

Orange County Public Schools

# Meadow Woods Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>24</b>

## Meadow Woods Elementary

500 RHODE ISLAND WOODS CIR, Orlando, FL 32824

<https://meadowwoodses.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 to 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
Figueroa Solis, Edmi	Principal	The Principal will be responsible for cultivating, shaping, and ensuring rigorous academic goals for all staff and students. The Principal will problem-solve, coach, and build capacity in staff to create a positive and effective school culture. The Principal will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support in order to ensure the school's mission and vision are achieved.
Fox, Rachel	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will support the principal in ensuring the mission and vision are achieved. The Assistant Principal will monitor data to provide needed adjustments to close the achievement gap, ensure building safety, coach and support all staff, and maintain and deepen current educational best practices to support the positive and effective school culture.
Castanera, Rosita	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will maintain an understanding of all communication skills, decision-making, relationship skills, conflict resolution, and goal setting to ensure students receive support and reduce all barriers to their academic success. The Guidance Counselor will confer with teachers to provide interventions, preventions, and behavior modifications that will allow all students to achieve success and participate in rigorous instruction.
Steelman, Jessica	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) will provide materials and knowledge of content to ensure equity among all students and classrooms. They will support the instructional coach in monitoring the teacher and student use of curriculum and access to culturally responsive texts.
Rodriguez, Raquel	Math Coach	The Math Coach will model, build capacity, and assist K-5 teachers with Math skills and standards-based instruction. She will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful with Math standards. She builds capacity within Math Interventionists to maximize student support in Math and assist in vertically aligning primary instruction to intermediate instruction.
Solano, Lena	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach will model, build capacity, and assist K-5 teachers with Reading skills and standards-based instruction. She will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful with Reading standards. She builds capacity within Reading Interventionists to maximize student support in Reading and assist in vertically aligning primary instruction to intermediate instruction.
Hassan Camacho, Abdel	Dean	The dean will provide social-emotional learning to our high-needs students to improve their resiliency. The dean will also oversee behavior management for our student body.

**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 leadership team was involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan by analyzing data, reflecting on overall trends, establishing measurable goals for areas of focus, designing action steps, and planning ongoing monitoring for implementation. The Spring Panorama Survey provided input from families, teachers, and staff. This information was used through the SIP development process.

**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))

Through bi-weekly leadership team meetings as well as data meetings, the team will reflect on the effectiveness and progress of the action steps to determine if adjustments need to be made to achieve the SIP measurable goals.

Demographic Data	
<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	93%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 ESSA Identification</b>	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	



<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	
--	--

**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	20	46	35	33	27	22	0	0	0	183	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	28	33	0	0	0	70	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	16	21	0	0	0	46	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	27	22	29	28	0	0	0	0	106	

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	15	13	14	32	24	0	0	0	98

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	21	41	34	37	30	28	0	0	0	191	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	1	11	26	35	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	17	32	0	0	0	58	
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	1	0	9	17	32	0	0	0	59

**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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	21	41	34	37	30	28	0	0	0	191	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	1	11	26	35	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	17	32	0	0	0	58	
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	1	0	9	17	32	0	0	0	59

**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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
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*	46	57	56	47	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	52	62	61	58	58	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47	50	52	55	52	53
Math Achievement*	54	61	60	53	63	63
Math Learning Gains	57	66	64	56	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43	56	55	45	48	51
Science Achievement*	39	56	51	47	56	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	67			66		

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	49			

**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	46	52	47	54	57	43	39					67

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
SWD	5	26	37	17	33	29	6					40
ELL	41	56	59	53	60	47	38					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	53	40	52	59	43	17					
HSP	46	50	49	54	56	43	43					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			53								
FRL	43	53	53	51	53	38	36					67

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	43	48	40	43	36	54	38					49
SWD	9	33	31	13	31	40	0					26
ELL	40	54	44	46	47	69	35					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	24		30	19		25					
HSP	46	54	48	44	39	62	40					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62			62								
FRL	40	46	32	37	40	56	38					40

