

Pinellas County Schools

Orange Grove 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Orange Grove Elementary School

10300 65TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33772

<http://www.orangegrove-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

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.

Leading the way in student success through integrity, leadership, and determination for a world that is yet to be created.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

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
Wilson, Christine	Principal	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.
Dority, Jessica	Other	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.
	School Counselor	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.
Bouanene, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.
Williamson, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.
Conard, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.
Rush, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/ certification.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Improvement Plan is developed with input from School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT), SIP Goal Managers, and School Advisory Council. There is a minimum of one person on SBLT from each grade level team / PLC. Data and information are articulated vertically and horizontally between teams.

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))

SIP Teams meet on the first Wednesday of each month to review goals and revise action steps as needed. SBLT meets every Wednesday and uses the four-step problem-solving model to identify subgroups and individual students in need of additional support.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	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	0	13	6	11	8	10	0	0	0	48	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	11	
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	1	1	0	5	5	0	0	0	12

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	1	1	1	0	0	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	2	8	8	15	14	11	0	0	0	58	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	5	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	8	8	15	14	11	0	0	0	58	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	5	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	79	55	56	76	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	80	62	61	68	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65	55	52	62	54	53
Math Achievement*	89	62	60	86	61	63
Math Learning Gains	83	65	64	68	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75	54	55	61	48	51
Science Achievement*	87	57	51	74	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* 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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	66			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	83			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	76			

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	79	80	65	89	83	75	87					
SWD	55	75	67	67	64	59	77					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	80	87		88	80		80					
MUL	86			92								
PAC												
WHT	80	79	62	90	84	77	92					
FRL	70	80	63	83	78	75	84					

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	71	73	55	83	87	73	79					
SWD	40			54								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	79			89								
MUL	80			80								
PAC												
WHT	74	75		87	88		82					
FRL	65	55		76	80		70					

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	76	68	62	86	68	61	74					
SWD	40	59	45	62	56	40						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	95	69		91	44		73					
MUL	69	54		94	92							
PAC												
WHT	74	70	57	84	69	55	70					
FRL	67	69	61	81	67	59	69					

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	80%	57%	23%	54%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	53%	22%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	66%	13%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	86%	61%	25%	55%	31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	85%	60%	25%	51%	34%

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.

Learning gains among our L25 continue to be our lowest performance component and our primary area of focus in ELA.

Contributing factors include lack of consistency with student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor. We need to increase time on task reading grade-level text, engaging in discussion, and writing with feedback. We need more emphasis on foundational skills, with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. We need to focus on VPK and kindergarten early literacy, as well as provide the necessary resources to intermediate grades to provide targeted instruction to students lacking foundational skills. We also need to consistently assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, and one-to-one instruction.

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

Based on spring FAST data, our math proficiency dropped from 89% in 2022 to 83% in 2023.

Contributing factors include a lack of consistency with student-centered instruction and standards-based

instruction with rigor. We need to consistently use Purposeful Questions, Number Routines, and multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction (Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS, Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and/ or “in the moment” student work analysis). We will also use student work to guide the analysis of student learning.

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.

We outperformed the state in all grade levels in ELA and Math based on spring FAST data:

3rd grade ELA was 75% proficient compared to 50% state average.

3rd grade Math was 88% proficient compared to 59% state average.

4th grade ELA was 75% proficient compared to 58% state average.

4th grade Math was 84% proficient compared to 61% state average.

5th grade ELA was 79% proficient compared to 54% state average.

5th grade Math was 88% proficient compared to 55% state average.

ELA: Primary grades placed a strong focus on Foundational Skills and Language Craft and Structure. We also placed a greater emphasis on phonics instruction. 3rd grade focused on Language, Craft, and Structure, and 4th and 5th grades concentrated on Key Ideas and Details. We also made vocabulary acquisition and use a focus in kindergarten - 5th grade.

Math: 3rd and 4th-grade students focused on Number and Operations and 5th-grade students concentrated on Operations and Algebraic Thinking.

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

We did not make gains in ELA or Math. We went from 79% in 2022 to 77% in 2023 in ELA. We went from 89% in 2022 to 83% in 2023 in Math. We attribute this to the new FAST assessment.

We maintained our Science proficiency at 87% in 2022 and 2023. A diagnostic assessment was given in the fall and winter to intentionally plan to fill in gaps in learning. We also placed a focus on a conceptual understanding of the applicable academic vocabulary schoolwide.

Actions that contributed to student success:

Extended Learning Programs: Additional before and after school to provide targeted instruction for students in small group settings. We also focused on specific students lacking foundational skills in 3rd - 5th grade and provided intense, small group instruction on phonics instruction.

