Country Oaks Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Country Oaks Elementary School

2052 NW EUCALYPTUS BLVD, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=9&sc_id=1171294728

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.

Growing Successful Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

We provide a positive and engaging learning environment, where student leaders own their learning toward academic proficiency.

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
Jones, Robin	Principal	
Coker, Susan	School Counselor	
Vicas, Sara	Dean	
Parantha , Reko	Assistant Principal	Student and teacher support, discipline, school safety, and data review.

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

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

Leadership was involved in data review and setting goals for the coming year. Surveys are sent out to parents and the information is used to inform the team for the coming year. Out PTO is also a source of information. Data is collected over the course of the year and we use our lagging data to inform our decisions.

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 post the goals set in the SIP as school-wide goals that will be monitored ongoing throughout the year. Adjustments will be made at each quarter to instruction and support.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	25	43	48	31	36	38	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	9	2	14	0	0	0	31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	22	19	32	23	20	0	0	0	117
Course failure in Math	1	7	9	17	19	18	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	41	45	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	29	0	0	0	36
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	1	18	11	26	29	37	0	0	0	122

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	1	6	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	21	54	39	47	38	31	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	7	12	2	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	1	11	8	33	24	18	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	0	9	5	21	18	12	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	28	30	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	29	30	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	30	30	30	27	0	0	0	130

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	8	5	21	31	24	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	54	39	47	38	31	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	7	12	2	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	1	11	8	33	24	18	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	0	9	5	21	18	12	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	28	30	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	29	30	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	30	30	30	27	0	0	0	130

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	8	5	21	31	24	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	35
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*	36	42	53	45	46	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				62			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			50		
Math Achievement*	38	50	59	50	49	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				57			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			58		
Science Achievement*	33	43	54	46	53	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					59	52			
Graduation Rate					40	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	42	53	59	59			36		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	182
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
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	17	Yes	4	2
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	36	Yes	1	

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	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	53			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	50			

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	36			38			33					42
SWD	7			10			13				5	55
ELL	27			30			15				5	42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			31			17				3	
HSP	36			37			33				5	42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43			42			43				4	
FRL	34			37			28				5	45

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	45	62	44	50	57	46	46					59
SWD	25	36	18	27	35	18	20					50
ELL	30	53	39	38	44	25	34					59
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	45	46		45	54							
HSP	44	63	47	49	59	51	47					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	69		56	51		47					
FRL	42	62	47	46	56	44	40					62

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	46	50	50	49	62	58	40					36
SWD	16	32	29	25	43	46	9					26
ELL	29	53	56	36	65	65	37					36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			33								
HSP	46	54	52	49	66	63	45					35
MUL	50			30								
PAC												
WHT	46	25		61	47		33					
FRL	42	50	52	45	61	61	35					35

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	41%	0%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	43%	1%	58%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	33%	36%	-3%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	37%	5%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	45%	-2%	61%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	35%	4%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	31%	2%	51%	-18%

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.

5th grade science was our lowest scoring area. We scored 33% proficiency. There were new teachers that little to no experience teaching science and struggled with the content of the curriculum. That group of students was academically low coming into 5th and needed a lot of support. Our supports were thin.

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

5th grade science showed the greatest decline going from 47% proficient to 33% proficient. It was an academically low group of students that struggled with the level of reading required in processing the science curriculum. We also lost some lab time due to increased size.

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.

3rd grade ELA has the greatest gap from the state. Our proficiency is 32% and the state is 59%. Students are lacking the foundational skills and have needed additional support time to close those deficiencies.

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

We did not show any areas of improvement this last year in grades 3-5th. Our kindergarten and 2nd grade scores were above state average.

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

Our EWS concerns are in ELA primarily. Students need the time to acquire the foundational skills needed for ELA success.

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

EWS and ELL, ELA students meeting proficiency
Science proficiency growth from last year
overall ELA / Math proficiency growth

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

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

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

Teacher retention is crucial to building a highly effective school. Retention of the highest performing teachers and providing support for them to become highly effective has benefits for the entire school environment.

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

By incorporating a support system for new and experienced teachers, will increase teacher retention and grow teacher efficacy by retaining 90% of our teachers and increasing teacher observations to a minimun of 2- observations per new teachers.

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

Teacher observations will be scheduled and teacher retention will be studied at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The number of teachers that are expressing stress on the job and their concern of lacking confidence in the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers need additional resources and support due to the fact that many don't come from an education background. We have also collected survey information from previous years.

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.

Teachers will have scheduled observations to observe ideal teaching examples. Follow up meetings will help to ensure that teachers are implementing observed strategies.

Person Responsible: Sara Vicas (vicass@hendry-schools.net)

By When: These observations will be complete by the 1st quarter. More will be scheduled as needed.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#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 students are below the federal index in ELA.

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

SWD proficiency will increase by 6% in ELA.

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

Students will be identified and their data will be tracked at each assessment period. If the projected growth is not seen, then we will add additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.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.)

Additional support instruction will target the specific areas of need for each of the students. Direct instruction will be used to watch and mark the students' response to the intervetion. Regular meetings will take place with stakeholders that are monitoring progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The instruction must be focused and specific to each student's needs and must be monitored regularly.

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.

Support teachers will meet regularly to review student growth and work to make adjustments to instruction. This will include the gened teacher as well.

Person Responsible: Reko Parantha (paranthar@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Meetings will happen monthly.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

ELL students have fallen below the federal index to 39%.

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

ELL students will increase proficiency by 4%, to 43%.

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

ELL students will be monitored by identifying them on our data charts. Their data will be reviewed by our resource support teacher, noting any areas that are lacking growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elvira Garcia (garciae@hendry-schools.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.)

Monitoring growth and watching for ways to individualize all students levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Closely monitoring the individual growth of students through various means is the only way to ensure that the required growth is happening.

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 students will be identified during the 1st quarter, along with a specific academic target, as shown by data. This will be tracked by weekly for progress.

Person Responsible: Elvira Garcia (garciae@hendry-schools.net)

By When: It will be implemented at 1st quarter.

#4. 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.

ELA proficiency dropped from 45% to 39% last year in grades 3rd - 5th.

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

Our goal is to increase from 39% proficient 49% proficient in ELA grades 3-5th.

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

Curriculum assessments will be monitored and an remediation plan will be made for assessments that fall below 70%. PLC meetings will be used to plan remediation and any other instructional adjustments needed. Data review will idenify areas of focus for student groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.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.)

Initial lesson planning will tightly focused on the standards and the intended outcome. Direct instruction along with repeated instructional spiral will be used to close gaps in remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

First instruction is the best instruction and small group instruction by teachers will allow students to have additional reinforcements needed to accquire the skills at grade level.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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 proficiency in math dropped from 50% proficient to 40% proficient in grades 3rd - 5th grade.

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

Our goal is to increase proficiency from 40% to 53% proficiency in grades 3rd-5th grade.

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

PLC meetings will review assessment data by teacher and grade level. Adjustements to instruction and support materials will be made as indicated by the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.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.)

Real time adjustment to instruction based on data using direct instruction will make a larger impact.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction will allow teachers to clarify misconceptions and close gaps for students. Additional practice will help students learn prerequisite skills.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Funding will be used to provide resources to students that have been identified within our focus subgroups. Resources will be for ELA support for SWD students and ELL students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

1st grade (current 2nd graders)- 57% not proficient and 2nd grade (current 3rd graders)- 56% not proficient Direct instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics will close the gaps of the foundational skills that are missing. Additional small group support will be given to students based on their individual academic needs in ELA.

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

Not proficient: 3rd - 68%; 4th - 56%; 5th - 59%
All students below proficiency will participate in targeted small group instruction and additional support during any non-instructional time during the day. They will receive extra work to complete at home for reading comprehension and fluency.

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

Kindergarten will increase proficiency from 61% to 70%
Second will increase proficiency from 44% to 50%
Third will increase proficiency from 48% to 50%
Proficiency growth will be measured by FAST. The following assessments will be used to monitor growth. Assessments used to monitor growth and areas of weakness will be: FAST, iReady, STAR, and weekly curriculum assessments. Students below grade level in specific areas will have a plan to do

some additional instruction. All students receiving below level scores on FAST will be monitoring more frequently.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Third will increase proficiency from 32% to 48%
Fourth will increase proficiency from 44% to 50%
Fifth will increase proficiency from 41% to 50%
These goals will be measured by FAST. Other assessments that will be used to monitor growth and areas of weakness will be: FAST, iReady, STAR, and weekly curriculum assessments.

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.

Data will be reviewed by teacher, student and as a class to look for trends and coordinate ongoing student support. Students below level will be monitored more often. Data will be posted and discussed during PLCs and during MTSS meetings for individual students. Students will also have a stake in the data, as they collect their own data and monitor growth.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jones, Robin, jonesr@hendry-schools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence based practices will be implemented in the classroom through aligning our curriculum with the BEST standards. The science of reading will be observed in all reading instruction, using the state approved reading curriculum. The science of reading components will be used to diagnose and plan for student instruction. Direct instruction using BEST standards, FLDOE reading support materials, and the expertise of reading endorsed teachers will help to ensure that reading pracitices are aligned.

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

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

The assesments used will identify specific areas of weakness based on the reading rope. There is an alignment with the assessment materials used to track student progress. Dibels will be used for all K-2 students. iReady and curriculum assessments will inform decisions for students in 3rd - 5th grades.

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 coaching and professional learning will done through coached observations of highly effective teachers. Highly effective teachers will observe and coach teachers in specific areas literacy and implementation of best practices. These will work hand in hand.	Vicas, Sara, vicass@hendry-schools.net
Assessments will be monitored regularly and remediated as a class when the class falls below the 70%. Individual students will be remediated when the class has a pass rate over 70%. Data will be reviewed during PLCs and student individual growth will be monitored.	Jones, Robin, jonesr@hendry-schools.net

Title I Requirements

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

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

Dissemination of the SIP's and the Schoolwide Plan is done by: Posting on the school website, through SAC meetings and the annual Title I Parent
Meeting. A summary of the SIP in English and Spanish is provided at the annual Title I meeting for parents.
SIPS are also discussed at other Parent meetings such as PTO meetings. All SIPS are finalized and board approved and are then published on the state website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Parent and family engagement plans are created by all stakeholders at each school. Parents, teachers, leaders and community members collaborate through use of surveys and planned meetings to provide input on the implementation of the parent and family engagement plan based on the comprehensive needs assessment and surveys. These plans are also a topic on the SAC agendas and approved by the SAC committee. Goals are designed to build positive relationships between school personnel and parents. Best practices and strategies are shared with families during literary nights, or math and science nights to create a culture of engagement and improved student achievement. These best practices directly align with the district strategic plan and the schoolwide improvement plan goals. The Parent and Family Engagement plan will be posted in English and Spanish.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Title I resource teachers and paras to provide extra support. Programs purchased such as iready, nearpod, brainpop, and Renaissance as supplemental interventions. Reading Coaches, Professional Development, data based or monthly standards based planning with teachers, LIM.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title I provides reading resource teachers, paraprofessionals, supplemental programs and supplies, and prek programs. Title III provides a district resource teacher, dictionaries and other supplies, ellevation platform. Title II provides reading coaches, professional development - UFLI, etc., funding for standards based planning and data planning. Title V provides LIM PD and supplies. Title IX provides funding for the homeless after school program. Title I Part C (migrant) provides advocates for recruitment and advocacy, supplies for migrant students and after school tutoring for migrant students. SAI funds (now called education enrichment funds) provide after school tutoring and supplemental intervention supplies. Food service provides snacks for after school programs. School safety funds are utilized for implementation of safety teams and hardening of schools to keep all students and staff safe for the most conducive learning environment.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Licensed counselors are based at school to support students in need of counseling. A district mental health counselor is available for more sever ongoing concerns with students. The district personnel is also part of our school safety team.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have an MTSS coach on campus to help evaluate data and support teachers in data collection that is relevant to the process of individualized student support. Meetings are conducted that include parent and teachers to share and dicuss data and next steps for each student in the MTSS process.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Paraprofessionals support students in the classroom during instruction and will assist in remediation when needed. Professional learning for paras is used to support the highly effective reading strategies used in small group instruction and whole group instruction. Professional learning for teachers is focused on our areas of high need, based on our current data in ELA and Math.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Parent meetings are held for inclusion students, and vpk students. School visits are coordinated for daycare students between elementary schools and daycare facilities. Kindergarten Roundup happens on one evening where parents receive transition strategies and best practices from prek to kindergarten. Summer packets are given to prek students to assist with the transition to kindergarten.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00

4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes