Ochwilla Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Ochwilla Elementary School

299 N STATE ROAD 21, Hawthorne, FL 32640

www.putnamschools.org/o/oes

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

It is the mission of Ochwilla Elementary School to provide a student centered, safe and caring environment that promotes academic excellence, reflects diversity, celebrates the joy of learning, and equips all students with knowledge and tools to achieve their full potential in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We shape the future of our community by preparing all students for success in college, career, and life.

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
Leary, Beth	Principal	School leadership, monitor quality of teaching and learning, and ensure safety and security. Monitor: progress on the SIP, new FAST Assessment Data, and effectiveness of the MTSS team. Participate in: individual student MTSS meetings to help remove barriers and align resources, weekly PLCs to establish and monitor expectations.
Shelby, John	Assistant Principal	Support school leadership, monitor the quality of teaching and learning, ensure safety and security, and manage student behavior and school discipline plan. Support the effectiveness of the MTSS team. Participate in: individual student MTSS/IEP meetings to help remove barriers and align resources, attend PLCs to support expectations. Monitor FAST Assessment Data and test coordination. In addition, lesson plan contact, lead for Title I documentation for the audit box, maintains the EOP, conducts various safety drills that are required monthly and reports that information to the facility director. Organizes and completes the Florida Safe Schools Assessment Tool. Establishes effective schedules for Paraprofessional/Custodians to support throughout the school.
Barnard, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Academic coach, technology contact and media representative Schedule and monitor all State and District Testing and facilitate iReady growth monitoring and diagnostic testing Provide Professional Development on best practices and provides instructional and behavior modification coaching to teachers Supports teachers in locating and using instructional/supplemental materials that support best practices and Florida Standards Delivers professional development based on observational data during Professional Learning Communities (PLC)/common planning time and inservice days to support the reading curricula, and its elements designed for intervention as well as enrichment
Mitchell, Stacey	School Counselor	Leads MTSS team meetings when a student reaches Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavior data collection and assists teachers in the implementation of progress monitoring for students in Tiers 2 and 3, data collection, data analysis and oversees the team as it works to ensure the process is done with fidelity along district guidelines Supports our students who have specific behavioral, social or emotional needs Work with students on academic needs Provides attendance support to our Data Clerk Assist with behavioral plans and support teachers through counseling with students and families as needed
Paul, Kerry	Science Coach	Work with and support social studies and science teachers assisting with the development of strategies,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach social studies and science to all students.
Kellner, Asia	Math Coach	Work with and support mathematics teachers assisting with the development of strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach mathematics to all students.
Hill, Audra	Reading Coach	Work with and support teachers with the development and successful demonstration and application of knowledge, strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach reading and writing to all students.

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.

School Leadership Team, SAC membership, School Reading Intervention Teacher, Grade Level Leaders, and Community Stakeholders are involved in Data Review and supporting Leadership Team at developing and implementing school goals for the 2023-2024 school year. Collaborative conversations and clarifying new school expectations that align to changes in assessments and school accountability are the key to success in developing the School Improvement Plan. The SAC members and roles will be decided on August 16th, which will be the first introduction for the school data and collaboration of new goals for the 2023-2024 school year. After the initial meeting, school-based leaders and SAC members will collaborate and create the final version of the School Improvement. The School Improvement Plan will be presented at the September 14th SAC meeting for final approval. All stakeholders are invited to be a part of the School Advisory Council. Members included the principal, voted teachers, voted staff, voted parents, as well as community partners.

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 data from iReady and FAST PM3 will guide the decisions made in the School Improvement Plan and help support educational goals for proficiency and learning gains for students in Grades K-6. After each FAST PM, school-wide data for Reading, Math, and Science will be analyzed to determine students at-risk, in need of additional support, and those scoring at or above proficiency. Students who fall into PCSD K-12 Reading Plan Tier 1 according to FAST Reading PM1, PM2 will be provided quality instruction in core classes of Reading, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Any students falling into Tier 2 and/or 3 will be provided ongoing Reading remediation as determined by the PCSD K-12 Reading Plan. While the Math core subject area has not indicated any Tier 2 or 3 indicators, OES will provide remediation for 15 - 30 minutes per day in Math for students scoring Level 1 on PM1 and PM2 on the FAST Math progress monitoring assessments. In addition, student data will be analyzed in PLC's led by the school administration and district Coaches for Reading and Math as well as school-based

administrators. Any adjustments to the Math and Reading Curricula that are deemed necessary (according to the District YAAG for Reading or Math) will be made during the PLC's. All changes made to the SIP will be based upon data analysis made in school-based PLC data analysis and Tier2/3 Monitoring meetings.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	13	34	23	30	26	26	31	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	2	5	2	2	0	6	16	0	0	33
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	5	8	14	1	3	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	1	1	8	8	6	12	27	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	13	18	10	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	21	24	0	0	59
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	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	1	6	8	5	10	14	11	0	0	55