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	47	58	55	53	56	45	47					66
SWD	8	38	45	25	52	44						70
ELL	41	66	67	47	55	56	38					66
AMI												

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
ASN												
BLK	46	58	58	47	50	46	39					60
HSP	46	58	55	52	57	47	49					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			73								
FRL	43	55	56	49	51	42	46					64

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	54%	-13%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	62%	-12%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	59%	-23%	51%	-15%

## 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.**

Based on the raw FAST data for the 2022-2023 school year, the data component that showed the lowest performance by grade level is 5th grade ELA with 41% proficiency and 44% proficiency in Math. Overall, the data component that showed the lowest performance is ELA with 44% proficiency contrasted with 47% proficiency in Math. Also, Science proficiency was very low with 36% proficiency on the last Science PMA.

One of the contributing factors, particularly with the 5th-grade data components, was the difficulty with maintaining consistent classroom environments and teaching styles due to multiple changes in classroom personnel. This factor created inconsistent classroom environments when students had to be exposed to different rules, procedures, and expectations throughout the school year.

A trend that can be easily identified is the level of proficiency in Science. Historically, the school has not been able to increase proficiency in this area for 5th grade. Contributing factors to this level of performance are the lack of academic vocabulary and the application of Science concepts. Also, the low level of proficiency in Reading affects the performance in Science.

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

The data component that shows the greatest decline from last year is 3rd-grade Math. In 2021-2022 FSA data, third grade showed a level of proficiency of 59%. Even though we are comparing different tests and standards, we can conclude that there is a lack of Math foundational skills and fluency as shown by the 47% proficiency in the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment data. The factor that contributed to this decline is the initial gap demonstrated in PM1 data with a 3% proficiency. These results are evidence of students entering third grade with a lack of mastery of Math Standards.

**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 fifth-grade Reading proficiency data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The school proficiency percentage for 5th-grade Reading was 41% and for the state was 54%. Changes in personnel in the Fifth Grade ELA Department are a major contributing factor to this gap. These personnel changes, combined with the implementation of new standards taught by teachers who were achieving fluency with them created unique challenges that affected student performance.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Fourth Grade in Math, increasing from 6% proficiency in PM1 to 51% in PM3 showing a growth of 45%. In addition, Third Grade also showed an increase of 44% in the same subject. More consistent data chats with grade levels, common planning, and monitoring of the alignment of instruction across classrooms were actions implemented in this area.

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

An area of potential concern is students who have been absent 10% or more days of the year. In total, 183 students fit this category, with 82 students in third to fifth grade and 101 students in grades kindergarten through second grade. These numbers support the lack of foundational skills in some grade levels.

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

The priorities for school improvement for the year 2023-2024 are:

1. Decrease the number of students with 10% or more absent days in the school year.
2. Increase the percentage of proficient students in Reading in the Third, Fourth, and Fifth grades.
3. Increase the percentage of proficient students in Math in grades Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grade.
4. Increase the percentage of proficient students in Fifth Grade Science.

#### **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 Small Group 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 classroom walkthrough observations, poor performance of formative assessments, and PLC discussions, it was evident that there is a need for planning for rigorous and differentiated small-group instruction that will support low performing students, particularly students with disabilities.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By establishing and implementing rigorous and differentiated small-group instruction, our overall achievement will increase in ELA and Mathematics. On the 2023-2024 PM3 ELA FAST assessment, the amount of proficient students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points from 44% to 54%. On the 2023-2024 PM3 Math FAST assessment, the amount of proficient students will increase by a minimum of 10% points from 47% to 57%.

