Orange County Public Schools

Timber Springs Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Timber Springs Middle

16001 TIMBER PARK LN, Orlando, FL 32828

https://timberspringsms.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
Soubasis, Steven	Principal	The principal is responsible for oversight of all curriculum and instruction which includes school operations. Budgeting and accounting is an area of responsibility where needs and constraints are assessed in order to adequately fund instructional initiatives aimed at reducing achievement gaps and increasing learning gains. This includes SELL, scheduling, promoting instructional leadership, school and community relations, program planning, assessments, evaluations, school activities, and functions. In addition, the principal is responsible for enforcement of district-wide policies, guidelines and procedures. The principal oversees school-wide progress monitoring and student data in an effort to close achievement gaps for student sub-populations; and facilitates and supports professional learning community groups within the school (PLCs). The principal monitors instructional staff to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. School and community stakeholders are communicated with regularly regarding the academic initiatives and progress of our students.
Parsons, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Instruction is responsible for curriculum and instruction, for devising and implementing the master schedule, State Reporting, and Facilitating PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings. Evaluating instructional staff is another area of responsibility to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. Communication with school and community stakeholders regularly is key to engaging and involving parents and community members regarding academic initiatives and progress of our students.
Weinstein Rojas, Lauren	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is charged with oversight of school operations including inventory, facilities, emergency and safety plans, threat assessments, and student supervision. She also facilitates PLCs and MTSS/ Data meetings. The assistant principal evaluates instructional staff to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. The assistant principal communicates with school and community stakeholders regularly regarding the academic initiatives and progress of our students.
Starling, Andreas	Dean	The dean is responsible for overseeing schoolwide positive behavior plan and discipline. Facilitating PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings is another area where the dean is involved. He will be working in PLCs, PDs, staff meetings, and data meetings to share discipline data and to support teachers academically as well as with student behavioral concerns that may impact learning. He supports the MTSS Tier 1 & 2 behavioral concerns which includes working with community members.
Gefter, Audra	School Counselor	The school counselor will support all students' academic, emotional, and life needs. The school counselor teaches character education, and college and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		career readiness and supports behavior interventions. Guidance oversees data accountability and course recovery.
Burden, Tara	Other	The SAFE coordinator supports and monitors district mental health initiatives. The SAFE coordinator supports the guidance and discipline teams to build a community where students are comfortable sharing concerns and seeking help.
Craft, Linda	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist participates in MTSS meetings to ensure proper focus and interventions are being implemented with additional support services as well as for ESE students. She plays a primary role in individual Tier 3 student meetings to determine the appropriateness of initiating ESE an evaluation. The staffing specialist will take care of our students with an IEP (ESE) or EP (Gifted), or 504 Plan. She supports the MTSS process and ensures students receive facilitated support to better meet their educational needs. Mrs. Craft works closely with all teachers, and leadership to identify and provide support services to students who may have specific needs because of the MTSS process, or that is relative to their specific staffing classification and/or placement.
Cornier, Lismaris	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Cornier Oversees ESOL Compliance and is the 504 coordinator. She ensures that teachers and staff receive the professional development they need to accommodate learners in these groups. She provides planning support as needed and organizes the multilingual parent leadership council.
Farmer, Allyson	Instructional Coach	Ms. Farmer supports professional development and professional learning communities. She is the instructional coach for the school and with ELA PLCs. She oversees new teacher induction at the school level, mentors, interns, and tutoring. She is the Curriculum and Assessment coordinator. Ms. Farmer participates in the MTSS process. She is in charge of ELA and Science data tracking.
Keith, Julia	Math Coach	As math coach, Ms. Keith works with Math PLCs for data analysis and lesson planning. She is responsible for math data tracking. Additionally, Ms. Keith oversees professional development, student mentoring, staff committees, and student recognition. She communicates regularly with stakeholders through Connect Orange and social media platforms.
Hutchinson, Shanese	Other	Teen safety matters

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.

Based on scores and early warning data, our school is focusing on attendance, ELA proficiency, and the proficiency of students with disabilities. The plan will be presented to staff and Stakeholders in August for their input, and revisions will be made as needed based on community input.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP goals and our progress will be routinely monitored during PLC meetings. PLC data analysis will include a disaggregation of data to examine the progress of our targeted subgroups. Interim goals will be tracked and the plan will be adjusted to include appropriate supports based on the outcomes of interim goals. We will use classroom walkthroughs to monitor and provide feedback for flexible grouping and rotations. Progress monitoring data for our areas of focus will be shared with the SAC at the middle and end of the year.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	65	64	178
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	33	34	76
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	73	89	227
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	26	40	134
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	54	68	122

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	56	48	60	164

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	1	0	1
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	51	54	64	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	31	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	7	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	51	73	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	35	50	155
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	51	73	181

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	56	38	55	149

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	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	64	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	31	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	7	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	51	73	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	35	50	155
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	51	73	181

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	56	38	55	149

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
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	1	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*	56	48	49	58	49	50	60		
ELA Learning Gains				54			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			38		
Math Achievement*	76	57	56	71	36	36	62		
Math Learning Gains				73			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			37		
Science Achievement*	59	53	49	63	55	53	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	64	68	77	61	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	83	77	73	88	52	49	80		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	67	43	40	31	79	76	63		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	626
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	2	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	67			
HSP	64			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	72			

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%
FRL	63			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	61			
HSP	58			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	59			

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	56			76			59	72	83			67
SWD	15			38			8	29			4	
ELL	38			65			23	67	71		6	67
AMI												
ASN	79			96			81	89	97		5	
BLK	54			70			61	61	90		5	
HSP	48			71			50	69	77		6	69
MUL	72			78				85			3	

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
PAC												
WHT	61			79			63	73	82		5	
FRL	47			65			46	63	77		6	82

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	58	54	44	71	73	67	63	77	88			31
SWD	19	47	41	33	65	59	13	35				
ELL	41	50	50	58	66	55	29	61	75			31
AMI												
ASN	78	67		96	88		82	100	100			
BLK	48	51	42	64	72	67	48	77	79			
HSP	52	50	43	62	69	62	59	65	82			33
MUL	64	59		84	82							
PAC												
WHT	63	57	46	78	76	73	69	85	92			
FRL	47	49	43	59	69	64	46	62	88			

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	60	52	38	62	44	37	60	78	80			63
SWD	8	30	28	14	37	35	17	48	33			
ELL	26	43	39	31	40	46	16	46	73			63
AMI												
ASN	83	65		90	60		92	93	98			
BLK	58	53	35	53	38	23	56	69	62			
HSP	52	50	39	52	43	43	53	77	77			60
MUL	71	33		72	30		74	80	90			
PAC												
WHT	64	53	42	69	46	28	61	79	80			
FRL	48	47	37	49	38	36	49	68	72			50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	51%	45%	6%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	44%	12%	47%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	78%	53%	25%	54%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	38%	1%	48%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	44%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	47%	44%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	66%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest overall performance is ELA proficiency at 54% proficient. This is a drop of 4% points from the preceding year and a drop of 10% points from the 2018-2019 school year. ELA proficiency on FAST PM 1 was 44%, so the students made 10% points growth during the year. As this was the first year with the new standards and state assessment, that must be a contributing factor to student scores. Despite this, a downward trend in ELA was taking place prior to the new assessment. This component is a serious area of focus for the school improvement plan.

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

The eighth-grade science and civics scores both declined by six percentage points. Progress monitoring data showed students' scores trending higher than was seen on the state assessment in civics and science. Certain target areas indicated by progress monitoring data were addressed throughout the year. The mismatch in data was surprising but it did correlate to ELA scores.

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 narrowest margin between our school and the state average is in civics. On the civics assessment, 71% of Timber Springs Middle School students were proficient, which is a lead of five points on the state proficiency rate, 66%. There is a downward trend in TSMS civics data since 2019's proficiency score of 82%.

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

Overall math achievement increased from 71% to 72%. Student scores and Algebra (91%) and Geometry (100%) are very high in this category.

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

Sixth and seventh grade math students who were not in Algebra or Geometry scored below the state average for the math assessment. Sixth grade was 2% below the state average, and seventh grade was 7% below the state average for math proficiency.
A large number of students were absent 10% or more days.

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

ELA achievement across subgroups.
Attendance rates
Non-accelerated math achievement
Science achievement
Civics achievement

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

A review of the early warning indicators shows that while the total number of students absent for 10% or more days decreased last year, there are still 101 students who were absent for this significant amount of time. As the EWI most present in our student body, attendance will be an area of focus for the 2023-2024 school year. As part of this area of focus, we will seek information from our chronically absent students to understand how the learning environment can better meet their needs and help them succeed. By addressing these school culture areas, we will decrease absenteeism because the students will feel a greater sense of belonging and connection to the school.

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

Student Panorma results for sense of belonging will increase from 38% to 43% on the Spring survey. Consequently, the percentage of students absent for 10% or more of the school year will decrease from 10.4% to 5%.

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

Attendance will be monitored through monthly meetings, and we will send out surveys seeking teacher input in preparation for those meetings. The meetings will help us select a targeted list of students and divide them among the leadership team for checkins. Students will be given a survey as part of the check in and the survey results will be shared at the following leadership team meeting. Specific action steps to address areas of concern will identified in the meetings. We will continue to monitor attendance through skyward data and sense of belonging in the fall and spring Panorama surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@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.)

We are looking to reduce chronic absenteeism by 5%.
We will be implementing a post-card strategy for chronically absent students. Additionally, we will recognize improved attendance rates for chronically absent students to incentivize continued attendance.

