

Orange County Public Schools

Ivey Lane Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Ivey Lane Elementary

209 SILVERTON ST, Orlando, FL 32811

<https://iveylanees.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 our families and communities, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Galbraith, Gorsha | Principal | Mrs. Galbraith serves as the instructional leader of Ivey Lane Elementary School. She monitors instructional delivery of the standards and allocation of resources to ensure students are provided with a high-quality education. The principal will facilitate instructional rounds and provide teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. The principal engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources directly impacting student achievement. Mrs. Galbraith establishes systems of guidance that result in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. Equally important, she provides avenues for teachers to collaborate, plan rigorous lessons, and contribute input for the optimal functioning of the school. |
| Cantrell, Jason | Assistant Principal | Mr. Cantrell is one of the instructional leaders on campus. Along with the principal he monitors the instructional delivery of the standards. Mr. Cantrell facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. The assistant principal partners with the principal to implement systems and structures that yield a strong learning environment. He has the responsibility of analyzing common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. Mr. Cantrell is also responsible for monitoring the discipline process to ensure a positive school climate and safe working environment. |
| McNamee, Stephanie | Instructional Coach | Mrs. McNamee serves as the instructional coach. She supports the administrative team in leading professional development in the content area of science. She utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in need of Tier II and Tier III support. She also provides support to teachers in developing best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. Mrs. McNamee provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. In her other role, she serves as the testing coordinator, she oversees the organization and administration of school-based, district level and state. |
| McKinney, Roderick | Math Coach | Mr. McKinney serves as the math instructional coach. As the academic coach, he facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity. Equally important, he also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. |
| Huff-Robinson, Nicole | ELL Compliance Specialist | Ms. Huff serves as the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) coordinator, ESOL Compliance Specialist, and Title I coordinator. As the MTSS coordinator, she oversees the school wide MTSS process by ensuring teachers and support staff are collecting academic and behavioral data with fidelity and providing the appropriate intervention support for the students in need of TIER II and TIER III support. Ms. Huff also facilitates and monitors services for English Language Learners |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | (ELLs) and organizes the Multicultural Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings. The CCT also assists teachers in implementing instructional strategies and monitors the effectiveness of those strategies. She facilitates professional development, data meetings, and assists the Reading Coach with common planning to build teacher capacity. Ms. Huff provides targeted instruction to identify TIER II and TIER III students. |
| Sanders, Chastity | Staffing Specialist | Ms. Sanders monitors and supports the exceptional student education (ESE) programs at the school by ensuring that all district, state, and federal guidelines are met. Ms. Sanders supports classroom instruction by pushing into multiple classrooms to provide focused, differentiated small group instruction on targeted reading skills. |
| Cunningham, Latoya | Dean | Ms. Cunningham serves as the math instructional coach. As the academic coach, she facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity. Equally important, she also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. |
| Robinson, Tiara | Teacher, ESE | Mrs. Robinson serves as the reading and math interventionist. She provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments as well as ESE services. She also provides support to teachers in developing best practices for delivering standard-based instruction |
| Hosey, Karrie | Reading Coach | Ms. Hosey serves as the Reading Specialist. As the academic coach, she facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity. Equally important, she also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. |

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.

Leadership team members initiate the School Improvement Plan (SIP) process by opening the template and reviewing the requested information including any updates. In answering questions for the school improvement process, state data is reviewed and shared school-wide and information is disaggregated so that root causes can be identified and actions steps planned. School improvement processes are shared with staff and parents through School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings which many times coincides with PTA/PTO meetings allowing for more parental involvement. Data and SIP action steps are

connected to the planning process for instruction during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and progress can then be tracked.

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))

Once the data has been reviewed, root causes have been identified and action steps developed to address the needs, monitoring becomes key to the school improvement process. Continually new data from the students are reviewed and adjustments are made if an increased proficiency is not apparent. Action steps may then be revised with modifications to allocate additional resources in order to keep students moving and progressing, and to ensure that gaps are being closed.

