

Orange County Public Schools

Magnolia 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Magnolia School

1900 MATTERHORNE DR, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://magnolia.ocps.net/>

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
Shuler, Timothy	Principal	The principal is responsible for the overall operation of the school. Some of these operations include: being an instructional leader, hiring effective faculty and staff, providing teachers with actionable feedback to improve instructional pedagogy, creating a safe and positive school culture, supervising and evaluating faculty and staff, maintaining secure funding for the school, and conducting meetings to create academic action plans to address student needs and improve student achievement school-wide.
Lee, Wendy	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in coordinating, providing leadership, and making available needed desired expertise. Observes instructional delivery, provides teachers with actionable feedback, participates in common planning, and assists with professional development.
Thomson, Arlene	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in coordinating, providing leadership, and making available needed desired expertise. Observes instructional delivery, provides teachers with actionable feedback, participates in common planning, and assists with professional development.
Gomez, Candace	Other	Monitors and supports students who demonstrate social and emotional needs. Participates in the development of behavior plans for specific students and collect data on behavioral trends, while also monitoring and supporting the school-wide behavior management plan. Additionally, she will communicate with parents and provide resources for families in need of support.
Gordon, Debra	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides individual and group professional development that expand and refine the understanding of effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, the CRT provides personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. The CRT provides support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need.
Garcia, Arlene	Instructional Coach	Provides individual and group professional development that expand and refine the understanding of effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, the instructional coach provides personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. The instructional coach provides support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need.
Hicks, Alida	Instructional Coach	Provides individual and group professional development that expand and refine the understanding of effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, the instructional coach provides personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. The instructional coach provides support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. The instructional coach provides support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need.
Allen, Whitney	Attendance/Social Work	Monitors and supports students who demonstrate social and emotional needs. Communicates with parents and provides resources for families in need of support.
Wooten, Lorna	Staffing Specialist	Works with the faculty to ensure the school is in compliance with the ESE policies and procedures in relation to students with exceptionalities and disabilities. Works collaboratively with ESE teachers to ensure all students are academically successful. This is accomplished through ongoing professional learning communities, professional development, and meetings providing the most up to date federal, state and OCPS mandates.

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.

Various stakeholders (the school leadership team, the Faculty Advisory Committee - FAC made up of teachers and school staff; parents and families through our PTA; and businesses through our Partners in Education - PIE) are integrally involved in developing the goals and strategies for the annual SIP. Input from the monthly meetings of the FAC and the PTA along with suggestions from our PIEs are used to shape the development 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 administrators will be regularly monitoring for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards through the feedback provided to them by the CRT and the instructional coaches. These school leadership team members are completing daily classroom walkthroughs and weekly PLC collaboration with teachers. This information will be shared with administrators who also complete weekly classroom walkthroughs. Frequent data chats with teachers, the progress monitoring data from the classroom walkthroughs, and data analysis of systemic assessments will allow the school leaders to determine whether the instructional strategies need to be revised to ensure continuous improvement occurs. The discussions and findings will be shared with the other stakeholders to get their recommendations or buy-in as needed. This monitoring system will be capable of informing the decision makers how well students are achieving to meet the academic standards of the State and to close the achievement gap.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING
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	0	1	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	9
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	

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	3	2	2	7

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	0	2	1	8	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1
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	0	2	1	3	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	6	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	
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	0	0	0	3	2	2	7

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*	20	56	53	22	57	55	18		
ELA Learning Gains				41			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	37	59	55	14	41	42	20		
Math Learning Gains				23					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	33	56	52	26	57	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	55	68	68		63	59			
Middle School Acceleration		74	70		52	51			
Graduation Rate	67	82	74	57	52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53	0	71	70			
ELP Progress		55	55		73	70			

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	212
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	183
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	57

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	20	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	36	Yes	4	

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	4	Yes	2	2
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	27	Yes	3	3

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	20			37			33	55		67		
SWD	20			37			33	55			5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				55							1	
HSP	20										1	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	8			44				57			3	

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	22	41		14	23		26			57	0	
SWD	22	41		14	23		26			60	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	8			0								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	22	36		12			31			58	0	

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	18	38		20								
SWD	18	38		20								
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	0											
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	18											

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.

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.

Based on progress monitoring and the 2023 FSAA, ELA showed the lowest performance. The 2023 FSAA assessment showed that of the 30 students who completed the ELA assessment, 3% (1) scored at Level 4, 27% (8/30) scored at Level 3, 33% (10/30) scored at Level 2, and 37% (11/30) scored at Level 1. Comparing the ELA progress monitoring scores to the actual ELA FSAA scores resulted in scores and achievement levels that were much lower than expected. The contributing factors were the rigor of the ELA state assessment, students' stamina to focus, and retention of the information presented in long and rigorous passages. However, with the implementation of ULS as the core curriculum in 2022-2023, the trend that was observed was the percentage increase of students scoring at Levels 3 & 4 and a percentage decrease of students scoring at Levels 1 & 2 when comparing the ELA FSAA score of 2022-23 to the ELA FSAA score of 2021-22. It would appear that using ULS with fidelity as a core curriculum demonstrates a positive trend for ELA FSAA student achievement.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA. While student achievement for ELA grew from the prior year (22% in 2022 to 30% in 2023) which is an 8% growth; student achievement in Math grew from 14% in 2022 to 37% in 2023 which is a 23% growth. The growth

in ELA is stymied by students' stamina to focus, and retention of the information in long and rigorous passages.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is that of ELA. The factors that contributed to this gap are the rigor of the ELA state assessment, students' stamina to focus, and retention of the information presented in long and rigorous passages. One positive trend is the effect the implementation of ULS as a core curriculum is having on the uptick of ELA FSAA scores.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the 2023 FSAA, Math showed the most improvement. Overall, the trends showed higher growth in Math compared to overall growth in ELA (a 23% growth for Math vs. an 8% growth for ELA). The new actions our school took in this area included the implementation of PBL (Project Based Learning) across all courses, a pilot compartmentalization of core classes for Math & Science, and ELA and Social Studies in High School. Mini Professional Development during PLC on instructional strategies was also initiated. Weekly collaborative data chats during PLC and weekly collaborative lesson planning where teachers work together to create common assessments and lesson plans also helped. The Coaching Cycle implemented among teachers resulted in an increase in instructional techniques which improve student engagement and participation in all courses and especially in Math.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern are academic growth in ELA and Math and student absences.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are:

1. Academic priorities in ELA and Math
2. Improving Graduation Rate

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.

Effective instructional practice that focuses on B.E.S.T Standards leads to improvement in student achievement. While student data demonstrate that students are making learning gains, there is still room for improvement in Reading and Math as it relates to grade-level expectations. Continued focus and monitoring of the strategies implemented in 2022-2023 will lead to embedded instructional practice in 2023-2024 that should result in goal attainment for the 2023-24 school year. In addition, focusing on B.E.S.T Standards regarding our subgroups will ensure teachers maintain rigor for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, it is expected that there will be a 25% increase over the 2022-23 results in Reading and Math for students taking the FSAA.

Monitoring:

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

During weekly PLCs, collaborative lesson planning will be done with the curriculum resource teacher (CRT) and the instructional coach. The execution of the lessons will be monitored by the assistant principal for instruction, and the CRT and the instructional coach will participate in daily classroom walkthroughs using the classroom walkthrough protocol. Teachers will receive frequent actionable feedback on their planning and lesson delivery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@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.)

Collaborative lesson planning is the evidence-based strategy that is being implemented for their Area of Focus. Different teams of teachers that are grouped together upon the grade and content collaborate weekly, planning lessons utilizing instructional strategies; debriefing these strategies, and analyzing data for improving delivery, re-teaching, or differentiating instruction to further implement interventions in order to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative lesson planning allows teams of teachers and instructional coaches to share and utilize instructional strategies that benefit larger groups of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will collaborate with their teams and with instructional coaches to share effective strategies for instructional delivery.

Person Responsible: Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)

By When: Once per week, the assistant principal will meet with the teams and the instructional coaches, and CRT to monitor teachers' collaborative discussions to ensure they are appropriate for evidence-based PLC practices.

During PLCs, teachers will focus on common strategies for implementation that are aligned with B.E.S.T Standards. Resource teachers will conduct peer observations and provide actionable feedback and coaching during sessions to frequently monitor instruction in the classrooms for appropriate demonstrations of evidence-based PLC practices.

Person Responsible: Debra Gordon (debra.gordon@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of each week.

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**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.

Magnolia School is the only school in OCPS that serves as the significant center site for students with disabilities from Grades 6 through 12. One hundred percent of our students have one or more disabilities. students are placed here from within the school district, from out of the county, from out of state, and from other countries. Our guidance staff works with the student's former school and with the parents/guardians to ensure that they meet the requirements for graduation. Students earn a Standard Diploma via Access Points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to graduate 100% of eligible students who meet the requirements for high school graduation. These requirements include the 24 credits needed; FSAA via Access points; End of Course (EOC) assessments; and Common Final Examinations (CFEs) which are teacher rubrics based on the courses students completed per grade level.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by having the CRT and Guidance staff check to make sure that students are working towards acquiring the 24 credits; ensuring that each eligible student is being assessed for the FSAA during the assessment window; and that teachers are having their students complete the EOC assessments, and that they themselves complete the CFE rubrics in a timely fashion.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debra Gordon (debra.gordon@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.)

The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this area of focus are direct instruction, small group instruction, meeting with the school counselors, and behavior intervention plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting specific strategies is that one is able to monitor the progress of the students and proactively intervene when the students show early signs of attendance, behavior, and or academic problems. One can therefore provide intensive individualized support to students who have significant challenges to success, and engage students by offering curricula and programs that connect schoolwork with career success. Using this evidence-based strategy will also allow for tools to improve the students' capacity to manage challenges in and out of school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The CRT will monitor the progress of the students and intervene at the early signs of academic problems. She will intervene by offering the teachers intensive individualized support curricula to work with the students affected. For students who display early signs of behavior issues, she will have the behavior analysts intervene with behavioral techniques, and for those students who have attendance issues, the CRT will work with the attendance clerk and the school social worker to address these issues appropriately.

Person Responsible: Debra Gordon (debra.gordon@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of each month, the CRT will share her findings with the administrators as she monitors this area of focus.

#3. 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.

The area of focus for Positive Culture and Environment that we will target this school year is student attendance. When students are present they are presented with opportunities to learn. When they are absent, they cannot learn because they will be missing from these opportunities. Teachers also are negatively affected when students are absent from school because teachers are held accountable for ensuring student achievement is growing. However, when students demonstrate chronic absences, this affects their achievement and ultimately affects the teachers' performance and effectiveness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 95% rate of student attendance over the 2023-24 year.

Monitoring:

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

Daily attendance data will be collected from teachers' input into Skyward. Weekly data analysis will be performed by the Registrar and administration. Students with five or more absences within a 30-day period will receive communication from the school social worker or from the Registrar/Attendance clerk. The administration will analyze the data to determine what resources to offer parents to help them improve their child's attendance. The school social worker will be instrumental in linking families to resources (such as financial assistance for housing, food, and electricity; mental/emotional assistance/resources; and medical/physical services) in the community. Connecting with families to build positive relationships and communicating the vision to work collaboratively by sharing fundamental community resources informs them that the school is here to assist as much as possible in providing an education to their children. However, this can only be done when students are present at school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Whitney Allen (whitney.allen@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is the use of the Attendance Child Study Team (ACST) meeting approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that the ACST meeting brings all individuals together in one place/setting to share information, examine the barriers to attendance, and discuss intervention strategies to resolve the issue without assigning blame and judgment to the student and or the parents.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The registrar/attendance will frequently monitor students' absences through Skyward and make contact with parents after the teachers made the initial contact. Five or more absences within the 30-day period trigger a call or communication from the registrar/attendance clerk. This monitoring of attendance will be vigilant, intentional, frequent, and purposeful.

Person Responsible: Arlene Thomson (arlene.thomson@ocps.net)

By When: The registrar/attendance clerk will provide the attendance report to the social worker bi-weekly.

The social worker will communicate with parents via email, telephone calls, and letters to inform them of students' attendance. The social worker will hold monthly ACST meetings to assist parents in reducing/eliminating the students' attendance issues.

Person Responsible: Whitney Allen (whitney.allen@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of each month.

If parents fail to attend the ACST meeting for the child and if there is no improvement in the student's attendance, then this triggers legal action that can be taken against the parents.