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	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	18	14	31	25	24	22	29	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	1	10	5	3	5	4	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	2	9	6	6	3	16	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	1	9	5	3	6	15	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	13	19	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	16	15	20	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	11	23	17	9	6	14	0	0	104

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	1	3	12	11	14	8	12	0	0	61

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	1	11	1	0	3	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3

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	18	14	31	25	24	22	29	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	1	10	5	3	5	4	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	2	9	6	6	3	16	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	1	9	5	3	6	15	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	13	19	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	16	15	20	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	11	23	17	9	6	14	0	0	104

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	1	3	12	11	14	8	12	0	0	61

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	1	11	1	0	3	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3

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*	41	43	53	33	43	56	33		
ELA Learning Gains				49			22		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			36		
Math Achievement*	41	49	59	37	47	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				62			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			18		
Science Achievement*	55	45	54	41	45	59	24		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	38	56	59	62			38		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	214
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	14	Yes	4	3
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	3	1
HSP	44			
MUL	31	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	42			

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	31	Yes	3	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	41			
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	50			

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	41			41			55					38
SWD	15			19							3	
ELL	36			45							3	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			23			50				3	
HSP	45			36							3	50
MUL	22			39							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			48			63				4	
FRL	39			40			55				5	40

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	33	49	51	37	62	62	41					62
SWD	13	39	39	24	49	44	7					
ELL	22	53		27	50							62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	40	42	20	60	55						
HSP	26	54		24	46							57
MUL	12	55		24	50							
PAC												
WHT	46	50		52	69		46					
FRL	31	49	53	35	64	68	41					60

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	33	22	36	30	16	18	24					38
SWD	15	0		22	11		10					
ELL	24			29								38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	17		12	0		7					
HSP	21			33								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	24		40	17		31					
FRL	31	24	36	29	18	20	21					45

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	54%	45%	9%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	58%	-22%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	45%	-7%	47%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	36%	1%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	45%	5%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	29%	51%	-22%	61%	-32%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	46%	-17%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	42%	11%	51%	2%

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.

Fourth Grade English Language Arts was lowest performing in grades. There were two different teachers, but the first year teacher struggled with student achievement outcomes. The final scores for that teacher did show improvement from PM 1-PM 3. During the 2023-2024 school year, there is a similar situation, so continued focus on progress monitored and Tier 1 instruction is necessary. The teacher was provided multiple opportunities for instructional planning, classroom management, and data analysis. This was a struggle at the beginning of the year, but did improve as the year progressed.

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

The fourth grade data was the primary concern for decline in proficiency, which was noted previously.

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.

Fourth grade ELA data had the largest gap of 22 points for levels of proficiency. Again, the data was contributed to a struggle with quality Tier 1 instruction in ELA.

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

Fifth Grade ELA grew by 31 percentage points from PM1 through PM3. The 5th Grade Teacher was in close contact throughout the academic year with the District Reading Coach and continued to plan the lessons through PLC meetings and implement quality Tier 1 instruction. As the year progressed, student engagement increased, and the teacher continued to hold students accountable for high quality work in both reading and writing learning opportunities.

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

Historical indicators of low attendance are evident in all grade levels. Also, 3rd grade retention due to Level 1 ELA Test scores have created consistent retention patterns for select students in 3rd grade who have not been identified with a disability in grades K-2 and had a prior retention in one of those grades already.

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

1. Grade 3 ELA Proficiency
2. Grade 4 ELA Proficiency
3. Grade 5 ELA Proficiency
4. Grade 6 ELA Proficiency
5. STAR Data for K-2 Students

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 Other

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.

Teacher retention is key to student success over time. It is important for our school to improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction over time and retain those teachers once they have mastered the skills necessary to provide the evidence-based instructional strategies that lead to increased student proficiency. Our focus with our positive culture and environment is to better increase teacher attendance. We will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

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

Ochwilla will retain 85%, or higher, of the Instructional and Support Staff for the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Throughout the school year, monthly early release meetings will be utilized to support a positive school culture that allows teachers to feel like they are part of the OWL FAMILY and have a strong desire to stay at Ochwilla and continue supporting the students at OES. Staff are encouraged to continuously update the MyVoice Survey data to monitor staff culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

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.)

Provide mentoring and induction programs for new teachers. Teachers who have been employed for three years or less are assigned a New Teacher Mentor. That mentor meets with the new staff based upon their individual needs. Some meet once a month, others meet weekly or bi-weekly based on the needs for support. In addition, administration communicate regularly with the mentor and create support plans for the staff that need more support. The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is implementation of structured professional learning that results in change in teacher knowledge and practices.

