

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf Village Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Oakleaf Village Elementary School

410 OAKLEAF VILLAGE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ove.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oakleaf Village Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Martin, Jason	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and insure proper security, maintenance and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments.</p> <p>Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement.</p> <p>Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.
Lester, Shelley	Assistant Principal	Manage school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place
Gilliam, Chernell	Assistant Principal	Manage school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place
Taylor, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Russo, Jane	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Hammer, Penny	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Kendall, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Devine, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Mason, Krystal	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Peterson, Lily	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Abramowich, Stanley	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Lively, Pamela	Teacher, ESE	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Wallace, Anthony	School Counselor	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Lundy, Kim	School Counselor	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Mosley, Beth	Teacher, K-12	Teacher
Guin, Carri	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Administration, emerging leaders, and the school advisory council (including parents) were solicited advice on how they think the school should focus its improvement efforts.

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))

This plan will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs. We will also convene as administration & grade level teams for quarterly data progression meetings to evaluate student growth based on I-Ready, Acadience, & FAST assessment scores, teacher-developed common assessment scores, MTSS students' progress monitoring data, and teacher-provided samples of student work on grade-level standards. We will be conducting weekly gradual release administration-modeled PLCs focused on grade level-wide proficiency of essential ELA standards to ensure all staff are involved in the growth of students across the entire building.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	28	27	21	26	22	18	0	0	143	
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	6	15	5	12	0	0	44	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	16	16	8	16	5	2	0	0	63	
Course failure in Math	0	11	19	2	14	2	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	19	17	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	22	21	25	0	0	68	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	17	20	0	0	42	

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	5	15	11	13	14	20	0	0	78

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	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	28	27	21	26	22	18	17	0	0	159	
One or more suspensions	5	1	6	15	5	12	25	0	0	69	
Course failure in ELA	16	16	8	16	5	2	10	0	0	73	
Course failure in Math	11	19	2	14	2	0	6	0	0	54	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	17	18	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	21	25	15	0	0	83	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	17	20	17	0	0	59	

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	2	3	6	10	13	11	13	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	28	27	21	26	22	18	17	0	0	159	
One or more suspensions	5	1	6	15	5	12	25	0	0	69	
Course failure in ELA	16	16	8	16	5	2	10	0	0	73	
Course failure in Math	11	19	2	14	2	0	6	0	0	54	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	17	18	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	21	25	15	0	0	83	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	17	20	17	0	0	59	

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	2	3	6	10	13	11	13	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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*	60	59	53	65	63	56	67		
ELA Learning Gains				63			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			38		
Math Achievement*	64	64	59	65	51	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				67			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			29		
Science Achievement*	60	65	54	67	69	59	59		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	37	55	59	50			62		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	281
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	54			
HSP	56			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	54			

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	45			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	52			
HSP	66			

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%
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	61			

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	60			64			60					37
SWD	31			41			33				4	
ELL	45			38			44				5	37
AMI												
ASN	67			75							2	
BLK	53			56			51				4	
HSP	58			62			53				5	42
MUL	62			59							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			72			80				4	
FRL	54			56			53				4	

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	65	63	53	65	67	59	67					50
SWD	44	50	36	44	53	39	46					
ELL	35	58	47	41	58	45						50
AMI												
ASN	68	77		74	77							

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
BLK	53	55	41	53	58	51	52					
HSP	61	70	65	67	74	71	62					55
MUL	68	72		66	64							
PAC												
WHT	78	62	77	74	71	46	76					
FRL	58	64	55	58	62	58	74					

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	67	63	38	64	54	29	59					62
SWD	41	38	41	38	30	23	26					
ELL	27	55		45	36							62
AMI												
ASN	76			86								
BLK	49	50	38	36	31	22	21					
HSP	67	60	42	68	55	30	71					60
MUL	80	76		66	45		70					
PAC												
WHT	77	69	40	77	66	41	75					
FRL	59	60	46	51	44	24	46					

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	53%	55%	-2%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	58%	1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	81%	75%	6%	54%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	67%	-1%	61%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	59%	-7%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	63%	-7%	51%	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.

OVE's lowest-performing data component is fifth-grade science proficiency. ELL and SWD subgroup student populations have the lowest science proficiency scores and lowest quartile learning gain percentages. Some of the contributing factors include lower student attendance.

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

The school's science achievement data declined by 11% from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. The school experienced a change in instructors and instructional techniques.

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.

Our ELA proficiency data declined by 4%. Having been above the state average, any decline is cause for concern and in particular, a decline that would bring you in line with state averages is concerning

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 is math proficiency increasing by 3%. Identifying the Math needs and adjusting instruction to meet those needs for each student according to the data was a contributing factor to this improvement.

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

Based on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern are chronic absenteeism and the number of students who have been identified as having a substantial reading deficiency.

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

- 1) Continue to increase the proficiency of students in science.
- 2) Increasing student growth and proficiency in reading across all grade levels.
- 3) Utilizing the new Eureka Squared curriculum to teach to the Florida Math BEST standards.
- 4) Decrease the number of students with attendance below 90%.

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 Math**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.

Since this is the second year for Math BEST standards and the first year with the new Eureka Squared curriculum, our focus needs to be on properly using the systems we have in place (curriculum, curriculum maps, B1G M, PLC time, etc.) to improve and align our instructional practice to match the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase of 3 percentage points in proficiency for all scholars from 68% to 71% to earn a school grade of an A.

Monitoring:

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

We will use mid and end-of-module Eureka Squared assessments and FAST beginning, middle, and end-of-year assessments to monitor the progress of our students. We will use daily exit tickets during lessons to monitor progress prior to summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.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 are the small group instruction and remediation given to students based on the data collected during daily exit tickets. In addition, this instruction will happen with the use of effective district newly-adopted curriculum, Eureka Squared.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials, our students will show improvement in the area of math. The resources we will implement include highly effective teachers with proper training and knowledge of the math standards in addition the the use of the newly adopted curriculum.

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.

- 1) Professional development/training on math BEST standards and Eureka Squared curriculum will be highly encouraged for all math teachers
- 2) Common planning
- 3) Utilize district curriculum specialists

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. 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.

A review of the state testing data shows room for improvement across the tested grade bands with regards to the school's ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

OVE's goal is to increase proficiency in each of the tested grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) by 2% and a specific 4% improvement in the ESE population and 4% in the ELL population.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through school-wide testing using the FAST and Acadience progress monitoring scores, as well as Savvas testing platform incorporated with the curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.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.)

ELA teachers will utilize the CUBE assessment, Savvas ELA curriculum, and Tier II and Tier III interventions via the MTSS process to review and remediate students demonstrating deficiencies. ESE and ESOL teachers & assistants will utilize the same resources to develop goals written into IEPs/ILPs, remediate based on the goals, and document growth for students specific to the subgroup they are responsible for.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase reading proficiency will lead to increase proficiency in all other subjects. Weekly school-wide PLC time will be used to emphasize 4 essential standards per grade level for ELA per year. With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include Savvas, Phonics to Reading, Heggerty, Spelling & Morphology, Kid Lips, and Lexia Core 5.

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.

- 1) Common planning
- 2) Professional development available and highly encouraged for all teachers new to teaching ELA and/or

the following curriculums: Savvas, Phonics to reading, Kid Lips, Heggerty, Spelling Morphology, and Lexia Core 5.

3) Utilize district curriculum specialists

4) Emphasis of four ELA essential standards per grade level throughout the year during PLC

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#3. 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.

In the past several years since 2020, attendance has become seemingly optional. We are using tangible incentives and creating excitement for scholars surrounding learning. We are also continuing our student success team meetings to work with families to increase scholar attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In analyzing our attendance overall data from last year: 81% of scholars had 90 - 100% attendance, 15% at 80 - 89% attendance, 2% at 70-79% attendance, and 6 (or less than 1%) at 60-68% attendance. This year we aim to increase our 90-100% attendance range by 3% points.

Monitoring:

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

OVE PBIS team will meet monthly on the first Tuesday of the month. The PBIS team consists of the guidance counselor, administrator, and teachers from each grade level. Teachers provide input via a Google Form and in the Contact Log of Synergy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.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.)

Creating a positive school and class environment will impact students' will to attend school. We will use positive reinforcements, recognition, and family positive notes. This year we have also increased opportunities for activities (art club, robotics, music) which we hope to create experiences students will want to experience.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As shared by Attendance Works, schools can increase attendance by creating a welcoming environment that emphasizes building relationships with families and stresses the importance of going to class every day. "The key is developing a school-wide school culture that promotes a sense of safety, respect, and personal responsibility, where students feel connected and know that someone notices, in a caring manner, when they missed 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.

Recognize when students are consistently present. Students with attendance of 95% or higher for each nine weeks will be awarded: a certificate at an awards ceremony, positive notes and calls home, and a

thank you note for parents.

Identify students who are not consistently present. We will follow the district flow chart for attendance. Teachers will call home after 3 absences. Notations will be made in Synergy. The attendance team will meet monthly to contact families at risk.

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#4. 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.

A review of the state testing data shows room for improvement across the tested grade bands regarding the school's ELA & Math proficiency specifically regarding students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

OVE's goal is to increase proficiency in each of the tested grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) with a 4% improvement in the SWD population.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through school-wide testing using the FAST and reviewed with internal data meetings as well as through district data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.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.)

ELA teachers will utilize the CUBE assessment, Savvas ELA curriculum, and Tier II and Tier III interventions via the MTSS process to review and remediate students demonstrating deficiencies. ESE teachers & assistants will utilize the same resources to develop goals written into IEPs/ILPs, remediate based on the goals, and document growth for students specific to the subgroup they are responsible for.

The evidence-based interventions being implemented are the small group instruction and remediation given to students based on the data collected during daily exit tickets. In addition, this instruction will happen with the use of an effective district newly-adopted curriculum, Eureka Squared.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing reading proficiency will lead to increased proficiency in all other subjects. With increased rigor and the implementation of grade-level appropriate materials, our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district-adopted materials which include Savvas, Phonics to Reading, Haggerty, Spelling & Morphology, Kid Lips, and Lexia Core 5. Additionally, with increased rigor and the implementation of grade-level appropriate materials, our students will show improvement in the area of math.

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.

- 1) Professional development/training on strengthening our tier 1 instruction for all SWD.
- 2) Common planning of tier 1 instruction as well as next steps for students who are identified as not meeting the minimum mark of proficiency.
- 3) Utilize district curriculum specialists to plan for SDI.

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: April, 1st, 2024

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No