Stanley Switlik Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stanley Switlik Elementary School

3400 OVERSEAS HWY, Marathon, FL 33050

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1375

Demographics

Principal: Linda Diaz C

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2022

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Stanley Switlik Elementary School

3400 OVERSEAS HWY, Marathon, FL 33050

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1375

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Stanley Switlik Elementary School will empower our diverse population of students to attain an educational foundation that enables them to be persistent learners who are prepared for success in college and careers in an ever changing global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Stanley Switlik school community fosters individual determination in a learning environment that emphasizes social/emotional well-being and academic goal setting to enable student citizens to act for the betterment of themselves and their community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Paul, Christine	Principal	Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision of all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.
Adams, Sarah	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of an elementary school program which meets the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Hendrix, Heather	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Heather Hendrix is the kindergarten chair.
Collins, Gayzel	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Gayzel Collins is the first grade chair.
Strama, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Nicole Strama is the second grade chair.
Forgrave, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Taylor Forgrave is the fourth grade chair.
Wert, Jeannette	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Jeanette Wert is the fifth grade chair.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sly, Tanya	Reading Coach	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Tanya Sly is an at-large member.
Meier, Christy	Instructional Coach	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Christy Meier is an at-large member.
Wiley, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Shannon Wiley is the specials department chair.
Willis, Chris	School Counselor	To advise the BLPT about student social and academic needs as well as provide guidance for positive behavior interventions and supports.
Fernandez, Amelia	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Amelia Fernandez is the ESE department chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/18/2022, Linda Diaz C

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

592

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	81	83	74	101	87	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	14	19	14	25	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	6	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/4/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	69	87	88	94	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	34	20	21	29	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	1	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	69	87	88	94	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	34	20	21	29	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	1	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	54%	56%				67%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						47%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						29%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	46%	50%				73%	71%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						66%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						59%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	57%	59%				66%	66%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	83%	70%	13%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	66%	8%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

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
2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	32	41	31	33	50	55	36				
ELL	24	48	40	34	53	57	25				
BLK	33			27							
HSP	41	54	41	46	61	53	46				
MUL	40			70							
WHT	70	68		74	78		72				
FRL	44	60	38	49	67	53	42				

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	40	23		37	31		38				
ELL	32	70		30	90		30				
HSP	53	52		49	65		61				
MUL	55			73							
WHT	68	42		68	52		60				
FRL	53	38		50	62		55				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	36	29	21	47	64	65	50				
ELL	44	46	45	69	62		60				
HSP	61	47	31	70	66	58	60				
WHT	75	47	27	77	69	64	81				
FRL	61	47	35	69	68	67	60				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Positive Trends
Academics
• 59% of students in grades 4 and 5 made ELA Learning Gains. This is the highest score since 2014.
• The 5th grade cohort made double digit gains in Math Proficiency going from 40 in 2021 to 56 in 2022.
• Lower Quartile ELA gains increased from 36 to 42.
• Math Learning Gains improved from 57 to 66
• First grade significantly reduced level 1 & 2 students to less than 10% in STAR Math.
• 53% of kindergarten students demonstrated high growth according to the spring STAR Reading SGP score.
• ESSA Subgroup identified below Federal Index in 2021-22 improved from 34% to 43% (Students with Disabilities)
Behavioral
• 41% of students who received Tier 2 support moved into Tier 1.
• 74% of students who received Tier 3 support moved into Tier 2.
Negative Trends
Academics
• Overall ELA Proficiency decreased from 58 to 52.
• Science Proficiency decreased from 60-53.
• Math Lower Quartile decreased from 64-51.
• ESSA subgroup below 41% (Black/African American subgroup)
Behavioral
• Chronic absenteeism has increase by 142% since 2020.
• EL students responded negatively to self-management and well-being on the spring assessment.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Overall FSA ELA and STAR Reading Proficiency and ensuring all ESSA subgroups meet the federal index continues to be the main priority for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors that led to this need-
• Inconsistent core instruction
• Inadequate materials
• Student and staff attendance
New actions to address ELA achievement
• Consistent core instruction: new resources and learning sequences.
• Classroom Lesson Structure using WICOR as an instructional approach
• Collaborative planning, supportive classrooms models, & coaching cycles
• Scheduled, daily, scaffolded Independent Reading time

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

• Overall ELA Learning Gains made the most improvement moving from 48 in 2021 to 59 in 2022. This is the highest score Switlik has had in this component since 2014.
• Continued ELA Lower Quartile Gains increasing from 29 in 2019 to 36 in 2021 and 42 in 2022.
• Increased Math Proficiency from 40 in 2021 to 56 in 2022.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

• Use of data to provide targeted support during the WIN period
• Differentiation during core periods
• Training in the use of supportive classroom models
• Collaborative and long range planning

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

• Standards based, explicit instruction, and foundational reading
• Use of data and assessment to identify knowledge gaps
• Grade level text and materials
• Collaborative Conversations

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional learning at the school level will be job embedded and directly grounded in the day-to-day practice of teaching and learning. PD will be delivered in whole group sessions, team sessions, and individually through coaching.
• Classroom Lesson Structure & AVID- Ongoing
• SIP Goals, Data Analysis & Professional Growth Plan Alignment (10/5/22) with follow-up (12/16/22)
• Restorative Practices (10/10/22)

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Improvement efforts will be monitored by the building level planning team. The principal, assistant principal, and coaches will serve as instructional leaders and provide regular observations and feedback to teachers. Model classrooms will be developed to build capacity at all grade level teams and programs. Coaches will be in classrooms 51% of the day.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities 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 critical need from the data reviewed.**	Overall ELA Performance decreased significantly since the pandemic and has continued to decline.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Overall ELA Performance will increase from 52% to 62% with grade three achieving 70% on F.A.S.T ELA assessment. Learning Gains will increase from 59% to 62% (STAR SGP measure will be used) Lower Quartile gains will increase from 42 to 55% (STAR SGP measure for lower quartile will be used)
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Data will be monitored according to Tiers Tier 1 • STAR Reading & FAST progress monitoring • Monthly ISIP Reading Assessment • Standards Based Formative Assessments • Student Data Notebooks Tier 2 + Tier 1 • Monthly Data Chats Tier 3 + Tiers 1 & 2 • Weekly Monitoring • Panorama Groups (EL, SWD, RTI, & ESSA Subgroups) • Interventionist Data Notebooks • Monitoring of IEP, RTI, & EL Plans
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tanya Sly (tanya.sly@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Explicit instruction is a student-centered instructional approach with four core practices: modeling with clear explanations; verbalizing the thinking process; providing practice opportunities; and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the**	Explicit instruction is a particularly effective instructional strategy to incorporate into the classroom because it supports all students, including those with learning and attention issues. Specifically, the components (direct explanations, modeling, structured practice, and feedback) have been shown to be highly effective in increasing student achievement. In addition to its effectiveness for all students, explicit instruction has been shown to be effective for the following populations of students: 1. English language learners (ELLs): Explicit instruction pays dividends for ELLs,

resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	enabling the teacher to be intentional about making language accessible. Explicit instruction is correlated to increased achievement gains among ELLs. 2. Learners with attention issues or language-based learning disabilities: These learners may have difficulty attending to the most crucial ideas in a lesson. Explicit instruction is useful for cueing students in to the most essential information, which then sets them up for success. 3. Learners requiring intensive intervention: To demonstrate mastery of a skill, students with learning and attention issues frequently need 10 to 30 more practice opportunities than their peers. This level of structure—from instruction to practice—helps ensure that the 1 in 5 and all students are capable and confident enough to tackle higher-order skills.

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.

Implement a common lesson structure using explicit instruction to enable the gradual release of responsibility from the teacher to the student.

Person Responsible	Tanya Sly (tanya.sly@keysschools.com)

Increase fluency and access to grade level text and standards through scaffolded, shared, and independent reading.

Person Responsible	Tanya Sly (tanya.sly@keysschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Overall Math Performance dropped significantly since the pandemic.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Overall Math Performance will increase from 57 to 62% on the F.A.S.T. Math assessment Learning Gains will increase from 66% to 70% (STAR SGP measure will be used) Lower Quartile Gains will increase from 51 to 62% (STAR SGP measure will be used)
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Data will be monitored according to Tiers Tier 1 • STAR Math & FAST progress monitoring • Standards Based Formative Assessments • Student Data Notebooks • Freckle Math Tier 2 + Tier 1 • Monthly Data Chats Tier 3 + Tiers 1 & 2 • Weekly Monitoring • Panorama Groups (EL, SWD, RTI & ESSA Subgroups)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Meier (christy.meier@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Close learning gaps through evidence-based math interventions focused on concrete/visual representations and math fluency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Visual representations is a principle of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and can help bilingual English language learners and students with disabilities specifically because they remove language barriers and support processing of abstract math concepts and problem-solving. When students use accurate visual representations to solve math problems, including word problems, they are more likely to solve the problems correctly. At all grade levels, devote time in each intervention session to building fluent retrieval of basic facts.

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.

Through explicit instruction in both guided and independent practice students will use concrete manipulatives and visual representations such as number lines, arrays, and strip diagrams.

Person Responsible   Christy Meier (christy.meier@keysschools.com)

Provide 10 minutes per session of instruction to build quick retrieval of basic number combinations. This will be accomplished using technology, flash cards, and other materials to vary the practice and facilitate automatic retrieval.

Person Responsible   Christy Meier (christy.meier@keysschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Science performance has dropped significantly since pre-pandemic levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Science achievement will rise from 53% to 62%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Tier 1 • Science Progress Monitoring • Standards Based Formative Assessments • Student Data Notebooks • STEM Fair Participation
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	All grade levels will provide experiential learning and science content area vocabulary instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Higher-level questions are essential to facilitating conceptual understanding. The inquiry process is facilitated by skillful questioning and provides students with the opportunity to become independent thinkers who master their own learning. Through the use of Costa's levels of inquiry, teachers will provide an investigative approach to science instruction through hands-on, experiential science instruction. Vocabulary lies at the heart of content area learning. Students will acquire scientific vocabulary through direct vocabulary instruction, content area reading, and through collaborative conversations to use their growing vocabulary.

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.

Teachers and students will use Costa's levels of inquiry to promote an investigative approach to science instruction.

Person Responsible   Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

All grade levels will emphasize science vocabulary through wide reading, direct instruction, modeling word solving, and providing students opportunities to use vocabulary through collaborative conversations.

Person Responsible   Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Chronic absenteeism has increased significantly since the pandemic.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Reduce the number of chronically absent students to 50 or below.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Attendance data is monitored weekly. Panorama Chronically Absent Group.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Willis (chris.willis@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Monitor attendance, promote awareness, and provide timely interventions and supports for students demonstrating a pattern of non-attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Evidence-based strategies and resources from Attendance Works will be used to develop interventions and supports.

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.

School counselor will meet weekly with parent educator to monitor attendance data, deliver interventions, and recognize good and improved attendance.

Person Responsible	Chris Willis (chris.willis@keysschools.com)

Promote attendance awareness through SAC, PTO, parent conferences, letters, and social media.

Person Responsible	Chris Willis (chris.willis@keysschools.com)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Achievement levels for overall ELA, Math, and Science performance have been trending down since the pandemic.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	90% of classes demonstrating a disproportionate percentage of Tier 2 & Tier 3 needs will engage in a coaching cycle.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Coaching cycles will be documented on the Outlook Calendar. The leadership team will meet weekly to review current assignments and discuss strategies implemented. Teachers who participate in coaching cycles will be recognized with a Coaching Cycle Completion magnet and credit for professional learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Instructional coaches will use Jim Knight's three part instructional coaching model of identify, learn, and improve.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The three part model, is well established and demonstrated to engage teachers in a process of continuous improvement through reflective practice, modeling, and direct support.

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.

Review progress monitoring data and target classes with the highest level of need and teacher receptibility.

Person Responsible	Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysschools.com)

Set up model classrooms to provide internal VIEW.

Person Responsible	Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysschools.com)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Subgroup data for the Black/African American population demonstrates a need for improvement in instructional practices and delivery of interventions.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The Black/African American subgroup at Stanley Switlik elementary will meet the Federal Index of 41.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Reading, Math, Science, & Attendance data will be monitored according to Tiers. Tier 1 • STAR Reading & FAST progress monitoring • Monthly ISIP Reading Assessment • Standards Based Formative Assessments • Student Data Notebooks Tier 2 + Tier 1 • Monthly Data Chats Tier 3 + Tier 1 & 2 • Weekly Monitoring • Panorama Groups (ESSA Subgroups) • Interventionist Data Notebooks • Monitoring of IEP, RTI, & EL Plans
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) is an evidence-based framework for effectively integrating multiple systems and services to simultaneously address students' academic achievement, behavior, and social-emotional well-being.
Rationale for Evidence-	(MTSS) is a framework for ensuring that ALL students' academic, social, and behavioral needs are met. Rigorous implementation of MTSS through Response to

based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Intervention (RtI) includes a combination of high quality instruction, assessment, and evidence-based intervention. Comprehensive implementation contributes to more meaningful identification of learning and behavioral problems, improves instructional quality, and provides all students with the best opportunities to succeed in school. This strategy will ensure students in vulnerable populations are monitored and receiving timely interventions and supports.

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.

Implement Universal Design for Learning as the foundation for all tiers. Monitor performance data and collaborate with grade level teams to ensure delivery of effective tier 2 and 3 interventions and supports.

Person Responsible   Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysschools.com)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

Explicit instruction is a student-centered instructional approach with four core practices: modeling with clear explanations; verbalizing the thinking process; providing practice opportunities; and feedback. It has been identified as a core instructional component according to the RAISE webinar. Explicit instruction supports all students, including those with learning and attention issues. Specifically, the components (direct explanations, modeling, structured practice, and feedback) have been shown to be

highly effective in increasing student achievement. Current fall STAR screening indicates 49% of kindergarten students students are at or above the district benchmark, 62% in first grade, and 54% in second grade. Utilizing explicit instruction as a tier 1 strategy in all ELA classrooms will ensure all students are provided with highly effective instruction and reach a desired outcome of 90% of students performing at or above grade level.

In addition to its effectiveness for all students, explicit instruction has been shown to be effective for the following populations of students:
1. English language learners (ELLs): Explicit instruction enables the teacher to be intentional about making language accessible. Explicit instruction is correlated to increased achievement gains among ELLs. In grades K-3, 16% of students are identified for EL services.
2. Learners with attention issues or language-based learning disabilities may have difficulty attending to the most crucial ideas in a lesson. Explicit instruction is useful for cueing students in to the most essential information, which then sets them up for success. In grades K-3, 14% of students are identified with learning disabilities.
3. Learners requiring intensive intervention: Students with learning and attention issues frequently need 10 to 30 more practice opportunities than their peers. This level of structure—from instruction to practice—helps ensure that all students are capable and confident enough to tackle higher-order skills. In grades K-3, 10% of students are currently receiving intervention.

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

According to the FSA ELA 2022 results, 45% of students in grade 3 and 46% of students in grade 4 achieved level 3 or higher. Current STAR progress monitoring data shows 52 percent in grade 3 and 57% in grade 4 are on track to achieve level three or higher on the state assessment. Grade 5 currently shows only 45% of students. For the same reasons as stated above in the K-2 instructional practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA, all ELA teachers will utilize Explicit Instruction as a tier 1 practice to ensure instructional time is maximized and addresses student needs. In addition, explicit instruction will address the current level of vulnerable populations.
1. English language learners (ELLs): In grades 3-5, 23% of students are currently identified for EL services.
2. In grades 3-5, 12% of learners are identified for attention issues or language-based learning disabilities.
3. In grades 3-5, 13% of learners require intensive interventions.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

The overarching goal is to have 70% of students achieve level three or higher on the third grade ELA summative assessment.
Kindergarten- Increase the percentage of students on track for proficiency from 49% to 70%