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 99% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F |
| 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 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 29 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 2 | 5 | 26 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | |

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 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

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 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 9 | 22 | 25 | 21 | 8 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| 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 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 9 | 22 | 25 | 21 | 8 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| 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 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2019 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 33 | 57 | 56 | 31 | 57 | 57 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59 | 62 | 61 | 59 | 58 | 58 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 61 | 50 | 52 | 62 | 52 | 53 |
| Math Achievement* | 56 | 61 | 60 | 54 | 63 | 63 |
| Math Learning Gains | 71 | 66 | 64 | 70 | 61 | 62 |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 74 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 48 | 51 |
| Science Achievement* | 40 | 56 | 51 | 37 | 56 | 53 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 0 | 50 | | 0 | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 66 | | | 48 | | |

* 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 | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 460 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 55 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 56 | | | |
| HSP | 66 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

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 | 33 | 59 | 61 | 56 | 71 | 74 | 40 | | | | | 66 |
| SWD | 10 | 45 | | 25 | 46 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 53 | | 60 | 82 | | 42 | | | | | 66 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 59 | 62 | 54 | 71 | 75 | 39 | | | | | 58 |
| HSP | 44 | | | 75 | | | | | | | | 80 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 58 | 59 | 55 | 69 | 73 | 39 | | | | | 60 |

| 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 | 31 | 58 | 75 | 45 | 40 | 42 | 40 | | | | | 46 |
| SWD | 11 | | | 21 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 64 | | 52 | 64 | | | | | | | 46 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 55 | 73 | 46 | 36 | 36 | 38 | | | | | 36 |
| HSP | 48 | | | 43 | | | | | | | | 60 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 61 | 73 | 47 | 45 | 40 | 48 | | | | | 47 |

| 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 | 31 | 59 | 62 | 54 | 70 | 55 | 37 | | | | | 48 |
| SWD | 13 | 62 | 85 | 28 | 64 | 62 | 13 | | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 63 | | 89 | 93 | | | | | | | 48 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 58 | 57 | 52 | 68 | 52 | 31 | | | | | 45 |
| HSP | 28 | 57 | | 74 | 89 | | 42 | | | | | 50 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 56 | 60 | 53 | 71 | 61 | 34 | | | | | 43 |

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 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 54% | -15% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 60% | -20% | 58% | -18% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 52% | -24% | 50% | -22% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 59% | -9% | 59% | -9% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 62% | -15% | 61% | -14% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 55% | -6% | 55% | -6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 59% | -15% | 51% | -7% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The component that showed the lowest performance was in ELA achievement. Although there was a 2-percentage point increase from 2021-2022, ELA continues to show the least amount of growth. ELA school data (2022-2023) reflected the lowest proficiency with only 32% of students achieving a level 3 or higher. There is a critical need to increase ELA achievement so students can develop important language skills, further develop vocabulary skills, and learn to read fluently and comprehend text across all content areas.

Another identified trend includes the Students with Disabilities (SWD) performing the lowest in ELA at 10% and Math at 25% compared to the other four subgroups.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline was in ELA achievement. The factors that contributed to this decline were students' lack of foundational skills, phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary readiness.

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.

ELA data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The contributing factors for this trend were

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

The 2022-2023 Florida Statewide Science data component showed the most improvement. Science proficiency increased from 40% to 48%; which demonstrates an 8 percentage point increase. The school teams implemented the use of "High Impact" strategies, small group differentiated instruction, developed flexible groupings, and placed an emphasis on building teacher capacity on analyzing Science and ELA data.

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

No Data is in EWS Part 1

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

- Taking Deeper Dive in the MTSS Framework
- Analyzing Formative, Summative, and Demographic Data (with an emphasis on subgroups)
- Implementing and Deconstructing the BEST Standards (grades K-5)
- Providing Targeted Support for the ESE and ELL Subgroup
- Differentiating lessons for Small Group Instruction (across all content areas)

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Ivey Lane Elementary student achievement will increase in ELA as a result of Implementing instructional strategies, analyzing multiple sources of data, and providing ongoing professional development that align with the B.E.S.T Standards. In addition, the School-based leadership team and district support will continue to place an emphasis on targeting small group differentiated instruction, increasing student proficiency in ELA and Science. Grade level teams will consistently and collaboratively plan standards-based lessons combined with delivering rigorous instruction to include effective monitoring and authentic engagement strategies. Based on the 2022-2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), there is a need for instruction to be more rigorous by building the instructional capacity of the teachers, interventionists, and support staff. In ELA, less than 50% of the students were proficient on the FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on 2022-2023 FAST Data:

ELA proficiency will increase from 32% to 45% (+17)

3rd Grade proficiency will increase from 28% to 42% (+14)

Science proficiency will increase from 48% to 55% (+7)

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by the school-based leadership team and district support. The team will develop a walkthrough schedule to observe all teachers and interventionists receiving TIER II and TIER III support. School-based leadership team and district support will provide side-by-side support using the coaching cycle for targeted teachers and interventionists. School-based teams and district support will monitor teacher's and interventionists' instructional practices during classroom walkthroughs. The actionable feedback will be shared with individual teachers and interventionists. Additionally, feedback will be shared through weekly PLCs and bi-weekly data and MTSS meetings. DIBELS, SIPPS, F.A.S.T progress monitoring assessments, standards-based unit assessments, and Exact Path will also be used to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gorsha Galbraith (gorsha.galbraith@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 the Area of Focus are DIBELS, SIPPS, LLI, Phonics for Reading, UFLI Foundations, and Exact Path.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to identify those at risk of reading failure early in development, before they actually fail, and to provide them with effective instruction and, if necessary, early intervention. In addition to screening and placing students, monitoring the progress of student learning is essential to determine which skills need to be retaught. Formative assessments will be

administered weekly or monthly, depending on the frequency of the intervention and the number of skills taught.

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.

Grade Level Teams (K-5) will participate in weekly common planning, facilitated by the school leadership team to strengthen the instructional staff's understanding of the BEST standards. During the common planning sessions, the teams will take a deeper dive into the ELA BEST standards, questioning and engagement strategies, and monitoring techniques. The MTSS coordinator, along with the school-based leadership team will continue to meet with teachers, interventionists, and support staff bi-weekly to discuss student progress and areas of concern in ELA and Science. ESE support will increase their collaboration with students, teachers, and instructional coaches. A push-in classroom schedule will be developed in order to ensure the SWD scholars are receiving as stated in their IEP.

Person Responsible: Gorsha Galbraith (gorsha.galbraith@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

The school-based leadership team will continue to build a school-wide system to observe instructional practices by creating a monthly instructional walkthrough schedule to collect data on instructional trends and student outcomes. Additionally, a walkthrough schedule will be created to provide feedback and support targeted Tier II and Tier III teachers and interventionists within the coaching cycle.

Person Responsible: Gorsha Galbraith (gorsha.galbraith@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

The Reading Coach, MTSS Coordinator, and Staff Specialist will provide professional development aligned to standards-based instruction, student engagement, monitoring for student understanding, and implementing accommodations with fidelity. Additionally, the instructional staff will be provided with a satisfaction survey to determine additional desired professional development for the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Nicole Huff-Robinson (nicole.huff-robinson@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023-April 2024

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

Ivey lane Elementary will continue to create a positive culture and environment specifically related to the Social Emotional Learning. It is vitally important to create a culture of social and emotional learning for the entire school community. Ivey lane Elementary students will develop social-emotional skills in rigorous focused cognitive learning that will impact academic success in a variety of settings.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There were 102 students at Ivey Lane for the 2022-2023 school year with absences of 10% or more days from school. For the 2023-2024 school year, Ivey Lane will reduce the number of students with 10% or more absences by 15% from 102 to 85 students.

In reducing the number of students with 10% or more absences, we will also:

- Reduce the number of students having two or more early warning indicators by 40%
- Reduce the number of students having attendance below 90 percent by 40%

Monitoring:

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

The school-based leadership team, in conjunction with the school- based Social Emotional Learning Leadership Team, will provide professional development to all staff strengthening the awareness and importance of Social

Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL). Additionally, the implementation of the strategies will be monitored by the SELL Team on a bi-weekly basis. All grade levels (K-5) will implement class meetings to build relationships with students and develop a positive classroom community. A specific day

and time will be assigned to each grade level to ensure that class meetings are taking place with fidelity.

Lastly, CHAMPS, the positive school-wide management plan, will sill support the SELL initiative throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Cantrell (jason.cantrell@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 school based leadership team along with the Social Emotional Learning team will continue to provide professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data. Each classroom will work to implement class meetings to build relationships with students and develop a positive classroom community which contributes to the overall development of a positive culture school wide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Professional development on Social Emotional Learning (SEL), teaching students conative skills, and SMART goals are areas that are beneficial to the students' long term comprehension of academic content. Infusing SEL components in the daily academic language and activities will reduce the amount of students scoring at a Level 1 by 25%.

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.

Provide professional development on strengthening awareness and importance of Social Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) with all instructional staff, support staff, and with school community stakeholders three times per year. (September 2023, January 2024, April 2024)

Person Responsible: Jason Cantrell (jason.cantrell@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023-April 2024

Increase the percentage of students in attendance daily through Social Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) and mental wellness initiatives such as:

- Promote stronger relationships between teachers, administrators, support staff, students, parents, and community partners
- Use Talking points to communicate with parents about school-wide initiatives, student behaviors, community events and resources
- Calm corner in each classroom
- Send letters home to families with attendance encouragement and strategies for support
- Let students earn points for high attendance and redeem points from the Knights school store

Person Responsible: Jason Cantrell (jason.cantrell@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Continue to implement the CHAMPS Behavior Management System to support classroom management, positively influence students engagement, and help increase academic achievement. CHAMPS is a positive and

proactive approach that allow the instructional and support staff to teach behavior expectations throughout the school day. CHAMPS training during the 2023-2024 school year will center around the topics below:

- Improve classroom behavior (on-task, work completion, cooperation)
- Establish clear classroom behavior expectations with logical and fair responses to misbehavior
- Motivate students to put forth their best efforts (perseverance, pride in work)
- Increase academic engagement, resulting in improved test scores
- Teach students to behave respectfully and to value diversity
- Develop a common language about behavior among all staff
- Create a plan for orienting and supporting new staff

The dean will monitor the progress of CHAMPS on a monthly basis and provide the school team with updates during the leadership and staff meetings.

Person Responsible: Jason Cantrell (jason.cantrell@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on 2022-2023 FAST data. There is an urgent need for improvement with our Students with Disabilities (SWD). Students with Disabilities subgroup show very minimal growth compared to the other four subgroups. This ESSA subgroup has consistently been below the 41% ESSA threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Forty percent of Students with Disabilities will show an increase of at least one level on the ELA FAST from Progress Monitoring #1 to PM #3.

Monitoring:

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

Analyze FAST progress monitoring data, EXACT Path diagnostics, and standards-based assessments to make ongoing instructional shifts in classroom instruction and interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gorsha Galbraith (gorsha.galbraith@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 the Area of Focus are DIBELS, SIPPS, LLI, Phonics for Reading, UFLI Foundations, and Exact Path to target the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to provide our students with disabilities explicit and systematic instruction with an emphasis on building connections across visual, auditory, and kinesthetic/tactile domains.

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.

The Reading Coach, MTSS Coordinator, and Staff Specialist will provide professional development aligned to standards-based instruction, student engagement, monitoring for student understanding, and implementing accommodations with fidelity. Additionally, the instructional staff will be provided with a satisfaction survey to determine additional desired professional development for the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Nicole Huff-Robinson (nicole.huff-robinson@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023-April 2024

Data will be continuously collected and analyzed for all students to monitor student growth and the effectiveness of reading interventions. A frequent, structured system of data collection and support modification will occur for all ESSA subgroups with a heavy emphasis on the Student with Disabilities subgroup.

Person Responsible: Gorsha Galbraith (gorsha.galbraith@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

The school-based leadership team and district support will continue analyzing formative and summative assessments. Data will be evaluated to ensure the effectiveness of the common planning process. Once data is evaluated, adjustments will be made to instructional delivery/lessons but also utilized to strategically reorganize extra reading hour and teacher-led small groups to intentionally target the needs of Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Gorsha Galbraith (gorsha.galbraith@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The school's review of the use of the resources supported by funding sources inclusive of general funds and those funds dedicated to school improvement activities are considered. A determination of a lack of resources which can be deficit of people and time may contribute to low performance. Ivey Lane Elementary will address this deficit by supporting the planning process and tutoring for students through after-school sessions. The afterschool sessions will allow teachers to further plan for the teaching and learning processes as well as offer additional support to students. Monies for this venture will come from Title I funds.

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

63% of Kindergarten students scored proficient on the 22-23 EOY STAR Early Literacy assessment. Kindergarten students did not take the STAR Reading assessment.

50% of 1st-grade students scored proficient on the 22-23 EOY STAR reading and STAR Reading assessment.

31% of 2nd-grade students scored proficient on the 22-23 EOY STAR reading assessments.

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:

- * Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

- *To prepare students to read words and comprehend text.

- * Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

- *To allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

The following programs will monitor progress: Wonders, SIPPS, UFLI, Exact Path, DIBELS, and Core Phonics Survey.

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

The following outcomes for intermediate-level grades for ELA at Ivey Lane Elementary School:

65% of our students scored below a level 3 on FAST

72% of third-grade students scored below a level 3

60% of our fourth-grade students scored below a level 3

62 % of our fifth-grade students scored below a level 3

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:

Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

- *To prepare students to read words and comprehend text.

- * Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

- *To allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

For Grades 4-5:

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA's strong level of evidence requirements: Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9:

- * Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

- *To think analytically and follow increasingly intricate series of evidence.

- * PLCs will continue to be led by qualified coaches, and teachers will be expected to model, insert collaborative structures (in each lesson), identify possible misconceptions, and insert scaffolding questions when necessary.

The following programs will be used for monitoring instruction and gathering data: Exact Path, Wonders

Benchmark Advance, Being a Reader, UFLI, Measuring Up, Magnetic, Learning Checks, and Spiral Review.

Teachers will focus on structured literacy. All instruction should be explicit and engaging with an aligned student task. Professional development will be added throughout the year. We are also offering extra planning days after school on Saturdays and at the end of each marking period.

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

Last year % of K-2 students achieved a proficient score on the STAR early literacy /STAR reading assessments. By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, at least 50% of K-2 students will score proficiently.

- By the end of the year, % of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidence using progress monitoring.
- By the end of the year, % of students in 1st will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidence using progress monitoring.
- By the end of the year, % of students in 2nd will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidence using progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Last year, 32% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in reading on the state assessment.

- By the end of the year at least 42% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the FAST ELA assessment, as evidence using progress monitoring.
- By the end of the year at least % of students in 4th grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the FAST ELA assessment, as evidence using progress monitoring.
- By the end of the year at least % of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the FAST ELA assessment, as evidence using progress monitoring.

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.

Monitoring is completed through various means, including a walkthrough and classroom monitoring forms. Coaching logs are completed for TIERED teachers required. Weekly PLC meetings where teachers will bring data, a focus on subgroups (SWD, Black. ELL, and FRL), and student needs will be discussed to address closing the achievement gaps.

Monitoring for standards-aligned instruction will take place in the classroom through daily walkthroughs. Continued monitoring will help us determine what gaps still exist when mastery is not occurring and

adjustments must be made. Coaches work closely with teachers to improve instructional practices. Biweekly data chats and or goal setting with students; MTSS interventions for our Tier II and Tier III students will be addressed bi weekly and documented as well. These monitoring processes should lead to an increase in student outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Galbraith, Gorsha, gorsha.galbraith@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?

Ivey Lane receives support from the School Transformation office and will use evidence-based programs such as Heggerty, SIPPS, being a reader, multi-sensory kits Exact Path, UFLI, MEasuring Up, and DIBELS for Instruction and/ or monitoring. Ivey Lane will align with the District’s expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted professional development, and differentiated instruction for students who are identified as needing Tier II and Tier III support. We will use streamlined classroom walkthrough tools to monitor instruction and identify trends.

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?

The following evidence-based practices/ programs address the identified needs and have a proven record for effectiveness:

- The foundational pieces of the optional daily slides teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
- Use comprehension slides in daily instruction to help students understand the text.
- Heggerty Phonemic awareness is used to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and the connections to letters.
- SIPPS builds students' decoding skills so they are able to read complex and multi-syllabic words.
- Being a reader is used to develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech. Helps students build decoding skills in order to read complex text.
- OCPS multisensory kits teach students decoding skills, how to analyze word parts, and how to recognize and write words.