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

With teacher turnover and overall retention being low, locally and nationally, we must invest in the staff we have. Teacher support is the key to establishing a positive culture on the campus, which starts with leadership. As we hire new teachers, we hear how much teachers appreciate the opportunity for additional support in and out of the classroom. We will provide PL in this area as well. Effective professional development is defined as structured professional learning that results in changes to teacher knowledge and practices, and improvements in student learning outcomes. Professional learning is conceptualized as a product of both externally provided and job-embedded activities that increase teachers' knowledge and help them change their instructional practice in ways that support student learning. Thus, formal PD represents a subset of the range of experiences that may result in professional learning.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Create a monthly schedule for District Novice Teacher Mentors to meet with identified staff at Ochwilla Elementary.

Person Responsible: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: August 15th, 2023.

Create a monthly schedule for the Novice Teacher Mentor to meet with Ochwilla administration and discuss support, concerns, and celebrations as teachers move toward mastery and professional certifications.

Person Responsible: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

Provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

Person Responsible: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: During the 2023-24 school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

According to data, the Black/African-American students had two consecutive years of scores below the federal index of 41%, with a most recent score of 39%. Students with Disabilities had three consecutive years of scores below the federal index of 41%, with a most recent score of 31%. Multiracial students had one year of scores below the federal index of 41%, with a most recent score of 35%.

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

If we focus on explicit instruction, active student engagement, students receiving scaffolded instruction during Tier 1 instruction as well as students who require Tier 2 receiving appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan then the proficiency rate on the FAST ELA PM3 will bring all of our students to 41% or above in May of 2024.

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

At this time, focus will be placed on early identification of these subgroups for Tier 1, 2, and 3 Instruction as noted in the District Reading Plan and be provided all the necessary support to increase the overall proficiency and change the achievement gap that began a few years ago. Teachers will disaggregate this data in PLC's and report to administration and district coaches on a quarterly basis following each progress monitoring session for FAST and iReady. In addition, all data will be discussed with our ESE Support Facilitation staff to ensure additional support is provided for both the IEP and direct needs for ELA learning growth over time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

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 deliver quality explicit instruction through Benchmark Advance curriculum supported by Collaborative Planning in PLC's. Also, students will receive Scaffolded Instruction during Tier 1 instruction. Students who require Tier 2 will receive appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan. High Leverage Practices 18 - Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement. This strategy provides students with frequent and varied opportunities to respond and encourages students to engage with peers as well. Through effective promotion of student engagement, teachers will acquire and implement a wide repertoire of research-supported active student response practices such as fluency-building activities, guided notes, class-wide peer tutoring, digital tools, and collaborative learning strategies.

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

These strategies directly align with the District K-12 Reading Plan and have evidence based outcomes which increase reading gains over time. Promoting active student engagement has an Effect Size of .82, when implemented with fidelity, we expect to see growth.

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

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

Data analysis for all students with a FAST PM3 score from May 2023 will determine groupings in classes for Tiers 1-3 intervention. Students are scheduled for daily Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading Interventions.

Person Responsible: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: July 27, 2023

School based PLCs will focus on disaggregating data, planning for instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to ensure the instruction is scaffolded to meet their needs and aligns to the K-12 Reading Plan. Tier 1 students receive instruction that is scaffolded to challenge and accelerate their learning with a focus on writing.

Person Responsible: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

Measuring fidelity of expectations of Tier 1 instruction that is on grade level and standards based using district approved resources.

Person Responsible: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: September 29, 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).

District staff from multiple departments support schools with additional funding to ensure schools supplement and do not supplant.

With allocated funds for school improvement, such as UniSIG, school leaders must seek approval through the Department of Strategic Initiatives and School Improvement before expending funds. This collaboration ensures that expenditures follow grant RFPs, are aligned with approved budgets, and meet school needs based on data.

The district has ongoing systems in place to provide resources to schools based on needs. Along with a general fund set-aside for school improvement, district staff from multiple departments provide additional support throughout the school year when student, teacher, and school needs are identified.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on full-year students tested in STAR reading, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile was 2nd grade with 61%. This achievement data, along with the transition to B.E.S.T. Standards for all K-6 and all new ELA adopted instructional materials in our district, confirms that we must focus on quality explicit instruction through Benchmark Advance curriculum supported by Collaborative Planning in PLC's, students receiving scaffolded instruction during Tier 1 instruction as well as students who require Tier 2 receiving appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan. Planning and instruction must be rigorous, targeted, and standards-based.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Based on full-year students tested on FAST ELA for their grade level, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile are 3rd grade 61% and 4th grade 61%. This achievement data, along with the transition to B.E.S.T. Standards for all K-6 and all new ELA adopted instructional materials in our district, confirms that we must focus on quality explicit instruction through Benchmark Advance curriculum supported by Collaborative Planning in PLC's, students receiving scaffolded instruction during Tier 1 instruction as well as students who require Tier 2 receiving appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan. Planning and instruction must be rigorous, targeted, and standards-based.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

