Orange City Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/orangecity/pages/default.aspx

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.

All students learn at Orange City School, where CPR – Cooperation, Pride, and Respect – brings us to life and helps us to do our best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange City Elementary... where hard work opens doors to a brighter tomorrow.

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
Freeman, Virginia	Principal	
Cinkosky, Chelsea	Assistant Principal	
Morrison, Theresa	Other	
Akins, Tonya	Math Coach	
Stafford, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Diamond, Melissa	Reading Coach	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team and the SAC reviewed data and developed areas of focus based on the data from the 2022-2023 school year

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))

Orange City Elementary will be participating in the stocktake process several times during the school year to evaluate the progress made towards our SIP goals. That data will be shared with stakeholders and changes to the plan will be made if determined by the SLT. Timelines for implementation will be monitored and reviewed as well as action steps.

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-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 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	6	29	28	27	18	23	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	10	6	9	3	16	0	0	0	44
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	8	9	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	28	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	30	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	4	4	4	3	25	0	0	0	40

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	12	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	29	27	29	24	18	26	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	3	6	8	5	3	16	0	0	0	41
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	33	26	33	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	32	55	0	0	0	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	11	18	12	12	19	0	0	0	83

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	5	5	10	18	14	21	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	29	27	29	24	18	26	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	3	6	8	5	3	16	0	0	0	41
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	33	26	33	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	32	55	0	0	0	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	11	18	12	12	19	0	0	0	83

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	5	5	10	18	14	21	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	44	52	53	41	53	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				44			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			44		
Math Achievement*	43	55	59	34	42	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				38			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31			21		
Science Achievement*	50	62	54	37	55	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	60	59	45			59		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	254
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
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	21	Yes	4	4
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	4	1
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	48			

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	18	Yes	3	3
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	36	Yes	1	

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	44			43			50					64
SWD	23			23			22				4	
ELL	26			30			55				5	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			12			40				3	
HSP	44			43			59				5	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			46			47				4	
FRL	41			37			48				5	63

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	41	44	38	34	38	31	37					45
SWD	17	23	23	15	26	19	5					
ELL	29	48	30	16	24		14					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	25		24	31		50					
HSP	45	57	44	36	39	23	36					44
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	39	43	34	39	37	35					
FRL	37	41	35	33	35	28	35					43

| 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	46	44	44	39	25	21	40					59
SWD	22	15	20	16	17		8					50
ELL	38	58		29	9		38					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			33								
HSP	49	53		37	12		38					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	50		40	37		52					
FRL	46	43	47	35	22	8	38					53

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	41%	53%	-12%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	59%	-13%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	55%	-18%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	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.

According to PM3, our 4th grade showed the lowest performance at 44% proficient. The contributing factors are that we lost an ELA teacher in December and a long term sub was put in place, our ELA coach was teaching math whole group and small group due to the math coach leaving mid year, and discipline in 4th grade was high due to not having teachers with the skill sets needed to be successful.

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

The data component showed the greatest decline was our black students in ela. The proficiency rate declined from 32% to 16%. The factor that contributed to this decline was that the state and district focus was shifted to math for the majority of the year. Our ELA coach also was made to shift to become more math focused which led to less ELA coaching cycles.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state is 4th and 5th grade math. We were below the state average by 18% in 5th and 4th grade math was below the state by 15%. Overall, we were 11% below

the state in math.
Contributing factors: Our math coach left in December and our math intervention teacher was teaching 4th grade whole group math along with 3rd grade whole group math. This took her out of teaching true intervention to more groups. Another contributing factor is that our 4th grade math groups were being taught in small groups everyday, which means they were not getting as much small group/intervention time.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our 5th grade science with an increase of 18%. One new action was that our science resource teacher was pulling our bubble students and teaching one lesson a week during the science block in small group from January through May.

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

Our largest area of concern would be attendance. 131 students, 23%, were absent more than 10% of the year.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are:
Planning - Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction in reading and math
MTSS/Problem-Solving - Tier 2 Behavior/PBIS Support, Attendance
Coaching
A trend that has been identified is the need to provide ongoing monitoring of these systems to ensure there is evidence of implementation and impact.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Data Review, it revealed that our proficiency rates are 47% in ELA and 46% in math, showing we are below the district and state average.