- Exact Path is used to build students' decoding skills so they can read complex text. It builds fluency, allowing students to read effortlessly. It is used to build comprehension and 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 |
|---|---|
| <p>Literacy Leadership Teams</p> <p>The Leadership Team meets weekly to analyze data and adjust action steps based upon assessments and Classroom Walk-throughs. PLCs are attended weekly as well to give instructional support and feedback from the trend data from the Classroom Walk-throughs. Identified trends for an individual teacher will be shared in private with that individual.</p> | Galbraith, Gorsha, gorsha.galbraith@ocps.net |
| <p>Literacy Coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Literacy coach participates in district coach meetings and uses data to identify areas of needs for instructional personnel. - The literacy coach will provide side-by-side coaching and model lessons to support the understanding or delivery of ELA content. - The Literacy Coach will support teachers to create appropriate scaffolds for SWD and ELL learners. | |
| <p>Assessment</p> <p>Analysis and use of the following data will occur to determine student understanding, to make appropriate interventions and to make adjustments as needed for students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -FAST -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2) -DIBELS (K-1) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5) -Benchmark Advanced -Exact Path (diagnostic and weekly lessons) | |
| <p>Professional Learning</p> <p>The school's Professional Development Plan is based upon the needs of the school from student outcomes and teacher-based needs whether in content or delivery. At Ivey Lane, professional learning will take place on Exact Path, UFLI, Being A Reader, small groups, and whole group instruction. Follow-up sessions will occur after implementation of these resources in order to correct any misconceptions of programs and to analyze data in order to make adjustments to student groups.</p> | |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is made available on the "School Information" pull-down menu of the school's website. To further disseminate the SIP information and garner additional input, the school shares the 2022-2023 school results from Progress Monitoring 3 for statewide assessments from the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) and End of Course (EOC) exams. Along with the data, SIP areas of focus, including interventions and measurable outcomes, are also revealed. Communication about the SIP occurs in faculty meetings, the School Advisory Council, and Open House as well

as being posted in the front office. Typically, the SIP information is presented to a joint School Advisory Council (SAC) and parent organization meetings where parental input is gathered. To increase parental awareness about the SIP, a QR code will be available at the Open House event at each teacher's door and various other locations in the school for parents to be able to review. Following the Open House event, a Class Dojo message will be sent to thank parents for attending. Open House and inform those who may have missed the event about the School Improvement Plan by providing a link. The QR code to SIP will also be posted in the front office so that parents new to the school may have quick access. Updates as to the progress being made toward the SIP goals will be shared at future SAC meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Communication is essential to building positive relationships with students, parents, teachers and other stakeholders. In advocating for increased opportunities for communication, the school will utilize flyers, school newsletters, grade-level newsletters, School Messenger phone messages, the marquee, email and Class Dojo. Links to information such as newsletters will be sent via Class Dojo to parents so information is not left in backpacks. Family Learning Nights will be held by the school to engage parents in their students' learning processes which can positively impact student achievement. The Family Engagement Plan will be available on the school's website via the "School Information" pull down menu and shared during School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings, and the Title I Annual Meeting. Upon posting the Family Engagement Plan on the school's website, a Class Dojo message will go out to share the link to the plan with parents.

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)

.In order to strengthen the academic program, students must attend school. By monitoring attendance and connecting with parents, time will increase for students to work with academic content which will lead to improved achievement. Cultivating solidarity through a House System with engaging activities and competitions appeals to students and increases attendance and involvement in their own learning. Small group instruction during ELA and math will allow for more targeted support and assist with reducing gaps that students may have. Areas of Focus which are being addressed include: 1) Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems, and 2) Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA.

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))

Providing opportunities for all children to meet challenging state academic standards is important for education. By addressing positive culture and instructional practice, students have a greater chance of success. In meeting the needs of the students, Title I monies are being used to purchase additional support resources. Additional resources from Magnetic Reading as well as University of Florida Literacy Institute (UFLI) materials to better support foundational reading will be procured through Title I funds. Science Bootcamp and Speed Bag will also be purchased to support reading through the content of science. Being a Title I school, Ivey Lane Elementary offers breakfast, lunch, and snacks during afterschool tutoring through the National School Lunch Program, which supports a positive learning environment.