If we focus on quality explicit instruction, students receiving scaffolded instruction during Tier 1 instruction as well as students who require Tier 2 receiving appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan then we will have 50% or more of the students in kindergarten through second grade on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we focus on quality explicit instruction, students receiving scaffolded instruction during Tier 1 instruction as well as students who require Tier 2 receiving appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan then we will have 50% or more of the students in third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will use the Benchmark Unit Assessments, interim assessments, iReady reading diagnostics in fall, winter, and spring for K-6, and FAST PM 1-2 to progress monitor data for grades K-6 and determine if explicit instruction, students receiving scaffolded instruction during Tier 1 instruction as well as students who require Tier 2 receiving appropriate interventions as outlined in the K-12 Reading Plan are being met. This ongoing monitoring will have a positive impact on student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Leary, Beth, c2leary@my.putnamschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our school uses iReady with an ESSA rating of moderate. iReady personalized instruction uses information from the iReady Diagnostic to generate an individualized program of online lessons in reading for grades K-8. iReady mitigates the challenges of what's next to meet each student's unique needs. The program helps teachers efficiently provide targeted instruction to help each student reach their academic potential and monitors how students are progressing in reading over time. Decision-making at the student, group, class, school, and district levels is explicitly driven by comprehensive, actionable reports; helping educators assess less and know more.
Benchmark Advance is used for our core curriculum and for intervention, we use LLI, SIPPS, and Steps

to Advance out of Benchmark. We follow our District Reading Plan and work with our District Literacy coaches to determine the best programs to meet the needs of our students. Therefore, the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs are included in our District's k-12 Reading Plan. iReady helps teachers efficiently provide targeted instruction to help each student reach their academic potential and monitors how students are progressing in reading over time. The evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need and show proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will disaggregate ELA/Reading data in PLC's and report to administration and district coaches on a quarterly basis following each progress monitoring session for FAST and iReady. The coaches will complete coaching cycles based on individual need.	Leary, Beth, c2leary@my.putnamschools.org
Collaborative Planning in PLC's	Leary, Beth, c2leary@my.putnamschools.org

The literacy leadership team will meet to track ELA progress. Walk Throughs will be conducted using a trend walk template and Marzano evaluation system.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School website https://oes.putnamschools.org/o/oes
Each year, the Ochwilla Elementary School Leadership Team holds a Title 1 Parent Night, and a School Advisory Council Meeting to disseminate the critical information for the SIP and Title 1 Budget. These meetings are posted online on the school website and the OES Facebook page. This information is also shared at the Meet the Teacher night via handouts and a table solely for sharing data and encouraging parents and stakeholders to provide feedback and sign up for the School Advisory Council meetings. During the Meet the Teacher event, announcements are made over the PA system encouraging stakeholders to sign up as well.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school has six different Parent Nights scheduled for both culture and academic growth activities which involve students and families. Each of these events are designed to bring students, families, and staff together to establish collaborative partnerships in order to increase student achievement. These events are detailed in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and are part of the PFEP for Title I. OES has continued to use social media to inform families and community stakeholders of upcoming events and provide links to activities and academic calendars so everyone is aware of the key events taking place. Also, the social media is designed to celebrate the positive culture that has been established at the school site. Finally, the school and district website are a link for parents to gain access to academic information for their child's progress in academics, attendance, behavior, assessments, and key events scheduled throughout the year. The school and district are launching a new tool, Parent-Teacher Chat, to increase partnerships between the classroom and home to increase parental involvement, which is crucial for academic achievement.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Improved Tier 1 instruction is a primary focus for the 2023-2024 school year. Learning Walks will take place for school-based teams led by administration and district leaders have planned to increase their support of these school-based informal assessments of instruction as well. The master calendar was reset with a key focus on Reading and Math Blocks being set at times when students are most active and less likely to be disengaged.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b} (2}, the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under Title I, Part A ensures that the school receives all the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving Federal funds. The District has a

methodology for support, not supplant when allocating State and local funds to each school.

Each school year, the District's Chief Financial Officer assures State and local funds are distributed at an equal level by preparing a report showing comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner. The report is audited by the State yearly to assure the District meets this mandate.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. Expenditures of all Federal title funds at the school level are monitored to ensure expenditures supplement the general curriculum and fulfill the intent of grant funding. All expenditures are reviewed by the Federal Programs Office to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and State guidelines.

Additionally, the school leadership team conducts a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) towards the end of each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and quarterly district-admin data conversations.

Schools implementing CSI, TSI, or ATSI activities may use available funds, including Federal title funds, to support implementation of identified activities in the schoolwide improvement plan.

Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance.

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: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$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.

No