 2nd quarter, and limited common planning time due to various constraints.

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

The greatest decline occurred for our 8th grade science achievement.The proficiency dropped from 65% to 54% in 22-23. A long term vacancy contributed to the decline as it caused a deficit for a class of students, multi content teachers, and lack of common planning time.

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 average we scored approximately 10% above the state in every category, however in math achievement we scored 20% above the state average. The focus on math, and making data driven schedule changes to best meet the needs of the students are contributing factors that show our high achievement in math. Targeted small group pull outs were also conducted for students who scored level I on both ELA and Math testing.

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

Math proficiency showed the most improvement. The scores improved to 71% proficiency from 60% the previous year. The actions included a teacher swap midyear as well as focused scheduling from the beginning of the school year. Targeted small group pull outs were also conducted for students who scored level I on both ELA and Math testing through Tier I interventionists and instructional coach.

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

Two areas of concerns identified include attendance and ELA Level I's. The attendance directly affects instruction and ELA is already one of our lowest areas with drops from previous years.

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

ESSA SWD category will be a major focus as there was not any improvement from previous years.
ELA Proficiency is another high priority for improvement.
Another priority will be climate and culture, as a new campus we have multiple areas to address to build and keep a positive environment.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, we will focus on the attendance area of the early warning systems. Students who miss 10% or more days show a higher likelihood to demonstrate lower achievement due to decreased instructional time and fewer opportunities to build relationships with faculty, community, students, and stakeholders.

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

Using the EWS system, the attendance of students will be monitored to directly affect school achievement. The number of students missing 10% or more days will drop by 20% bring the total number from 133 in 22-23 to less than 100 in the 23-24 school year.

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

The attendance records will be actively monitored on a daily and weekly basis. Following the attendance requirements, regular parent contacts will occur including phone calls, letters and meetings to notify and educate the parent on the importance of the student attending school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leisa Brown (leisa.brown@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.)

Regular monitoring, student meeting, and parent contact will be the interventions. The attendance team will add the students to our MTSS process to regularly monitor, check in and contact parents as needed. Parent engagement and information sessions will be provided in multiple languages to increase understanding and compliance.

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

As a middle schooler, the age of the students puts the parents as the responsible party for attendance. Through monitoring and regular contacting with the student and parent, this will allow all parties to be notified and involved in the process. Additional targeted community outreach opportunities such as ESOL Parent Nights will be held to increase awareness of attendance policies for families who are new to the country.

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.

Monitor the student attendance records

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly for daily reports

Send home 1st communication letters for students in warning for missing days

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly, as needed

Meet with the students who have missed 5 or more days

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly, as needed

2nd communication with parents

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly, as needed

Meet with student 2nd time

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly, as needed

3rd communication with parents

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly, as needed

ATS meeting with parents and student

Person Responsible: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly, as needed

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The students with a disability proficiency needs to improve in all tested areas. Our ESSA subgroup, SWD, has remained stagnate at 35%. In reviewing the last 2 years of data, this subgroup proficiency has not shown improvement and is identified as a crucial area to focus on.

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

The goal is to improve the SWD subgroup proficiency from 35% to 42%.

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

The team including the Staffing Specialist and administrator will be regularly meeting with the ESE and Core teachers to monitor the current achievements of the identified SWD subgroup. The monitoring will include summative and formative assessments to identify specific areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@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.)

Ownership of learning, by students, will be the intervention implemented. The ESE case manager and staffing specialist will regularly meet to analyze data and review IEP goals quarterly. The ESE case manager will meet with students to go over their progress reports and include them in the monitoring to allow them to better understand their own areas of focus.

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

The rationale for including the students into the monitoring, is that it allows the students to have ownership of their learning. The students will be able to identify their areas of concerns through the help of trained educators, while developing their own goals and plan to improve their 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.

Team meeting to discuss and review assessment data

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Spangler (3173@ocps.net)

By When: BiWeekly

Student meeting to discuss data

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Spangler (3173@ocps.net)

By When: After team meetings, biweekly

Student develops personal plan for improvement

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Spangler (3173@ocps.net)

By When: During student meetings biweekly

Identify areas of need in each core subject, working with support facilitation and ESE teacher

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Spangler (3173@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

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).

Resources will be reviewed by the SAC committee which includes stakeholders from the staff, community, parents and students. The team will look at the resources identified as a need based on the data provided, and will review its effectiveness on a quarterly basis.

The school team will provide a report that includes the results of the resources purchased through school improvement funding allocations allowing the SAC committee to review the allocations and results included within the interventions and action steps.