Goal setting with every student: We utilized the learning continuum to connect the goals to standards and every child had an action plan to achieve their goals. Plans were routinely monitored and discussed with students. We were also more consistent including students and parents in data chats and student-led conferences.

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

An area of concern in ESW is the number of Level 1 students in ELA and Math. Based on 2023 FAST data, we have 14 Level 1 students in ELA and 11 Level 1 students in Math. We will assign a staff mentor to these students in August and create an action plan to close the gap.

A second area of concern is attendance. We have 48 students below the 90% in 1st - 5th grade. The Child Study Team will meet with these students and reach out to their families in August. Building a strong home school connection will be the best indicator of student success.

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

Collegial Coaching: Empower math teacher leaders and literacy teacher leaders to support / coach colleagues.

Standards-Based Collaborative Planning Utilizing Learning Boards:

- Create daily learning targets that state the purpose for learning and identify critical content.
- Clarify the high yield instructional strategy.
- Clarify the evidence to ensure it is aligned to the rigor of the grade level standard.
- Align Resources to Standards.
- Plan to Close the Achievement Gap Using Data.

Conditions for Learning:

- Maintain a student-centered pedagogy where students have increasing autonomy and responsibility for their own learning (AVID / Culturally Relevant Teaching).
- Use engagement strategies, establish and maintain effective relationships and communicate high expectations for all students (SEL).

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports school-wide behavior program is the primary way we build a positive school culture at Orange Grove. During our pre-school training, we will have PBIS professional development for staff. This includes training on school-wide expectations, rules, classroom behavior systems, our school-wide positive reward program, and discipline procedures. Throughout the school year, teachers and administrators will teach students and families about PBIS, classroom procedures, and expectations.

We will also build a positive school culture by strengthening the community of our classrooms and school. First, we will use Restorative Practices techniques to build relationships and address problems. Teachers will conduct at least two Restorative Practices circles each week. These circles should be a chance for each student to share, listen, and make connections. When problems arise, class meetings or restorative questioning will be used as a method for resolution. Second, communication between the school and parents is a priority. Families will receive weekly emails that highlight initiatives, goals, recommendations, and upcoming events. Throughout the year, parents will have the opportunity to attend several events to learn about curriculum and academic expectations. Teachers use a variety of methods to keep open, two-way communication with parents. Furthermore, parents are always encouraged to contact the teacher or administrator with concerns. Third, we will build community and culture with our celebrations and recognitions. We have monthly character assemblies to celebrate achievements in academics, art, music, behavior, and character. All students will have several opportunities throughout the year to be recognized in front of the school, staff, and parents.

Finally, we will build positive school culture by improving attendance. In the 2022-2023 school year, 12.7% of our students had an absence rate of 10% or more. Regular daily attendance is crucial for academic achievement, as well as building the classroom community.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, the percentage of students with an attendance rate of 90% or more will increase from 87.3% to 100%.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance will be monitored by the individual classroom teachers who will contact families when attendance is a concern. They will refer student attendance problems to the Child Study Team.

The Child Study Team consists of the Principal, School Social Worker, School Counselor, Curriculum Specialist, and Data Management Technician. The team meets twice a month. During the meetings, student absences are monitored through the Attendance Dashboard in Power BI. The Child Study Team will address the attendance issues of students that are flagged in the attendance dashboard and those referred by teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

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.)

Orange Grove will use several recognitions to motivate and reward students. We will have quarterly perfect attendance parties. Each day, classes that have 100% attendance will post "100% Healthy and Present" ribbons on their doors and will be recognized on the afternoon announcements.

Communication with families is another intervention we will use to increase attendance. Attendance information will be sent to parents as part of the school's weekly communication (email/phone messages). When a student is struggling with their daily attendance, the CST will communicate with the parents through phone calls, in-person conferences, or home visits. Through this communication, we will problem-solve, develop interventions, and set goals with the parents to work toward improved attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

At the elementary school level, parents are an important stakeholder in student attendance. It's important for parents to understand how crucial daily attendance is to both learning and becoming a part of the school community. Sharing this information with parents can help prevent attendance issues. When students are experiencing problems with attendance, including the parents in the problem-solving process is the most effective way to see a decrease in absences.

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.

Attendance Training - The Attendance flow chart will be part of the Staff Handbook and will be reviewed with staff during pre-school training.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Daily Attendance Recognition - Classes with 100% attendance will be recognized with door signs and on afternoon announcements.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily throughout the year

Perfect Attendance Celebrations - Students with perfect attendance each grading period will attend a celebration at the end of the grading period.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: Quarterly, throughout the year

Weekly communication with parents - Attendance messages will be sent to all families. These messages will be part of the weekly school update emails/phone calls.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly throughout the year

CST Meetings - Bi-monthly meetings to review attendance concerns

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: Twice a month, starting in August 2023

Home Visits/Conferences - Direct communication between the Child Study Team and families of students struggling with regular daily attendance.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: As needed, throughout the year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Orange Grove has currently received 3 of 9 awards for healthy generation award recognition, as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Orange Grove will focus initiatives on the Health Education and Nutrition and Food Access topic to become eligible for the National Healthy Schools Award in these topic areas, while also maintaining award status in 3 of the previously achieved topics on the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Thriving Schools Integrated Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Healthy School Team will meet a minimum of four times throughout the year to monitor the progress toward meeting the nine goals. We will adjust our strategies as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

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.)

Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies as it relates to personal health.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Schools can play an important role in promoting healthy eating habits to children, and ensuring school food provides healthy, balanced, and nutritious meals with the appropriate amount of energy and nutrients pupils need.

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. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individual including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student.
2. Attend district-supported professional development.
3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment.
4. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan.
5. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Recognition, if applicable.

Person Responsible: Jeff Conard (conardj@pcsb.org)

By When: April 2025

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on spring ELA FAST data, primary grades showed a need in Foundational Skills/Language Craft and Structure in kindergarten, and Foundational Skills 1st and 2nd-grade students. 3rd grade needs to focus on Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, specifically Context and Connotation and Morphology. 4th and 5th grades need to concentrate on Reading Prose and Poetry. We also see vocabulary acquisition and use as a need in kindergarten - 5th grade. Contributing factors include a lack of consistency with student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor. We need to increase time on task reading grade-level text, engaging in discussion, and writing with feedback. We need more emphasis on foundational skills with high-quality feedback, and opportunities to use that feedback.

Based on spring FAST Math data, 3rd grade needs to focus on Number Sense and Additive Reasoning. 4th-grade students need to focus on Number Sense and Operations with Whole Numbers, and 5th-grade students need on Number Sense and Operations with Fractions and Decimals. Contributing factors include lack of consistency with student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor. We need to consistently use Purposeful Questions, Number Routines, and multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction (Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS, Illustrative Mathematics tasks). We will also use student work to guide the analysis of learning.

Based on 5th grade SSA, Nature of Science is our focus in kindergarten - 5th grade. Contributing factors include a lack of consistency with the scientific method, experiment variables, and empirical evidence. We need to focus on standards articulation in vertical PLC's.

Based on 2023 FAST Data, our black and multiracial subgroups were 78% proficient in ELA and 78% proficient in Math. Contributing factors include the need for increased professional development in CRT practices and AVID to create a more engaging curriculum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase by 5% from 77% in 2023 to 82% in 2024 as measured by the FAST Assessment (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

Proficiency in Mathematics will increase by 5% from 83% in 2023 to 88% in 2024 as measured by the FAST Assessment (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

Proficiency in Science will increase from 87% to 93% as measured by SSA (Science State Assessment).

Proficiency among our Black and Multiracial subgroups will increase by 5% from 2023 to 2024 as measured by the FAST Assessment (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus, Instructional Practice specifically related to Benchmark-aligned Instruction, will be monitored by FAST Assessment (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

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.)

1. Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T./FSASS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.
2. Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.
3. Celebrate students' growth with regard to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are still transitioning from the Florida State Standards to the B.E.S.T. Standards (Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking.) We will use the B.E.S.T. Standards for all instruction.

School-wide focus on aligning the level of rigor to standard-based instruction, as it relates to instructional delivery, tasks, and assessments while addressing unfinished learning in ELA, Math, and Science.

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. Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

2. Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Strengthen student inquiry skills through the implementation and monitoring of routine use of higher-level thinking through questioning, class discussions, problem-solving activities, and/or collaborative study groups.

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

3. Implement goal-setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.

Implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

Person Responsible: Christine Wilson (wilsonchristin@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#4. 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.

Implement a Gifted Program to provide services that meet the needs of identified gifted students based on their Education Plans and the Florida Frameworks for Gifted Learners to ensure academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the spring FAST assessment, the percent of gifted students scoring at or above grade level in ELA was 100% in 2023 and will be maintained at 100% in 2024.

Based on the spring FAST assessment, the percent of gifted student scoring at or above grade level in MATH was 95% in 2023 and will increase to 100% in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

District testing and classroom grades will be utilized to monitor for desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Medina (medinaan@pcsb.org)

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.)

Monitor testing data and trends for gifted learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy is used as a Best Practice for gifted learners.

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.

Orange Grove Elementary School will do this by expecting teachers to intentionally plan for differentiation (using testing data) for gifted learners.

Person Responsible: Andrea Medina (medinaan@pcsb.org)

By When: Action steps should be implemented and completed during the 2023-24 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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?

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

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3021 - Orange Grove Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			Notes: TDE's to support PD and Data Chats			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
Total:						\$2,000.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes