

Alachua County Public Schools

Hidden Oak 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Hidden Oak Elementary School

2100 FORT CLARKE BLVD, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/hiddenoak>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

Hidden Oak Elementary is committed to the success of every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Hidden Oak school community will work together in a positive, supportive atmosphere to create a child-centered, educationally productive environment maximizing each student's potential to become a confident, independent, life-long learner.

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
Sailor, Sharon	Principal	Supervise the operation and management of school activities and functions. Utilize performance data and feedback from students, teachers, parents and community members to make decisions related to improvement of instruction and student performance. Approve all school-sponsored activities and maintain a calendar of all school events. Develop and maintain positive school /community relationships. Interview and recommend personnel for employment, supervise assigned personnel, and conduct annual performance appraisals. Assign teachers according to identified needs. Manage the school's financial resources. Provide leadership in the school improvement process and the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Lowry, Heather	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in the administration and supervision of school operations. Develop the master schedule for all students and teachers. Assume administrative responsibility for the school in the absence of the principal. Assist in the development of school curriculum and implement county and state guidelines. Assist with interviews and the selection of personnel. Supervise assigned personnel and conduct annual performance appraisals. Monitor ESE program for compliance with state and federal guidelines. Assist with the administration of all testing programs. Organize safety drills and submit reports.
Wilkinson, Paula	Behavior Specialist	Assist in development and implementation of preventive discipline plan. Provide assistance to administration, teachers and staff for behavior management. Manage the discipline referral process. Advise students on appropriate school behavior and follow-up with teachers and parents on results. Supervise students before and after school, in the hallways and in the cafeteria. Participate in the implementation and/or design of a school-wide student behavior-management plan, through our school-wide PBIS program, including discipline. Conduct staff development activities related to student behavior management.
Butfiloski, Carmen	School Counselor	Plan and develop guidance programs based on developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school and district priorities. Use relevant student assessment data to make recommendations to parents and teachers. Collaborate with students, parents, school staff and other appropriate persons to assist in meeting student needs. Review student records and indicators to evaluate student needs and plan programs. Provide crisis intervention services including follow-up services as appropriate. Establish working relationships with outside services and make appropriate referrals for psychological, social work, health and community services.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The Leadership Team along with the advice and recommendations of our faculty and staff, create our SIP. The SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council to approve, question, and/or edit the 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))

We will use classroom walkthroughs, ongoing student progress monitoring, common planning input, as well as stakeholder feedback. This data will be shared with the Leadership Team quarterly.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) 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	21	19	14	16	16	10	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	6	2	3	0	0	0	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	5	21	20	10	14	4	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	7	8	7	10	14	7	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	50	58	35	30	17	12	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	39	18	30	30	16	13	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	7	19	17	23	19	13	0	0	0	98

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	22	16	11	10	9	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	2	15	25	24	9	6	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	2	17	15	14	11	11	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	7	9	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	0	0	4	14	12	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	19	21	21	13	12	0	0	0	88

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	2	18	19	27	16	15	0	0	0	97

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	6	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	21	19	14	16	16	10	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	6	2	3	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	5	21	20	10	14	4	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	7	8	7	10	14	7	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	50	58	35	30	17	12	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	39	18	30	30	16	13	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	19	21	21	13	12	0	0	0	88

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	7	19	17	23	19	13	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	18
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*	68	52	53	71	53	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				69			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			42		
Math Achievement*	73	53	59	75	40	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				77			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			58		
Science Achievement*	78	54	54	75	54	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					43	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	61	59	43			55		

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	67			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	56			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	45			
HSP	71			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	51			

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	68			73			78					52
SWD	32			39			42				4	
ELL	57			62							3	52
AMI												
ASN	62			76			71				3	
BLK	41			46			38				4	
HSP	67			69			76				4	
MUL	80			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	78			85			91				4	
FRL	54			54			62				5	60

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	71	69	48	75	77	63	75					43
SWD	26	28	24	36	62	50	46					
ELL	50	73		70	80							43
AMI												
ASN	85	97		82	94		88					36
BLK	40	43	38	51	55	44	44					
HSP	71	65		74	69		75					
MUL	73	86		65	83							
PAC												
WHT	80	71	57	84	81	79	86					
FRL	49	58	45	57	65	52	49					36

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	71	68	42	72	71	58	72					55
SWD	38	62		38	46		36					
ELL	67			67								55
AMI												
ASN	84	86		88	86		100					55
BLK	30	39	27	41	28	23	33					
HSP	76	80		62	67		56					
MUL	64			68			70					
PAC												
WHT	82	66		82	80		86					
FRL	44	58	38	42	38	18	55					

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	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	49%	9%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	58%	20%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	54%	29%	55%	28%

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 data components that showed the lowest performance were Math and ELA scores for Students with Disabilities. Contributing factors include need for additional support for new ESE teachers in the Support Facilitation model.

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

Overall, 28% of Students with Disabilities (ESE) scored a level 3 or above on 2022-23 FAST ELA PM3. This is a 2% increase from 26% achievement in the 2021-22 school year. 40% of Black / African American students scored a level 3 or above on 2022-23 FAST ELA PM 3, which is the same level of achievement as in the 2021-22 school year. Students with Disabilities scored lower in 2022-23 than 2021-22 - from 36% to 30% achievement on FAST Math PM3. Contributing factors - need for additional support for ESE teachers, and support in differentiated instruction for all teachers.

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.

No significant gap compared to the state average.

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

Overall school data remained consistent with the previous year. Black/African American students and Students with disabilities are still underperforming. High-dose tutoring was offered to students with Reading deficiencies, and additional ESE support was offered to students with disabilities.

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

Potential areas of concern from the Early Warning Signs (EWS) - 3rd grade has the most students with two or more indicators, 2nd & 3rd grades have the most failures in ELA and the most reading deficiencies.

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

Student with Disabilities, 3rd Grade ELA, Black/African American Students

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Achievement of students with disabilities increased from 26% to 28% but is still an area of focus for growth. To increase student achievement in ELA, student progress will be monitored to allow for student growth and success. Our subgroup of students with disabilities is our only subgroup that is below the 41% goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

35% of students with disabilities will score level 3 or higher on the final 2023-24 FAST ELA progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Frequent review of FAST progress monitoring data, weekly assessments, progress monitoring for DIBELS, through. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers and grade level teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Sailor (sailors@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Standards-based instruction, implementation of district curriculum and interventions utilizing UFLI and SIPPS. We will use high dose tutoring as an intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student performance indicates that students' lack foundational skills needed for mastery of grade-level content.

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.

Students in need of intervention will be identified using multiple data points (FAST, DIBELS, ISIP, Benchmark Unit Tests) and placed in the appropriate intervention groups.

New ESE teachers and High- Dose tutors will receive UFLI training and continued support.

Person Responsible: Heather Lowry (lowryhm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: By the end of the first quarter.

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

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

Black / African American students are referred at a higher rate and with greater frequency than their peers. When students are not in class they miss out on classroom instruction and fall farther behind.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To decrease the number of referrals of Black / African American students by 20% while ensuring that student referrals are proportionate to our student population.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through referrals, PBIS activity results, and other discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paula Wilkinson (wilkinsonps@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Continued implementation of PBIS strategies, inclusion of calm down corners in classrooms, Tier 3 behavior plans with high needs students, culturally responsive teaching strategies, and Professional Learning assigned to teachers through Insights to Behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building a positive school culture, teaching and recognizing positive behaviors, culturally responsive teaching strategies and behavior management will reduce referrals and out of class time for 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.

Continue to implement all components of PBIS including positive referrals, "Hoot Loot" and Hoot Loot experiences, monthly character traits that are emphasized on a weekly basis with all students. Student recognition through Wise Owls of the Month.

Person Responsible: Paula Wilkinson (wilkinsonps@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: This will be monitored at the end of each 9-week grading period.

The PBIS team will meet monthly to share and discuss discipline data. This data will then be shared with teachers. Professional Development will be suggested/recommended based on this monthly data.

Person Responsible: Paula Wilkinson (wilkinsonps@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: This will be monitored at the end of each 9-week grading period.

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 principal and district Support Principal or Executive Director will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

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

K-2 students receive Reading/ELA instruction in a 90-minute block. District-adopted curriculum (Benchmark Advance) including UFLI is used for all students. Students who are staffed ESE receive supplemental instruction or support facilitation services from an ESE teacher who pushes into the classroom, or pulls out small groups of students (3-5 students). Students who are not staffed ESE but who require Reading intervention receive additional UFLI instruction from a high-dose tutor. Student data is collected through DIBELS, iStation (ISIP), Benchmark Unit Tests and FAST progress monitoring. Overall, 28% of Students with Disabilities (ESE) scored a level 3 or above on 2022-23 FAST ELA PM3. This is a 2% increase from 26% achievement in the 2021-22 school year. 40% of Black / African American students scored a level 3 or above on 2022-23 FAST ELA PM 3, which is the same level of achievement as in the 2021-22 school year.

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

Students in grades 3-5 receive Reading/ELA instruction in a 90-minute block. District-adopted curriculum (Benchmark Advance) is used for all students. Students also receive reading instruction through the district-adopted Social Studies curriculum for an additional 30 minutes of content-based ELA instruction. Students who are staffed ESE receive supplemental instruction or support facilitation services from an ESE teacher who pushes into the classroom, or pulls out small groups of students (3-5 students). Students who are not staffed ESE but who require Reading intervention receive instruction from a high-dose tutor using UFLI or SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phoneme Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words). Student data is collected through DIBELS, iStation (ISIP), Benchmark Unit Tests and FAST progress monitoring.

Overall, 28% of Students with Disabilities (ESE) scored a level 3 or above on 2022-23 FAST ELA PM3. This is a 2% increase from 26% achievement in the 2021-22 school year. 40% of Black / African American students scored a level 3 or above on 2022-23 FAST ELA PM 3, which is the same level of achievement as in the 2021-22 school year.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the school year 35% of Students with Disabilities, and 45% of Black / African American students will perform at grade level on the FAST ELA PM3, as well as score in the core on DIBELS.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the school year 35% of Students with Disabilities, and 45% of Black / African American students will perform at grade level on the FAST ELA PM3, as well as score in the core on DIBELS.

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.

The Areas of Focus will be monitored through quarterly data chats with grade level teams and individual teachers. Admin will also conduct frequent classroom walkthroughs, and monitor student data - DIBELS, FAST, iStation, Benchmark Advance Unit tests.

Frequent monitoring of data, and more frequent classroom observations will improve student data. Admin will provide support to teachers as needed including through Professional Learning opportunities.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lowry, Heather, lowryhm@gm.sbac.edu

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?

The evidence-based practices/programs being implemented include district-adopted curriculum (Benchmark Advance and UFLI) for all students. Students who are staffed ESE receive supplemental instruction or support facilitation services from an ESE teacher who pushes into the classroom, or pulls out small groups of students (3-5 students) using the district curriculum. Students who are not staffed ESE but who require Reading intervention receive additional UFLI instruction from a high-dose tutor. Students in grades 3-5 also use IXL ELA for skill building. Evidence-based practices align with the district's K-12 Reading Plan and to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Programs are district-approved and research based.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Team has been selected and will meet quarterly to review the Reading Plan.	Sailor, Sharon, sailors@gm.sbac.edu
Progress Monitoring will continue, and data will be reviewed in grade-level and individual data chats.	Lowry, Heather, lowryhm@gm.sbac.edu