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

Our goal will be to increase the percentage of our overall proficiency from 47% to 54% in ELA and 46% to 53% in math, including our ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, and AA by PM3. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA and Chapter Assessments in Math to monitor progress. By May 2024, 75% of classroom teachers will demonstrate evidence of 3/4 of the Instructional Look-Fors.

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

Lesson plans monitored and updated through Teams folders
Coaches complete student/teacher actions during facilitated planning and leadership reviews weekly
Look for Walk Through Data
Review updated walk to intervention schedules and data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by school-based experts (coaches) and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff.

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

Research has shown that teacher effectiveness is the most important school-based factor that influences student outcomes, including student achievement.

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

Tier 2 - Moderate 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.

Academic coaches will collaborate with teachers during PLC and collaborative planning to use student achievement data from ongoing progress monitoring to create actionable MTSS (WIN: What I Need) plans tied to S.M.A.R.T (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely goals) set within PLC to keep students and teachers on track to increased proficiency.

Person Responsible: Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: April, 2024

Administration will work to oversee the continuation of Teacher Clarity/Opportunity Myth and supports throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: January, 2024

Academic coaches and administration will work with teachers to create small groups for ELA and Math based on both classroom and district assessment data.

Person Responsible: Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October, 2023

Administration will work to oversee the continuation of small groups and response to intervention and instructional supports.

Person Responsible: Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: April, 2024

Academic coaches and intervention teachers will work with teachers to find effective standards-aligned resources for both intervention and enrichment groups.

Person Responsible: Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: December, 2023

Academic Coaches will observe classroom instruction and provide teachers with feedback and support on a regular basis

Person Responsible: Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing...by May 2024

#2. 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.

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Ensure all students and staff are provided with a safe, healthy and supportive environment focused on learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Data Review, it revealed that 44 students had an EWS marker for suspensions and overall the discipline data shows an increase from 196 to 224 during the 2022-2023 school year and 80 of the 224 referrals were for hitting/striking.

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

Orange City Elementary will implement an individual student incentive into the schoolwide PBIS plan. Teachers and all staff will monitor student implementation of the PBIS expectations and will reward individual students when they are caught following expectations. Paired with Tier 2 supports for students who do not respond or continue to receive referrals, our goal is to decrease discipline referrals by 10% and to lower teacher turnover by 9% to less than 10 percent.

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

Monthly PBIS and discipline data review
TOA and admin will facilitate training for staff
Collect data on the number of students that earn the individual rewards/Tier 2 students who participate

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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 professional development for teachers/staff and students on the 200 club and the importance of teaching positive behaviors. Trainings can also include RULER or Mood Meter to meet the needs of students not responding to the intervention.
Provide follow up support/training for teachers with students not meeting the expectation to build teacher capacity.

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

Data shows that many students struggle to make the right decisions and that instruction is needed for both teachers and students on how to support class and individual incentives as well as tier 2 interventions for those struggling. 19/77 staff members resigned/retired/transferred during the 2022-2023 school year and we are working to lower that percentage.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Continue to monitor PBIS practices by continuing structures of the PBIS program developed during year 1 and year 2.

Person Responsible: Chelsea Cinkosky (clcinkos@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: April, 2024

Provide professional development for students and teachers on RULER and mood meter to increase understanding of emotional regulation .

Person Responsible: Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: November, 2023

Introduce and monitor Rocket 200 club to provide incentives and reinforcers for positive behavior for individual students in TIer 1 as well as provide additional support for TIer 2 students

Person Responsible: Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

Monitor student attendance and begin a tracking system. Teacher calls on day 2, School Counselor makes parent contact at day 5 and MTSS attendance chair makes contact on Day 10. Assist families with strategies and tools and establish attendance contracts.
https://www.attendanceworks.org/resources/toolkits/bringing-attendance-home/

Person Responsible: Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

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).

