

Sarasota County Schools

Ashton Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ashton Elementary School

5110 ASHTON RD, Sarasota, FL 34233

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/ashton

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.

We exist to ensure high levels of learning for all students and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school culture will encourage each person to be able to reach his or her fullest potential through respectful relationships and collaboration. We believe that each child is entitled to reach his/her fullest potential. We commit ourselves to developing and maintaining a school environment which encourages this growth.

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
Jarvis, Kristi	Principal	Direct oversight to SIP implementation
Ruscoe, Jacob	Assistant Principal	Assist with direct implementation and monitoring of SIP
Maurer, Matt	Teacher, K-12	Instructional and Administrative Support - Goal Monitoring
Barnes, Aimee	School Counselor	Related support to teachers for SIP implementation
Dove, Katy	School Counselor	Related support to teachers for SIP implementation
Isaacson, Denise	Teacher, ESE	Related support to teachers for SIP implementation
Valentine, Lauren	Behavior Specialist	Behavior support to teachers for SIP implementation
Griffith, Kelly	Behavior Specialist	Behavior support to teachers for SIP implementation
Dearing, Xiomara	Instructional Coach	Literacy support to teachers for SIP implementation
Kreger, Kerri	Instructional Coach	Intervention support to teachers for SIP implementation

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.

All data from the previous year is reviewed and shared with all stakeholders. Trends are identified as well as areas of needed growth. The SAC continually reviews student data and provides feedback on student performance. All of this input and analysis is used to identify the 3 areas of focus for our SIP.

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))

The SIP is a working document. It is continually reviewed with all stakeholders. As PM data is gathered and analyzed, the Guiding Coalition and SAC may make adjustments as warranted. Data is continually reviewed to monitor progress towards goal attainment. Quarterly data chats allow an ongoing review of student achievement data toward our goals.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	25	31	18	16	27	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	3	2	3	0	0	0	13
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	2	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	11	7	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	4	7	7	11	0	0	0	40

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	4	2	5	9	0	0	0	21

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	4	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	4	27	14	18	21	9	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	17

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	1	4	0	5	14	10	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	7	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	34
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	4	27	14	18	21	9	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	17

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	1	4	0	5	14	10	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	7	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	34
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	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	83	65	53	87	66	56	87		
ELA Learning Gains				77			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				72			71		
Math Achievement*	91	68	59	92	52	50	90		
Math Learning Gains				86			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				87			82		
Science Achievement*	92	69	54	84	67	59	86		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	68	59	80			86		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	665
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	76			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK				
HSP	77			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	84			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	79			

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	62			
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK				
HSP	79			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	75			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	83			91			92					74
SWD	46			59			50				4	
ELL	67			90			87				5	74
AMI												
ASN	82			92			94				4	
BLK												
HSP	74			90			82				5	71
MUL	82			88			92				4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	84			91			93				5	74
FRL	74			82			87				5	88

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	87	77	72	92	86	87	84					80
SWD	47	62	58	67	73	72	52					
ELL	80	85	83	81	79	68	67					80
AMI												
ASN	97	100		97	92		92					
BLK												
HSP	77	70	89	84	83	84	75					73
MUL	85	76		92	85		93					
PAC												
WHT	88	75	66	93	86	91	85					90
FRL	76	71	67	82	83	78	73					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	87	72	71	90	84	82	86					86
SWD	45	55	50	61	73	69	50					
ELL	77	89		82	89		89					86
AMI												
ASN	92	80		97	90		100					
BLK												
HSP	84	72	80	87	86	80	82					87
MUL	85	73		91	83		100					
PAC												
WHT	88	70	68	89	83	81	83					87
FRL	81	66	71	85	88	85	81					84

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	85%	67%	18%	54%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	67%	19%	58%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	87%	70%	17%	59%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	96%	70%	26%	61%	35%
05	2023 - Spring	95%	66%	29%	55%	40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	90%	67%	23%	51%	39%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our lowest performance was in Grade 3 ELA. This is our core group who experienced the pandemic during the formative early years of learning to read. This group of students have consistently performed below their past peers. However, this trend is not typical for our students.

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

Grade 3 ELA showed a decline in performance. This was the 1st year of the new FAST assessment which may play a factor. As noted above, these students learned to read during the pandemic and not being able to "see" sounds may be a contributing factor to this decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We do not have any areas of performance where a gap exists compared to the state average.

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

Our 5th Grade Math scores showed a 4% improvement from the prior year. Our school has established consistency using spiral review at multiple grade levels which is a contributing factor to overall math achievement. Students are exposed to grade level standards daily until mastery is achieved. Reteaching occurs one on one to increase student understanding.

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

Our main concerns will be 3rd (and now the group moving to 4th) ELA. It is imperative we implement structures and resources to reduce the achievement gap. Also, while we have made great strides in ESE performance, it remains below other subgroup areas and will continue to remain a focus.

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

1. ELA Performance
2. ESE Performance
3. Suspension/Discipline Data

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.

When disaggregating the ELA data, it is evident we need to continue to increase reading achievement. While our overall proficiency levels are high, there is room for improvement especially when comparing to math data of same students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2024, Ashton will demonstrate an increase of 4% in students demonstrating ELA proficiency as measured by state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through the use of the Intervention block time and structured tiered interventions, on going progress monitoring, and group discussions during PLCs. The PLC will be a primary vehicle to examine gaps in achievement and collaborate on instruction and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristi Jarvis (kristi.jarvis@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

1. Intervention support to identified students
2. PLC collaboration to address student performance
3. Small group, guided reading to work on specific standards showing deficit (Intervention Model and Jumpstart support)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The above strategies all focus on identifying, addressing and monitoring student performance in areas of noted deficit. The intervention support and small group instruction will provide a focused path to help students attain

mastery of the standards, The PLC collaboration will serve as the support to have a constant eye on student performance, make recommendations and adjust as necessary.

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 leaders of our Guiding Coalition, led by our principal, will collaborate with their teams to be sure each teacher is adhering to the fidelity of this process. The principal will obtain the intervention support, monitor teacher instruction and facilitate the Guiding Coalition as data is examined and any necessary

adjustments are made. Kindergarten and 2nd grade will have a dedicated teacher to work with students in their grade level to provide needed interventions. This instruction will be fluid based on need.

Person Responsible: Kristi Jarvis (kristi.jarvis@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: This process will be on-going throughout the school year. The administration will actively monitor these processes through attendance at PLCs, Data Chats and observations.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

SWD performance is far below that of other subgroups in our school. There is a significant gap in SWD in ELA and especially when compared to the same student performance in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2024, Ashton will demonstrate an increase of 4% in students with disabilities demonstrating ELA proficiency as measured by state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through strategic observations of instruction, especially with provided interventions. There will be on going progress monitoring, and group discussions during PLCs. The PLC will be a primary vehicle to examine gaps in achievement and collaborate on instruction and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacob Ruscoe (jacob.ruscoe@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

1. Structured tiered intervention implementation
2. Heggerty at grades K-2
3. Standards Based Instruction
4. PLC support to identify the needs of each student and actively implement and monitor supports to assist with closing these achievement gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. By addressing specific student needs through tiered intervention support, teachers are able to directly address and monitor progress towards achievement in these core standards.
2. Phonemic awareness is critical to the foundation of reading development. This resource will provide students with daily integration of these vital skills.
3. The standards are what every student is expected to know, understand and be able to do. With this approach, we ensure that every student is being taught the standards needed to demonstrate proficiency.
4. Collaboration is a key to success. The PLC process will allow all stakeholders to work together to help meet the needs of all students.

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 Guiding Coalition, lead by our principal, will work to provide the instructional direction to the school. This group will meet regularly to examine the ESE strategies implemented and provide feedback to the team as they work collaboratively with their ESE PLC. Our ESE AP will provide coaching to team members as well as regular data points as to progress based on this area of focus. The team will make any necessary adjustments based on the data and overall student performance.

Person Responsible: Jacob Ruscoe (jacob.ruscoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: The process will begin during preservice with PD. PLCs will be a constant focus and mechanism to drive instruction forward. Monthly collaboration regarding achievement will occur by all team members.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our office discipline referrals and out of school suspensions increased this past year. The data is not in line with district data or past data for our school. Key changes need to occur to create an environment where students are able to demonstrate appropriate behavior on a regular basis.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2024, Ashton will demonstrate a decrease of 10% in students receiving office discipline referrals AND out of school suspensions.

Monitoring:

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

Our PBIS team will actively monitor student discipline data. This group will identify trends and proactively adjust behavioral supports as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacob Ruscoe (jacob.ruscoe@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

1. Proactive Behavior Support for teachers - on-going training and structured process for support
2. PD on behavior management and tiered support for staff
3. Proactive behavior management support to provide (admin) tiered behavioral interventions to students
4. Monthly PLC meetings to look at behavioral data and trends

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Like with instructional interventions, behavior needs to be taught. Our improvement plan allows for a proactive approach to directly address student behavior and teach replacement behaviors. It also offers a high level of accountability for students and staff.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. PD provided to teachers on structures and process
2. Individualized support with behavioral interventions
3. Systematic process established for providing student support and monitoring
4. Coordination of monthly PLC meetings focused on behavior

Person Responsible: Jacob Ruscoe (jacob.ruscoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: The training will take place during preservice week. The other components will be on-going throughout the year. The team will actively monitor progress and implementation and adjust as needed.