Person Responsible: Arlene Thomson (arlene.thomson@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of each semester.

If parents fail to attend the ACST meeting for the child and if there is no improvement in the student's attendance, then this triggers legal action that can be taken against the parents.

Person Responsible: Arlene Thomson (arlene.thomson@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of each semester.

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).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations will be done with the school leadership team as well as with our stakeholders. With input from the school staff through the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), the school leadership team will determine the most financially fiduciary ways to fund the various needs from the UniSig grant and then share that information with the other stakeholders - PTA/SAC members and PIE members.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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**

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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)

N/A

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))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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				\$59,766.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	500	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$10,000.00
			Notes: Consumable corrective reading materials to be used in one-on-one and small group instruction to improve literacy skills for the lowest 25% student subgroup. Not to exceed \$10,000.00			
	5100	519	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$7,000.00
			Notes: 10% Allowable technology - iPads and protective cases for classroom instruction to support corrective reading initiatives to improve literacy skills for the lowest 25% student subgroup. Not to exceed \$7,000			
	5100	500	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$10,000.00
			Notes: Leveled reading materials to be sent home to support students' in practicing and retaining skills acquired to improve literacy in the lowest 25% student subgroup. No to exceed \$10,00.00			
	5100	510	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$3,500.00
			Notes: 5% Allowable classroom supplies- paper, spiral notebooks, pens, pencils, markers, folders for needed supplemental student materials to improve and retain literacy skills in lowest 25% student subgroup. Not to exceed \$3,500.00			
	5100	390	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$5,000.00
			Notes: Educational field trip for students with disabilities to Orlando Science Center; standards-based exploration to build literacy skills. Total to include admission and transportation- 139 students X 22.00 per ticket=\$3,058.00, Transportation = 2 Orange County Public School buses @ \$971.00 per bus= \$1,942.00- not to exceed \$5,000.			
	5100	390	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$12,566.00

			<i>Notes: Educational field trip for students with disabilities to Disney's Epcot Center reading/language arts, reading process, and literacy through cultural exploration. total to include admission and transportation-95 students X 109.00 per ticket=\$10,355.00, Transportation = 2 Orange County Public School buses @\$971.00 per bus= \$1,942.00 not exceed \$12,566.00.</i>			
	5100	390	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$5,200.00
			<i>Notes: Educational field trip for students with disabilities.to SeaWorld Orlando, reading/language arts: reading process, literacy analysis, writing process, writing application and communication. Total to include admission and transportation - 139 students X 23.00 per ticket=\$3,197.00, Transportation = 2 Orange County Public School buses @\$971.00 per bus= \$1,942.00- not exceed \$5,200.</i>			
	5100	390	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$6,500.00
			<i>Notes: Attend educational field trip for students with disabilities. to Wonderworks Orlando , ELA standards-based activities. Total to include admission and transportation- 139 students X 30.00 per ticket=\$4,170.00, Transportation = 2 Orange County Public School buses @\$971.00 per bus= \$1,942.00 - not to exceed \$6,500.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Graduation: Graduation				\$4,300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Graduation Improvement	Improve Graduation rate	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$600.00
			<i>Notes: Why Try Program: online resources to help the instructional staff in a separate day school to teach students with profound cognitive disabilities coping strategies, positive affirmations, and to build resilience and endurance while promoting positive behaviors and enhancing student academic performance. The cost of \$600 includes one subscription and training.</i>			
	Professional Development	Improve Graduation rate	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$3,700.00
			<i>Notes: Attend Innovative School Summit Orlando to discover new strategies to support at-risk students with profound cognitive disabilities. A team of 4 teachers will attend ISS conference in Orlando at \$845 each registration fee. Substitute teacher cost for 2 days equals \$240.</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$5,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Restorative Practices Training	Building positive relationships	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$2,300.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teacher costs for instructional staff participating in Restorative Practices Training totaling \$2,300.</i>			
	Professional Development	Building positive relationships with students, parents, and teachers.	1561 - Magnolia School	UniSIG		\$3,200.00
			<i>Notes: For 3 instructional staff to attend the Visions Florida Conference including registration, accommodations, and travel totaling \$3,200.</i>			
					Total:	\$69,566.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes