

Orange County Public Schools

Union Park 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Union Park Elementary

1600 N DEAN RD, Orlando, FL 32825

<https://unionparkes.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
Ramirez, Ashlynn	Principal	Digital administrator, school-based budget, supervises progress monitoring (all content), evaluates secretary, registrar, and all lead team members, grades 3-5, parent engagement/ involvement, accountability corrections, boosting staff and student morale, retaining teachers, overseeing schoolwide data tracker, monitoring schoolwide communication, community connection, overseeing PLC/PD
Vales, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Digital administrator, school-based budget, supervise progress monitoring (all content), evaluates classified, ESE, grades K-2 and specials, parent engagement/involvement, accountability corrections. boosting staff and student morale, retaining teachers, supporting schoolwide data tracker, good cause lead, monitoring schoolwide communication, community connection, overseeing PLC/PD.
Malanga, Connie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	CRT - UPE tracker, digital roll-out, FAST State testing (plan/schedule), WIDA testing lead, community liaison, new teachers lead, progress monitoring lead, ELL support, good cause support, ESOL compliance, progress reports/report grade tracker, in-service points, master calendar, social media/website lead, MAO lead, Saturday school, Spring Break Camp Lead.
Ayala, Lauren	Reading Coach	Resources for students, data analysis for ELA, PD schedules, Read to Succeed, deliberate practice, teacher retention, staff morale mentoring for students, student clubs, reading bootcamp (Pre-FAST), writing bootcamp (Pre-FAST), grade 3 portfolio support, report card/ progress reports grade tracker, PLC Facilitator for ELA.
McGovern, Kimberly	Other	Provide specific instruction to the identified lowest 30% quartile students in all grade levels, MTSS Lead, parent meetings for MTSS, DIBELS lead K-1.
Shank, Melanie	Staffing Specialist	Compliance, MTSS support, 504, IEP's, parent meetings, ESE testing liaison (FSAA, Accommodations), ESOL support, and behavior MTSS support.
Gonzalez - Rodriguez, Sonia	Instructional Media	Media specialist - digital lead, student morale, textbook inventory, textbook manager, digital inventory, news crew, community outreach, book club, book fair, and AR lead.
Scott, Shermeka	Math Coach	Digital implementation, bottom quartile data analysis for math & science, report card/ progress reports grade tracker, PLC schedules, after-school tutoring, math bootcamp (Pre-FAST), PLC Facilitator for math & science, Math Olympiads, and STEM lead.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davila, Jose	Dean	Behavior support for teacher- Title 1, positive behavior, social skill groups, Restorative Justice Circles, and zones of regulation.

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.

At the end of the year and throughout the summer, we met as a leadership team and received feedback from our teachers on ways we could improve as a school. We reviewed the collected feedback and data to hone in on areas of need. We also reviewed common feedback/questions that we would receive from parents during parent meetings/SAC regarding student progress and the next steps for UPES. Many question the resources that are available and how we could go about receiving more. During summer Common Planning we then touched base with our teachers again to discuss what they wanted to see based on data of their upcoming classes. We gathered all of this information, along with the instructional shifts of the district, to create goals for the 2023-2024 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))

Classroom walkthroughs have been scheduled weekly, with an overall focus on standards-based learning and monitoring. The leadership team will use this data to drive PLCs and coaching. We will be using a matrix this year for each individual teacher to track all district assessments, common assessments, and interventions. Meeting monthly to go over data with teachers and make adjustments as needed. For those students making up the lowest 30%, we have assigned interventionists to specific grade levels to support these students in the classroom and through pull-out groups. When this data is reviewed, we will adjust the plan as needed to ensure we meet our goals. This could include shifting interventions, walkthrough focuses, or even what is discussed during Wednesday staff professional development, to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

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	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes

2021-22 ESSA Identification	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	19	19	17	10	8	0	0	0	79	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	26	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	28	0	0	0	50	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	10	6	10	22	21	0	0	0	69	

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	18	28	26	9	26	28	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	10	14	9	16	0	0	0	54
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	18	28	26	9	26	28	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	10	14	9	16	0	0	0	54
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	57	56	51	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	55	62	61	54	58	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44	50	52	28	52	53
Math Achievement*	52	61	60	48	63	63

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	78	66	64	42	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58	56	55	22	48	51
Science Achievement*	51	56	51	27	56	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	58			61		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	49			

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%
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	51			

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)

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	44	55	44	52	78	58	51					58
SWD	19	35	29	20	45	47	0					46
ELL	37	44	32	47	77	62	34					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	52		47	77		73					
HSP	45	54	36	50	78	59	38					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	68		55	79							
FRL	34	49	46	42	72	58	46					59

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	42	44	35	41	58	41	49					36

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
SWD	0	15		7	30		0					25
ELL	27	40	40	29	59		16					36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			24								
HSP	41	47	40	36	57	46	41					36
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53			59			80					
FRL	31	37	33	31	45	33	44					28

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	51	54	28	48	42	22	27					61
SWD	9	21	21	12	14	15	0					48
ELL	39	50	32	37	37	25	23					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	63		51	50		8					
HSP	48	53	29	44	41	23	30					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	48		54	35		36					
FRL	43	49	28	40	38	18	25					60

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%	54%	-1%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	60%	-19%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	59%	-15%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	51%	0%

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.

Our 2022-23 FAST Math data showed the lowest performance with 45% proficiency and our goal was 54% proficiency. A contributing factor was an inconsistent transfer of best practices for differentiation and small group instruction amongst grade levels and inadequate monitoring of student progress. Also, walkthrough data and reflections with instructional teams indicate that students weren't given enough time to practice their learning.

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

Our 2022-23 FAST Math data showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping 7 percentage points from 52% proficiency on the 2022 state assessment to 45% proficiency on the 2023 state assessment. As mentioned above, a contributing factor was an inconsistent transfer of best practices for differentiation and small group instruction amongst grade levels and inadequate monitoring of student progress. Also, students did not have enough time to practice their learning. For the 2022-2023 school year, our math instructional coach was also a first-year coach.

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 Math proficiency data for 4th grade of 45% had the greatest gap when compared to the State average of 61% proficiency. Contributing factors included a first-year coach, new standards, and teachers not providing enough intentional practice time for all students.

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

Our 2022-23 FAST ELA proficiency showed the greatest improvement, increasing from 44% proficiency on the 2022 State assessment to 49% proficiency on the 2023 State assessment. Our targeted interventions and intentional bottom 40% pull-out groups by our ELA coach contributed to the improvement in this data component.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, it's evident that students earning a Level 1 on state assessments is a concern moving into the current school year. Roughly 30% of our students entering 4th and 5th grade received a level 1 on the state assessment last school year. Also, about 25% of our students going into 4th and 5th grade have two or more early warning signs. This is already impacting them without the school year even starting.

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

1. Math proficiency.
2. Standards-based learning to increase overall proficiency in all subject areas.
3. Purposeful Engagement (tools, strategies, and students being able to experience their learning).

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.

Our 2022-23 FAST Math data showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping 7 percentage points from 52% proficiency on the 2022 state assessment to 45% proficiency on the 2023 state assessment. This was also our lowest-performing area on the 2022-23 state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the Math Proficiency data of 52% on the 2021-2022 FSA state-wide test to 45% on the 2022-2023 State-wide test (just under 50%), the school plans to increase Math proficiency to 60% on the math State assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We believe we have the team and resources this year to accomplish our goal. We have adjusted our master schedule so that our math instructional coach is able to present in all math intervention blocks. We've provided an intentional gradual release model for our teachers to use during whole groups to be able to identify and target individual needs for further instruction in small groups or math intervention. To monitor the implementation of instructional practices, including the gradual release model, we will be conducting weekly math-focused walks. These walks will focus on a specific instructional practice and a specific grade level each week. Teachers will receive timely feedback and will be walked again to monitor feedback was implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shermeka Scott (shermeka.scott@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 will be using SuccessMaker, as provided by the district, to provide evidence-based intervention. This program is aligned with the B.E.S.T. math standards. Our teachers will also be following the district's Curriculum Resource Maps which integrates Envision Math and its intervention resources into small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This program was provided by the district and is a digital tool that all of our teachers have access to and can be easily monitored by them with support from our math instructional coach.

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.

Create standards-based intervention groups based upon data and progress monitoring on a bi-weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Shermeka Scott (shermeka.scott@ocps.net)

By When: Groups will be created by the end of August after the first SuccessMaker Diagnostic is complete. Our math instructional coach will be monitoring the intervention data.

Students identified in the SWD subgroup will be considered for our tutoring programs. Coincidentally, many of those students also fall in the ELL and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups which are also weaker subgroups for our school.

Person Responsible: Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)

By When: After-school tutoring students will be identified in September to start the program no later than the end of September. As we monitor data, students will be shifted and instruction will be adjusted. We will pay close attention to the progress of our SWD students, as they represent one of our lowest-performing subgroups. Shifts in groups and instruction will be fluid until the Spring.

Administrators and math coaches will receive training on evidence-based strategies to support professional growth and inform performance evaluations of instructional personnel.

Person Responsible: Shermeka Scott (shermeka.scott@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year as needed.

#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.

The structures that were put in place for the 2022-2023 school year yielded trends that indicated growth, but not students meeting proficiency, as our overall tested proficiency for our ESSA SWD subgroup was 39%, compared to our overall school proficiency which was 49%. As a school, we've identified this as an area of need so we will focus on instructional practice of the standards. Not solely being knowledgeable of the benchmark, but implementing instruction, with rigorous engagement strategies that are standards-aligned and providing all students, especially our SWD students, with intentional time to practice the benchmark and provide options for reteaching.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall proficiency of our SWD subgroup for last school year of 39%. This year we are expecting to raise the proficiency of our SWD students to 45% proficiency on the 2024 FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor thoroughly weekly walkthroughs of all subject areas and provide on-the-spot feedback to the teachers. We will monitor all data bi-quarterly, including common assessments, district ELA and Math programs, and intervention, to identify any adjustments that need to be made, with a closer look at the data for our SWD subgroup. Admin and instructional coaches will also be present in all PLCs to ensure all instruction, resources, and tools being used are standards-aligned. We will collaborate with the Support Facilitation teacher to ensure she is using similar strategies with our SWD subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Ayala (lauren.ayala@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.)

Teachers will back their instruction in small groups or interventions with the use of Exact Path and Successmaker, so students receive adequate time to practice the skills needed at their independent level. We will also increase our systematic use of explicit instruction by setting an expectation of maximizing instructional time. Teachers will meet once a week with a coach and administrator to discuss standards-based instruction, implementation of instruction, how to appropriately differentiate the instruction, and data analysis of common assessments. Instructional coaches will communicate support and monitor these strategies during weekly PLCs with teachers. Teachers will identify the students that are in SWD ESSA subgroup and collaboratively plan specific standard-aligned questions and differentiated strategies to guide their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these programs is to develop administrator and teacher capacity to make data-driven instructional decisions based on program formative and summative assessment results. This strategy was also selected to ensure that administrators and teachers learn and systematically implement explicit instruction with differentiation for all students while giving them opportunities to practice and be hands-on with their learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 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.

PLCs will meet bi-weekly to analyze the SWD data and share/explain best practices for instructional practice with the support of coaches/admin and plan for intentional reteach opportunities.

Person Responsible: Lauren Ayala (lauren.ayala@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school 2023-2024 school year.

Provide teachers with professional development that focuses on instructional practice as it relates to best practices for the SWD subgroup and aligned instruction while incorporating rigorous engagement and hands-on experiences.

Person Responsible: Shermeka Scott (shermeka.scott@ocps.net)

By When: We have developed a PD plan through December and will reevaluate based on data after the second FAST administration.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on previous data, our SWD students have been below 41% proficiency for more than 2 years and our ELL students are straddling just above 41% proficient. We want to focus on creating a fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, specifically focusing on our ELL and SWD population. Both subgroups make up the lowest performance in all areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on previous data, our SWD students have been below 41% proficiency for more than 2 years and our ELL students are straddling just above 41%. As a school, we want to see our ELL and SWD students increase their overall proficiency to 54%

Monitoring:

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

We will specifically track the data of our SWD and ELL students, as those subgroups will be targeted on our data matrices for individual teachers. We will also ensure our Tier 1 Interventionist our consistently supporting the bottom 40% of students, which includes both SWD and ELL learners. They will use their own trackers to ensure progress is being made and communicate with homeroom teachers and admin.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 use of targeted pullout groups will be implemented for this area of focus. Along with district-approved resources that will support the needs of our SWD and ELL populations. Teachers will also back their instruction in small groups or interventions with the use of Exact Path and Successmaker, so students receive adequate time to practice the skills needed at their independent level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these strategies is to develop administrator and teacher capacity to make data-driven instructional decisions based upon formative and summative assessment results. These strategies were selected to ensure that administrators and teachers learn and systematically implement explicit instruction, with differentiation, for all students, while giving them opportunities to practice and be hands-on with their learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 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.

We will ensure to invite these students to attend tutoring opportunities.

Person Responsible: Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)

By When: After the first FAST administration and then adjust as needed by monitoring the data.

Provide professional development to teachers on specific strategies that will support our ELL and SWD students, in turn supporting all learners.

Person Responsible: Connie Malanga (constance.malanga@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year, while tapping in our staffing specialist and support facilitator.

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).

Data is reviewed over the summer to ensure hiring decisions match the needs of our school for the upcoming school year. Funding is then utilized to ensure student's needs are met through small groups, targeted instruction, and aligned resources. Our SWD students are specifically targeted and monitored as they are consistently performing below the 41% proficiency threshold. The allocated Tier 1 Interventionist positions are utilized to work directly with our lowest 30% population to meet the needs of all students as communicated in our areas of focus and provide additional interventions. These decisions are also communicated in our monthly SAC meetings, where stakeholders help identify additional ways to allocate resources.

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

When reviewing the data, all ELA data for current grades 1st and 2nd, fell below the 50% mark. By focusing on standards-aligned instruction, we will ensure that we are adequately monitoring teacher performance with meaningful, timely feedback as well as monitoring student performance throughout the academic school year using Exact Path.

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

When reviewing the data, all ELA data for current grades 3rd through 4th fell below the 50% mark. We will incorporate small group instruction to target deficit standards to support all students making progress towards proficiency, with a focus on our ESSA subgroups. Teachers will also use Exact Path during this time to provide continuous practice. We will monitor progress toward standard proficiency and independent skill practice.

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

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 37% on the first grade 2022-2023 EOY FAST, the school plans to increase first-grade ELA Proficiency to 60% on the ELA state assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 44% on the second grade 2022-2023 EOY FAST, the school plans to increase second-grade ELA Proficiency to 60% on the ELA state assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 48% on the third grade 2022-2023 EOY FAST, the school plans to increase third-grade ELA Proficiency to 60% on the ELA state assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

Based on the ELA Proficiency data of 42% on the fourth grade 2022-2023 EOY FAST, the school plans to increase fourth-grade ELA Proficiency to 60% on the ELA state assessment for the 2023-2024 school year.

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 through formative assessments and common assessment data, as well as using the progress monitoring tools suggested by the district, specifically Exact Path for ELA. We will also closely monitor the data of the first two FAST assessments and make adjustments to instruction as needed to achieve our goals.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ayala, Lauren, lauren.ayala@ocps.net

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?

In order to achieve the measurable outcomes previously stated for each grade level, we will be using Exact Path for interventions as well as SIPPS and Corrective Reading for targeted Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Exact Path is aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. Both SIPPS and Corrective Reading have statistically shown a significant effect on improving our students' outcomes in reading fluency which in turn supports reading comprehension.

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?

All three selected programs address the identified area of focus which is to improve ELA proficiency. Students who are struggling readers need support with SIPPs and/or Corrective Reading. Once they show mastery in foundational skills, they can use those skills to further their independent practice on Exact Path to focus on targeted skills to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary. All three programs have a proven record of effectiveness on the Lowest 25% of students in each grade level.

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
<p>Ensure Exact Path is being used in the classroom to support intervention needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Monthly data meetings to analyze data and create action steps. Monitor those action steps. -Train teachers on how to use the data collected from Exact Path to adjust instruction and differentiate. -Use the "assign lessons" feature to assess and reassess when needed. -Provide training on how to align Exact Path with those strategies being taught in the classroom. 	<p>Ayala, Lauren, lauren.ayala@ocps.net</p>
<p>Ensure all students are placed in the appropriate Tier 2 interventions (and Tier 3 if applicable). SIPPS and corrective Reading will both be used to address this area of focus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Pick appropriate staff members to lead these programs. Use previous years' data to identify teachers with high success rates. -Track Data every 2 weeks using the provided mastery checks to adjust instruction as needed. -Provide teachers with quarterly professional development on how to best implement the listed programs above. 	<p>McGovern, Kimberly, kimberly.mcgovern@ocps.net</p>

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.

We communicate the SIP and progress towards its goals to all staff during Pre-Planning, as well as during our Mid-Year data review. We speak more frequently about monitoring the goals and adjusting needed instruction/resources at our instructional leadership team meetings bi-weekly. We also do a middle-of-the-year data overview chat with teachers to communicate whether or not we are meeting our goal. It is posted on our school's webpage (unionparkes.ocps.net) and goal progress is reviewed at our monthly SAC meetings.

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))

Coordinated by our PEL, we host family nights monthly to build a connection between home and school. We provide academic, as well as behavioral support, during these chats. We also plan 3 to 4 events throughout the year that welcome the whole family and community partners. Lastly, in order to communicate individual academics, we plan for "report card nights" where teachers meet with families virtually, in person, or over the phone to communicate instructional needs. The PEL plan is also listed on our website. (unionparkes.ocps.net)

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)

With our weekly walkthroughs, we plan to provide feedback on adherence to the master schedule, with an academic focus on standards-based instruction and engagement. We want to ensure our teachers are maximizing instructional time and providing multiple avenues for students to experience their learning. To align with this goal, we are focusing our after-school PDs on this same focus. We've also used funds to purchase additional programs that will strengthen our writing instruction and build up our student's love for literacy. Lastly, after-school tutoring will be provided to accelerate the curriculum. This program will begin in September.

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

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

Our staff engages in ongoing professional development on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. We have a student services team that will be meeting weekly to discuss ongoing student concerns, as well as any new concerns that develop. This team includes admin, school counselor, school mental health designee, and our designated school social worker. We also embed social and emotional learning in our classroom management strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students.

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))

We will host our annual Teach-In event in November to provide awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce. We use this time to highlight the importance of continued education outside of that received from colleges and universities and will also include sports, trade schools.

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).

We provide teachers with a tiered approach to behavior. Teachers are given in-classroom Tier 1 interventions that can be used to support classroom behavior. Our dean and behavior specialist track the behaviors that are being reported in the classroom. Once repetitive behaviors become present we then work as a team to provide Tier 2, or, if needed, Tier 3 support in order to prevent continuous behavior and meet the child's needs to teach any missing skills. Our staff specialist gets involved when we need to meet with parents and towards any requests for behavior support or implementation of ESE programs.

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))

Admin schedules individual data chats with teachers 3 times a year to go over their classroom data and ensure they have a plan to reach all students and adjust instruction when needed. Instructional coaches also discuss data more often during PLCs to ensure reteaching is happening and targeted students are making gains. As a whole school, we include data discussions in our after-school professional development to ensure all staff members understand the use of data to improve instruction. This ensures teachers feel supported in being effective in the classroom.

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))

We currently have 3, full-day, VPK classrooms on our campus to support local families interested in beginning the transition to elementary from home care or daycare programs. Many of these families are also zoned for our school to start Kindergarten, so inherently it supports students who will eventually be enrolling in our K-5 classes. Our VPK teachers attend ongoing professional development with the district/state to ensure they have the knowledge and strategies to support the transition.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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.

Yes