On the 2022 FAST ELA Assessment our SWD showed a 5% proficiency and on the FAST Math assessment our SWD showed a 17% proficiency rate. This year, by improving our small-group instruction we will increase our SWD student achievement by 38% percent on the 2023-2024 PM3 ELA FAST assessment from 5% to 43%- and by 26% on the 2023-2024 PM3 Math assessment - from 17% to 43%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration and Math and Reading Coaches will focus on the effective implementation of district curriculum resources and the intentional planning of differentiated instruction conducted through small groups. This focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and standards-based unit assessments (SBUA). Teachers will identify and closely monitor SWD performance and discussions about their progress will take in place during PLC meetings in order to make instructional adjustments to support this group of students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Edmi Figueroa Solis (edmi.figueroasolis@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 effectively implement a multiple evidence-based intervention programs to support the academic growth of students with disabilities. For Reading, students will be working on Exact Path, SIPPS, and RAZ Plus. In Math, students' learning will be supported by Succes Maker, MDIS, Number Worlds, Reflex Math.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected to ensure that students' needs are addressed during small group instruction in both reading and math in order to increase achievement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 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.

Analyze data for each class monthly to ensure that students are grouped for ELA small group differentiation.

**Person Responsible:** Lena Solano (lena.solano@ocps.net)

**By When:** September 5th

Analyze data for each class monthly to ensure that students are grouped for Math small-group differentiation.

**Person Responsible:** Raquel Rodriguez (raquel.rodriguez@ocps.net)

**By When:** September 7th

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment****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.

Teacher retention and recruitment is a crucial need due to a high-mobility rate of instructional personnel. This year, we are implementing more systems of support for teachers. These systems include a stronger mentoring program, scheduling activities that foster team building within our school community, more frequent positive and actionable feedback through classroom visits, implementing teacher recognition initiatives, and an enhanced system to request teacher input.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Meadow Woods Elementary plans to increase the favorable perception of the overall social and learning climate by a minimum of 10%, from 57% to at least of 67%, as measured by the 2023 Spring Panorama Education Stakeholder Survey.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored by teacher input in the 2023-2024 Winter Panorama Education Stakeholder Survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Edmi Figueroa Solis (edmi.figueroasolis@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.)

The evidence-based interventions being implemented for this area of focus are a strong mentoring program, team-building activities that strengthen relationships, positive and actionable feedback through classroom visits, a teacher recognition program, and an enhanced system to request teacher input.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected based on district requirements, strengthen relationships among staff members, highlight the abilities and efforts of teachers, and ensure that teachers' perceptions are heard and valued.

**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.

Implementation and enhancement of a strong mentoring program throughout the year.

**Person Responsible:** Rachel Fox (rachel.fox@ocps.net)

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

Well-balanced Wednesdays. One Wednesday a month, different school teams will organize fellowships where teachers and staff will gather to enjoy time together and reflect on the 2023-2024 journey.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Steelman (jessica.steelman@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

Classroom Walkthroughs for positive and actionable feedback will be conducted at least twice a week.

**Person Responsible:** Lena Solano (lena.solano@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year

Every month, a teacher will be highlighted as Teacher of the Month. This teacher will be announced on the school newsletter, the school marquee, and social media, and will receive a certificate.

**Person Responsible:** Rachel Fox (rachel.fox@ocps.net)

**By When:** Every Month

Teachers will provide input through a comment box targeting areas of growth in the Panorama Survey.

**Person Responsible:** Rachel Fox (rachel.fox@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 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).

Meadow Woods Elementary's students' data is consistently monitored with an emphasis on students with disabilities. The School Leadership team, teachers, and staff are part of the decision-making process to determine the resources that are needed to support these students.