Orange City Elementary School utilized the gap analysis to find areas of support for our Unisig funding. While EL, Math and Science scored below the district average we are continuing to make gains in proficiency. Our PBIS data shows several students who are underperforming academically are also struggling with behavior and PBIS expectations.
The ELA small group and intervention structure utilizes funds from Unisig to provide both materials and collaborative planning sessions for teachers across the school. We also utilized Unisig money for data analysis to assist students in ESSA subgroups that are underperforming and provide opportunities for students to improve. We hired a Teacher on Assignment to support both academic and behavioral needs of our students. Materials and resources for both ELA, Math and Science will also be purchased to support learning gains in all students.

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

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our analysis of our district's data dashboard, we noticed that our Renaissance assessment data performed below district average, varied from 5% below district in Early Literacy with 40% of kindergarten and 49% of first grade students scoring below proficient. Our data also shows 15% below district in Star Reading with 49% of students scoring below proficient.
iReady data also indicated that there is a need for more intensive foundational skills instruction in K-2. Students
were provided with SIPPS and monitored through the Mastery tests. Additionally, data from our school level walkthroughs indicate a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to grade-level foundational skills.

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

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our overall ELA Proficiency was 47% on FAST PM 3 with 47% of third graders, 55% of fourth graders and 59% of fifth grades scoring below proficient. 28 of our 5th grade students have been identified as having a phonics deficit.
Additionally, walkthrough data indicates from 2022-2023 indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the benchmark.

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

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to Renaissance data. Decrease the number of students listed as
having a substantial reading deficiency based on our EWS data.
By January, 57% of students will show proficiency on Renaissance ELA PM 2 assessment
By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.
By May, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 50%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment and FAST PM data. Decrease the number of students listed as
having a substantial reading deficiency based on our EWS data.
By January, 48% of students will show proficiency on FAST PM 2 assessment.
By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.
By May, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 50%.

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 monitor our area of focus through completed planning protocols, data analysis at PLCs, and walkthrough data and feedback for continued growth.

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

Freeman, Virginia, vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us

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?

Evidence-based practices/programs being implemented are ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum aligned
to the BEST Standards, SIPPS in K-3 to address foundational skills, Heggerty phonemic awareness,
Being a Reader in grades K-2, daily small group differentiated instruction utilizing ELA Benchmark

Advanced Curriculum to also include the intervention and enrichment toolkit. Additionally, collaborative planning with grade level teams utilizing a planning protocol and Test ItemSpecifications.

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?

We will use the district approved ELA resources and curriculum for core instruction as well as interventions.
These address the identified need and have a record to effectiveness for our population per the district.

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
ELA Collaborative Planning with grade level teams to include support teachers, administration, academic coach, and regional resource teachers. Academic Coach and regional resource teacher in order to ensure that instruction and students tasks are aligned to the benchmark. Literacy Leadership, Literacy Coaching team, including District Transformation Resource Teachers, will facilitate Professional learning on whole group and small group instruction and planning for differentiation. Formative and summative assessment data will be considered during planning.	Freeman, Virginia, vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us

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.

The SIP and Unisig budget will be shared with parents at Open House and another TItle I meeting in the spring. SAC and PTA will also receive the information during the first meetings of the year. We will also send home parent information during the school year in our newsletter

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 parent engagement plan will be shared annually on the school website. vcs.org
We collect input from SAC every year and build monthly events that we share through newsletters, phone calls, flyers and the school marquee to encourage family participation. Our family liaison also works with families to share information

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)

We provide 2 intervention teachers with Title I funding and also fund reading, math and science nights. Materials and supplies to enhance and support learning are also provided through Title I funds. Our parent liaison is a great resource to families as well.

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))

NA

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))

na

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$176,674.83
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6300	130	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$12,900.00
			Notes: Stipends Planning for Math & ELA Coach & TOA. This time is needed to focus on data analysis, instructional planning, and systems planning. The focus is ELA, Math, and Science and all areas reflected on the School Improvement Plan (430 hrs x $30/hr = $15,637.38)			
	6300	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,750.53
			Notes: Retirement 13.57%			
	6300	220	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$986.85
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
	6300	120	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$72,000.00
			Notes: Stipends Collaborative Planning Weekly - Math, ELA, Science- Teams will analyze data from formative, district, and state assessments. The teams will create intervention and enrichment action plans for individual students, classes, and grade levels. The team will monitor and adjust instructional groups based on OPM data for intervention and enrichment. The team will pace instruction using the curriculum map, assessment calendar, and for mative assessment data to choose appropriate standards/benchmarks needed for core instruction and intervention groups. The team will monitor progress towards achievement of the SIP focus areas. The team will participate in weekly collaborative planning with the instructional coaches, support facilitation, general education teachers, and intervention teachers to develop clarity of the standard, target task aligned activities, and develop rigorous questions to ensure the mastery of standards			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			being taught. (48 teachers x 2 hrs/week x 25 weeks x $30/hr) The total cost for this activity is $87,278.40			
	6300	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$9,770.40
			Notes: Retirement 13.57%			
	6300	220	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$5,508.00
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
	6300	110	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$4,200.00
			Notes: Stipends AP Summer Planning - The 120 hours are needed to focus on data analysis, instructional planning, and systems planning. The focus for the AP is ELA, Math, and Science and all areas reflected on the School Improvement Plan. The total cost for this activity is $5,091.24			
	6300	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$569.94
			Notes: Retirement 13.57%			
	6300	220	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$321.30
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
	5000	750	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$21,600.00
			Notes: Stipends for Substitutes - Under the direction and support of the ELA and Math/Science coaches and classroom teachers, permanent highly skilled substitutes will be trained to facilitate small group instruction in the classroom. The instruction is in addition to what the classroom teacher and intervention teachers provide for students. Substitute will also provide tutoring throughout the day. (180 days x $120/daily = $23,252.40)			
	5000	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,652.40
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
	6300	510	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$45,415.41
			Notes: Materials & supplies - Paper, copies, pencils, markers, highlighters, training binders and books., for all professional development and after-school work within the school for turnaround work.			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**				**$84,581.32**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6120	130	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$46,257.00
			Notes: Salaries TOA- The TOA will work with individual and small groups of students to support the district's vision for resilience education. The TOA will aim to seamlessly integrate student civic, character and life skills education into the academic experience for all learners and educators. By providing a foundation for safe and positive learning through resiliency education, our school will enhance students' ability to succeed in school, careers, and life. The TOA will also serve as a teacher leader on our Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) team. By utilizing research based lessons, the TOA will lead the iniative to decrease the numbers of referrals and improve our attendance rate by decreasing the number of students with 10% or more days absent. The district will be providing ongoing MTSS/PBIS training ongoing throughout the year. The TOA will be required to attend the district trainings in order to accurately facilitate and support the implementation of PBIS. In addition, she will work to support coaching teachers to create individual behavior plans for students to decrease not only the referral			

			count, but also the levels of offenses by providing calm down strategies for students. The TOA will also be working closely with the district social worker and District Student Services department to implement strategies to decrease the number of students with 10% or more days absent. The total is $63,549.64			
	6120	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$6,277.07
			Notes: Retirement 13.57%			
	6120	220	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$3,538.66
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
	6120	230	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$6,780.00
			Notes: Medical Flat Rate			
	6120	230	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$3.05
			Notes: Life .0066%			
	6120	240	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$693.86
			Notes: Workmen's Comp 1.5%			
	6300	120	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$16,450.00
			Notes: Stipends Instructional leaders wills support grade level/department teacher teams with the effective management and implementation of the curriculum and standards. These leaders are expected to set an example for others through their demonstration of integrity and professionalism. All instructional leaders will participate in ongoing professional learning. They will also support with the delivery of professional learning for all teachers. They will participate in Learning Walks and Data Chats with administration, and following each, they will be expected to share out at a faculty meeting or professional learning (10 x $1,645 = $19,940.70)			
	6300	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$2,232.27
			Notes: Retirement 13.57%			
	6300	220	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,258.43
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
	6150	120	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$900.00
			Notes: Stipends Family engagement nights to get parents more involved in the school and the child's education in hopes to increase parent involvement (6 teachers x 2 hrs. x 3 events x $25/hr. = $1,090.98)			
	6150	210	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$122.13
			Notes: Retirement 13.57%			
	6150	220	4131 - Orange City Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$68.85
			Notes: Social Security 7.65%			
					Total:	**$261,256.15**

Budget Approval

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

No