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

The post-card strategy was shown to reduce chronic absenteeism by approximately 2.5%. (Rogers, T., Duncan, T., Wolford, T., Ternovski, J., Subramanyam, S., & Reitano, A. (2017). A randomized experiment using absenteeism information to "nudge" attendance (REL 2017– 252). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED572488).
The incentives and rewards will help us celebrate our students and build family connections which is good for attendance. (Sheldon, S.B. & Epstein, J.L. (2004). Getting Students to School: Using Family and Community Involvement to Reduce Chronic Absenteeism, School Community Journal, 14(2), 39-56. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ794822).

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

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Schedule Monthly Attendance Meetings

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: 08/21/2023

Create monthly teacher input form.

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: 08/21/2023

Order supplies for postcards

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: 09/01/2023

Plan and conduct quarterly celebration activities

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly (10/13, 12/22, 3/14, 5/24)

Design student survey based on Panorama questions for sense of belonging

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: 9/30/2023

Present survey results at leadership meetings

Person Responsible: Sharon Butler (sharon.butler@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly beginning in early October and continuing as students are identified for chronic absense.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Proficiency scores for students with disabilities are far below the overall proficiency. ELA proficiency of SWD students was 16% and math proficiency was 35% on the 2023 administration of F.A.S.T.

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

When examining the highest score, students with disabilities will have a minimum proficiency rate of 21% (an increase of 5%) in ELA and 40% (an increase of 5%) in mathematics on the 2024 F.A.S.T. administration.

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

Progress will be monitored during PLC meetings, data chats, and progress monitoring administrations. Progress monitoring will include data of how we are offering and students are using appropriate support according to students' IEPs and 504s as well as the data from formative assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Parsons (kimberly.parsons@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.)

This year, we have created a partial-day ESE coach position. That coach will provide targeted academic support for teachers of students with disabilities through a combination of modeling and coaching cycles and provide support facilitation for one period a day.

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

Instructional coaching improves both teacher efficacy and student achievement. "On average, teacher coaching raises the quality of teachers' instructional practice and their impact on student achievement by ... as much as or more than the differences observed between a novice teacher and an experienced veteran." Kraft, M.A., and Blazar, D. (2018). Taking Teacher Coaching to Scale: Can personalized training become standard practice? Education Next, 18(4), 68-74.

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.

Meet with ESE teachers and coach to create a plan and set coaching goals

Person Responsible: Linda Craft (linda.craft@ocps.net)

By When: 09/01/2023

ESE teachers plan a minimum of once a month with each PLC to design specialized instruction, monitor progress, and address gaps

Person Responsible: Allyson Farmer (62521@ocps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Professional development in PBIS and mentoring to decrease time ESE students are spending out of class for discipline

Person Responsible: Andreas Starling (andreas.starling@ocps.net)

By When: quarterly

ESE teachers reflect with administration on progress and needs

Person Responsible: Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)

By When: at the start of year and quarterly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

The lowest overall performance is ELA proficiency at 54% proficient. This is a drop of 4% points from the preceding year and a drop of 10% points from the 2018-2019 school year. ELA proficiency on FAST PM 1 was 44%, so the students made 10% points growth during the year. As this was the first year with the new standards and state assessment, that must be a contributing factor to student scores. Despite this, a downward trend in ELA was taking place prior to the new assessment. This component is a serious area of focus for the school improvement plan.

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

ELA achievement will be 65% on the 2024 administration of F.A.S.T. progress monitoring 3 (PM3). This is an 11% increase from the 2023 FAST PM3 Assessment.

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

ELA achievement will be monitored in weekly PLCs, data chats, and progress monitoring assessments. PLCs will monitor scores on SBUAs/Unit Assessments and all the FAST progress monitoring administrations to guide instruction and measure progress towards our goal. Guidance from observations and classroom walks will be used to provide feedback to teachers on instrucational practices. Coaches will conduct a minimum of two walkthroughs per week.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Parsons (kimberly.parsons@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.)

Small group rotations and/or flexible grouping will be used in ELA with fidelity.

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

The rotational model allows for tiered and accommodated instruction, reteaching, and practice.

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.

Professional development on rotational models and flexible grouping

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: 9/13/2023

Facilitate rotational models in needed classrooms

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: through 10/01/2023

Teachers reflect on rotations/grouing during PLCs

Person Responsible: Allyson Farmer (62521@ocps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly after 09/01/2023

Reflect and adjust models and supports

Person Responsible: Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

By When: After each PM assessment

Targeted tutoring using ELA data

Person Responsible: Allyson Farmer (62521@ocps.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing beginning Q2

Because vocabulary is an area of growth in our school, we are incorporating schoolwide academic vocabulary instruction tied to visuals. Each week, students will focus on one new academic vocabulary word and relate that word to each subject.

Person Responsible: Allyson Farmer (62521@ocps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly beginning 9/25

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 school has selected to add personnel to support the areas of need in the form of a partial-day ESE coach, math and ELA tutor, and depending on budget, we will be hiring someone to support the Den, a support for students during the day.

Additional resources have been funded by SAC for literacy support.

Time is being allocated for professional development in the goal areas.