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our area of focus to improve our K-2 Reading/ELA will be improving the differentiation of small-group instruction to better address the needs of our students to close the achievement gap and build foundational reading skills. Small-group instruction will allow our teachers to work closely with their students to target the specific skills they have deficits in and allow them to build those skills through targeted interventions. Small-group instruction will help students develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link letters and teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

Our area of focus to improve our 3-5 Reading/ELA will be improving the differentiation of small-group instruction to better address the needs of our students to close the achievement gap and build foundational reading skills. Small-group instruction will allow our teachers to work closely with their students to target the specific skills they have deficits in and allow them to build those skills through targeted interventions. Small-group instruction will help students develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link letters and teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

### **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**

By improving our small group instruction, we expect to see a 10% proficiency increase in our K-2 students ELA achievement on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

By improving our small group instruction, we expect to see a 10% proficiency increase in our 3-5 students ELA achievement on F.A.S.T. by the end of 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.

Administration and our Reading Coach will complete weekly Reading walkthroughs. We will have monthly data meetings to ensure students are properly grouped in their small-groups to ensure they will get the instruction needed to close achievement gaps. Data analysis will come from K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring, SIPPS progress monitoring, district-created standard-based unit assessments (SBUA's), and Exact Path will also be used to monitor progress.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Figueroa Solis, Edmi, edmi.figueroasolis@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?

Small-group differentiated instruction will allow us to target our students specific learning needs and help them close their achievement gaps. K-1 DIBELS, Heggerty, and SIPPS will give students the opportunities to develop awareness of sounds in speech, decode words, and write and recognize words. Exact Path and standards-based small group instruction will allow students to ask questions to better understand the text, teach students a routine for determining the gist of a text, and teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

**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?

K-1 DIBELS, Heggerty, and SIPPS allow students the chance to develop the awareness of the segments in sounds in speech; how they link letters, and teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; and, build students’ decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. Exact Path and our small-group instruction will provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly and routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

**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
Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team will have monthly meetings to analyze data, identify trends, and create actions steps to address them. Based of monthly data analysis, actions steps will be adjusted as needed.	Fox, Rachel, rachel.fox@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching - Reading Coach will attend District Coaching meetings. She will also implement coaching cycles as a result of collection of data from classroom walkthroughs. The reading coach will also model lesson and will be an active participant of PLC planning by providing support to teachers with best planning and instruction practices.	Solano, Lena, lena.solano@ocps.net
Assessments - We will use and analyze data from FAST, Hegerty, SIPPS, SBUAs, and Exact Path to determine interventions and support the needs of students.	Guarino, Joseph, joseph.guarino@ocps.net

**Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**  
List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan will be presented to the faculty and staff at a staff meeting. It will be presented to parents and the community at SAC meetings, and it will be posted on the school website. A QR Code will be shared with the community during school events and meetings.  
<https://www.floridacims.org/districts/orange>

**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))



Meadow Woods Elementary Parent Liaison ensures that families are welcomed to our school and are also informed of any updates. This person establishes relationships with stakeholders who partner with our school to ensure that our community is involved in the accomplishment of the school's mission and to support the needs of students. Parents are informed through our website, social media, and SAC meetings.

School website: <https://meadowwoodses.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)**

By implementing rigorous small-group instruction with high-quality centers, the academic programs will be strengthened in both Reading and Math by first assessing students' foundational skills to fill the gaps. Efficient and effective small-group instruction will allow teachers to provide personalized and constructive feedback. Teachers will plan their differentiated small groups and purposeful centers during common planning meetings. Using the CRMs and provided resources will increase the amount and quality of learning time. The district-provided resources such as the Wonders curriculum, Raz Plus, The Bookroom, SIPPS, and Being a Reader will help provide students with enrichment and acceleration. Our goal is to close the achievement gap through the effective implementation of these resources.

**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))**

The plan was developed in coordination with the Head Start program and adult education programs. Teachers in the VPK program will also implement meaningful small groups and centers that will prepare students for their elementary education. To promote school involvement, this year we will be hosting ESOL classes designed for limited English proficient students, 16 years of age or older. These classes will also incorporate small groups to focus on more one-to-one attention which results in improved student outcomes. These parents improve their English language skills to increase their ability to communicate in English for a variety of purposes including employment, higher education, and for life in the United States.

## 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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

### Budget Approval

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

No