Grade 1- Increase the percentage of students on track for proficiency from 62% to 70%
Grade 2- Increase the percentage of students on track for proficiency from 54% to 70%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The overarching goal is to have 70% of students achieve level three or higher on the third grade ELA summative assessment and for the Overall School ELA achievement reach 62%.
Grade 3- Increase the percentage of students on track for proficiency from 52% to 70%
Grade 4- Increase the percentage of students on track for proficiency from 57% to 70%
Grade 5- Increase the percentage of students on track for proficiency from 45% to 62%

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Tier 1- Increase percentage of students Meeting the 50th percentile rank from 52% to 60% by mid-year screening and an additional 10% by the end-of-year summative assessment.
• STAR Reading & FAST progress monitoring
• Monthly ISIP Reading Assessment
• Standards Based Formative Assessments
• Student Data Notebooks
Tier 2- 30% of students are currently identified as On Watch or Intervention. By the mid-year assessment, one third of these students will reach the 50th percentile rank and by the end-of-year an additional third will reach the 50th percentile rank.
• Monthly Data Chats
Tier 3- 18% of students are currently identified as urgent intervention. The goal is to reduce the percentage of students scoring below the 10th percentile rank to 10% or less.
• Weekly Monitoring through Interventionist Data Notebooks
• Panorama Groups (ESSA Subgroups)
• Monitoring of IEP, RTI, & EL Plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Paul, Christine, christine.paul@keysschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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?

We intend to implement the PK-5 practice profile for literacy instruction. The components of the profile include explicit instruction, systematic instruction, differentiated instruction, scaffolded instruction and

corrective feedback. Situational awareness during instruction, combined with intentional instructional planning is at the core of improving instructional practice. The practice will be used to deliver high-quality curriculum that is aligned with the Florida B.E.S.T. ELA standards and Moderate to Promising ESSA Evidence (Benchmark Advance K-5). This practice profile has been identified as a critical part of the district's lesson structure to support reading and align with B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The PK-5 practice profile has is effective with all students and especially ELLs, students with disabilities, and students requiring interventions. All ELA teachers will utilize the components of the practice profile as tier 1 practice to ensure instructional time is maximized and addresses student needs. The intentional use of the practice profile will address the current level of vulnerable populations and essentially bring our school more in balance with 70% at Tier 1, 20% at Tier 2, and 10% at Tier 3.
1. English language learners (ELLs): In grades 3-5, 23% of students are currently identified for EL services.
2. In grades 3-5, 12% of learners are identified for attention issues or language-based learning disabilities.
3. In grades 3-5, 13% of learners require intensive interventions.

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
1. Literacy leadership will meet weekly to review walkthrough and student performance data in order to determine progress towards the goals above. 2. The literacy coach will provide job embedded professional learning on explicit reading instruction aligned with B.E.S.T. standards for classrooms demonstrating a high level of need as evidenced by student performance and walkthrough data. 3. Model classrooms will be established showcasing exemplars in explicit instruction. 4. District support will be enlisted to provide professional development related to core program implementation and impactful strategy training.	Sly, Tanya, tanya.sly@keysschools.com
Tiered monitoring for ESSA subgroup.	Paul, Christine, christine.paul@keysschools.com

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Stanley Switlik Elementary School we utilize several methods to engage all stakeholders in building a positive school culture and environment:
1. School Advisory Council/Parent Teacher Organization Meetings
2. Building Level Planning Team
3. Back to School Task Force (District/School) & School Leadership Team
4. School Newsletter, DOJO, Website, Facebook, Social Media, & EdConnect
5. Title I Parent Engagement Nights
6. Meet the Teacher, Open House & Parent/Teacher Conferences
7. Parent Feedback Surveys
8. School and Community Events

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

1. Teachers- promote and implement PBIS strategies and teach HLI curriculum.
2. BLPT & PBIS teams- Monitor Panorama data and develop school wide PBIS initiatives
3. Parents are engaged in HLI curriculum through take home materials
4. Students participate in the design and implementation of PBIS strategies and incentives
5. Community is invited to learn more about PBIS and HLI initiatives and provide support where appropriate
6. School administration serves to model and promote a positive school culture and environment and continue to seek out ways to improve