Sawgrass Bay Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School

16325 SUPERIOR BLVD, Clermont, FL 34714

https://sbe.lake.k12.fl.us

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

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.

Sawgrass Bay Elementary promotes high levels of learning for ALL and strives for excellence as we cultivate the leaders of tomorrow

Motto: We are all learners. We are all leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A data driven, goal oriented, collaborative learning community working interdependently to ensure all students develop into leaders and learners who excel both academically and socially and are empowered to take risks and reflect on results.

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
Nelson, Andrea	Principal	Oversee the school improvement planning process, curriculum and instruction, school safety and daily management of the campus. Support all grade levels but will work closely with 3rd-5th and ESE systems. Collaborate closely with the guiding coalition and ensure we are displaying a common vision across campus to move student learning and teacher expertise forward.
Motyl, Manuela	Reading Coach	Ms. Motyl is the K-5 Literacy Coach. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices.
Stratton, Kara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Stratton helps oversee the MTSS process on campus. She analyzes the data and facilitates the Tier 2 and Tier 3 meetings. She also works closely with new teachers on campus, and is the school testing coordinator.
Lees, Christina	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lees is the K-5 Instructional Coach. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices in math and science.
O'Connor, Hailey	School Counselor	Helps lead the guidance department in the following areas: attendance meetings, maintaining 504 accommodation plans, case reviews, in class guidance lessons, and individual/group counseling. Ms. O'Connor works closely with our students in Pre-K/VPK-2nd grade.
Charnigo, Maria	School Counselor	Helps lead the guidance department in the following areas: attendance meetings, maintaining 504 accommodation plans, case reviews, in class guidance lessons, and individual/group counseling. Ms. Charnigo works closely with our students in grades 3-5
Block, Cheryl	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE school specialist, Ms. Block is the ESE contact on campus. She facilitates ESE meetings, maintains ESE records and IEPs, delivers professional development, models lessons, and assists with appropriate placement of students.
Larkin, John	Dean	As the dean, Mr. Larkin works closely with the Mental Health Liaison and the PASS teacher to decrease referrals and out of school suspensions across campus. He is also the restorative practices chair on campus and supports our ELL student population.
Fulton, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Work closely with VPK, kindergarten, first grade, second grade, and our enrichment teams. She is also the, health coordinator, school safety chair, and manages facilities.

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.

During the SIP development process we consistently use input from a variety of stakeholders. We meet with our school-base guiding coalition, which is composed of various teachers and staff. We review data, prior goals and actions and determine next steps that will help support our continued growth. In addition we also gather input from our SAC. We present assessment data, prior goals and focus areas then ask for input and make necessary adjustments as needed.

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 utilize progress monitoring data to determine if our action steps are working in helping to achieve our goals. After each progress monitoring assessment we will meet with our school guiding coalition and also gain input from our SAC in regards to making any necessary adjustments to the SIP.

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	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	82%
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) 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: C

	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
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	14	41	34	30	27	16	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	3	4	4	1	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	1	10	2	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	36	35	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	35	29	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	9	29	31	36	0	0	0	109

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	16	25	44	37	0	0	0	129

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	40	38	45	34	36	47	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	9	7	1	3	10	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	46	34	16	35	25	10	0	0	190

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	16	15	17	39	37	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	40	38	45	34	36	47	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	9	7	1	3	10	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	46	34	16	35	25	10	0	0	190

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	16	15	17	39	37	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified retained:

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

(Grade Level header spans columns K–8)

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*	45	47	53	44	50	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				49			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			50		
Math Achievement*	53	55	59	46	46	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				51			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			38		
Science Achievement*	38	52	54	47	52	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	80	61	59	67			71		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	269
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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	18	Yes	4	2
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	29	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	54			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	49			

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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	50			
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	41			

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	45			53			38					80
SWD	16			20			17				4	
ELL	26			46			6				4	80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			43			26				4	
HSP	44			50			39				5	79
MUL	25			33							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	53			63			42				4	
FRL	38			48			37				5	78

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	44	49	51	46	51	42	47					67
SWD	15	35	36	24	32	24	14					
ELL	38	53	57	40	53	42	33					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	48		34	50		45					
HSP	41	50	62	43	46	38	39					77
MUL	44	18		38	50		40					
PAC												
WHT	51	52	42	54	58	50	59					
FRL	36	46	50	40	49	34	34					

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	47	50	50	46	40	38	47					71
SWD	11	32	36	20	27	33	17					64
ELL	42	59	54	37	59	71	33					71
AMI												
ASN	64			57								
BLK	35	64		38	40		31					
HSP	48	45	54	42	43	42	45					71
MUL	52			50								
PAC												
WHT	47	56		55	44		55					
FRL	39	47	55	36	30	22	35					67

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	35%	52%	-17%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	54%	-2%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	62%	-2%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	52%	-18%	51%	-17%

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.

As evidenced by last year's state assessment data we are making progress in math, but our greatest need for improvement continues to be ELA and science. After we disaggregated the overall data, 5th grade showed the lowest performance in ELA and science. One contributing factor last year was teacher retention. Unfortunately we lost and had to replace two ELA teacher in 5th grade last year. While our instructional coaches provided support within the classrooms affected, it was a difficult transition that had an impact on 4 out of the 6 5th grade classes.

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

As evidenced by last year's state assessment data, Science and ELA (5th grade) showed the greatest decline:
ELA: 47% to 39%
Science: 47% to 38%
One contributing factor last year was teacher retention. Unfortunately we lost and had to replace two ELA teacher in 5th grade last year. While our instructional coaches provided support within the classrooms affected, it was a difficult transition that had an impact on 4 out of the 6 5th grade classes.

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.

When compared to the state average, 5th grade, in all areas had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.
SBE 5th Grade ELA: 39%
FL 5th Grade ELA: 54%
SBE 5th Grade Math: 37%
FL 5th Grade Math: 55%
SBE 5th Grade Science: 38%
FL 5th Grade Science: 51%
Again, I believe the factor that contributed to this gap was teacher retention/transitioning during the school year. We also saw significant needs for support with core (tier 1) behavior in fifth grade...meaning, a majority of our referrals and discipline incidents involved 5th grade students.

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

Our greatest are of improvement this year was math achievement. Overall we improved from 46% to 55% in proficiency. We met our school-wide goal of 55%. In looking at individual grade levels (cohorts), 4th grade showed the most improvement. This cohort improved 16% in proficiency from last year from 51% proficient in 2022 to 65% proficient in 2023. One of the actions we took in this area is to build in a quick spiral review at the beginning of each math block. Additionally, we analyzed student data to determine which areas or with what benchmarks students will need the most support. Teachers then tailored the spiral review to meet their student needs. In addition, we continued the 30 minute acceleration block where students were grouped and received instruction according to their individual needs.

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

In reflecting on our EWS data from the prior year, attendance continues to be a potential area of concern along with reducing the number of students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are as follows:
-5th ELA
-4th and 5th Grade Writing
-Science
-Math
-Positive Culture and Climate

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

While we continue to make gains each year, instructional practice as it relates to benchmark-aligned instruction continues to be one of our most critical areas, as evidence by the FAST ELA and Math results. This area of focus was selected as a critical area of need because the data showed gaps in proficiency across grade levels, specifically in fifth grade. In addition, two of our ESSA subgroups (SWD and Multi-Racial) were below the 41% proficiency target. Teachers will analyze school-wide and grade level data and engage in intentional collaborative planning focusing on benchmarks that are essential to students' mastery of grade level content. Essential benchmarks will be identified throughout the year and teacher teams will come to a clear understanding of the benchmark's intention, example of proficiency with the benchmark, prior skills needed for success, and determine how students will be assessed. The collaborative teams will utilize best practices and strategies such as setting the purpose focused on student learning and aligned to the benchmark. They will build in opportunities for students to consolidate their thinking through collaborative learning and also have a chance to apply what they have learned independently.

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA, Math, and Science proficiency.
ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 60%
Math proficiency will increase from 55% to 65%
Science proficiency will increase from 38% to 50%

As a result of focusing on benchmark-aligned instruction, we also expect to see an increase in our ESSA subgroups of SWD and multiracial students.
SWD proficiency will increase from 26% to 31%
Multiracial Student Subgroup will increase from 38% to 42%

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

-progress monitoring through common formative assessments and FAST data
-classroom walkthroughs/learning walks
-through conversations that occur during common planning
-PLT meeting agendas including data used to monitor student mastery of essential standards/benchmarks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Teachers will continue work in professional learning communities with an intense focus on student learning, and results. The four PLC questions will guide the learning and work within the professional learning communities as teachers plan for instruction with a focus on mastering essential grade level standards/benchmarks. Teachers will plan with instructional best practices such as setting the purpose, modeling strategies and providing opportunities for students to consolidate their thinking through collaboration.
Students in K-2 will receive foundational reading instruction through our core curriculum of Fundations.

Students in grade 3-5 who need additional support with phonics or phonemic awareness will be pulled for intervention using Fundations. We will also utilize i-Reay and Amira as intervention programs for students needing additional support.

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

If teachers work collaboratively with a focus on student learning, results, and instructional best practices, then they will ensure all students receive a guaranteed and viable curriculum in ELA and Math. Being more intentional in selecting standards/benchmarks as essential and taking the time to deconstruct and arrive at a common understanding of instructional strategies utilized and expectation for proficiency, will ensure we are working to fill existing learning gaps that will allow students to be successful not just in their current grade level but also in years ahead. Extensive research has been completed about how an effective professional learning community impacts student achievement.
In addition, using a core phonics program (Fundations) will ensure consistency and ensure all students receive appropriate and research based instruction as they are learning to read. We will also utilize i-Reay and Amira as intervention programs for students needing additional support.

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.

Professional learning will continue to incorporate the book "Learning by Doing" to focus in on the following expectations for best practices:
-Implement a guaranteed, viable curriculum - teacher teams will identify, deconstruct, and plan for instruction and intervention or acceleration on essential standards/benchmarks. Student learning will be monitored through an ongoing assessment process that includes frequent, team developed formative assessments
-Each grade level will develop SMART goals based on their universal data and determine action steps to reach their goals. They will meet after each progress monitoring to revise action steps as needed
-Universal data will be collected to determine which students need additional instruction. This data will be used to determine which students will received additional instruction using Fundations.
-Writing teams will meet throughout the to analyze student data, revisit and revise grade level SMART goals as needed, and plan for instruction to continue to move learning forward.

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/24/2024

The instructional coaches will implement the coaching cycle in order to focus on continuous improvement of instructional best practices as needed. They will provide support and co-facilitate collaborative planning as needed.

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/24/2024

The leadership team will continue to focus on building team leader's capacity to facilitate common planning with a deeper focus on essential standards/benchmarks and using data to drive decision making. We will meet bi-weekly and continue utilize the book "Learning by Doing" as a guide to support. We will review student and teacher data to determine where we will need to focus and provide grade level or

individual teacher support. We will also support grade level teams in their action steps they create to help reach their SMART goals.

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/24/2024

-Teachers will incorporate a brief daily spiral review or provide frontloading of benchmarks or skills in both ELA and Math
-Instructional coaches will create slides for each grade level to utilize for the review. Student data along with the district scope and sequence will be used to determine daily tasks.

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/24/2024

-5th grade teachers will utilize a pre-assessment at the beginning of each science unit to determine which standards students are already familiar with and where they will need to focus their support
-Teachers will determine essential standards and use information from the pre-assessment to form groups according to student needs. Students will receive additional instruction and support based on their needs.

Person Responsible: Christina Lees (leesc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/24/2024

Science Focus - Fifth Grade students will be grouped using benchmark assessment data and will receive additional instruction specifically focused on Science content to fill in gaps of knowledge. Students already proficient will read and respond to text focused on science content. They will meet 30 minutes on Wednesday and will be grouped according to their individual needs.

Person Responsible: Christina Lees (leesc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/24/2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Instructional staff will identify, unwrap, and plan intervention and acceleration on essential standards/benchmarks. Ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data will be used to inform intervention and acceleration activities to increase learning gains for all students. All students will participate in a "walk to" intervention to best meet their instructional needs in both ELA and Math (5th grade will also include science). If teachers use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration for all students, then students will receive timely feedback that will help move their understanding of the content forward.

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA and Math Learning Gains. While we do not have learning gains from the 22-23 school year, we are using prior learning gains data to set goals for the 23-24 school year.
ELA Learning Gains will increase from 49% to 65%.
ELA Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 51% to 55%.
Math Learning Gains will increase from 51% to 55%.
Math Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 42% to 45%
As a result of strategically planning for differentiation, we also expect to see an increase in our ESSA subgroups of SWD and multiracial students.
SWD proficiency will increase from 26% to 31%
Multiracial Student Subgroup will increase from 38% to 42%

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

This area of focus will be monitored through participation in PLTs, essential standards document, data tracking and evidence of student movement in intervention/acceleration groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Analyzing and using ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to inform interventions and acceleration for ELA and math will help increase learning gains. This will be evidenced when discussing "What we will do for students who did not get it, and what will we do for those who already know it" within our professional learning communities. Teacher will use essential standards selected to determine focus areas for intervention/acceleration. They will create groups based on standards progression and use entry/exit tickets to determine student grouping. The entry/exit tickets will be used to determine student mastery before moving on to the next group. This data will also be used to group and re-group students accordingly.

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

If teachers use ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to intervene or accelerate students then students will receive timely and effective intervention. To monitor this strategy, we will complete classroom

walkthroughs during the acceleration block, participate in data analysis conversations with teachers and progress monitor students on the mastery of essential standards in both ELA and Math.

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 utilize common formative assessment data to determine students' needs and form appropriate groups. Based on the data, the following intervention programs will be implemented with fidelity 4 times per week in 30 minute blocks to provide explicit instruction targeting foundational skills and comprehension as needed:

-i-Ready Tools for Instruction
-FCRR
-Fundations
-Instruction/intervention/acceleration focus on essential standards/benchmarks using the core curriculum as a resource

-Data will be analyzed on an ongoing basis. Students will rotate groups as needed or indicated by the assessment data (entry/exit tickets). Groups will target students with significant gaps, students close to proficiency, and also those who are on grade level or above.
-Writing teams will meet throughout the to analyze student data and plan for instruction/intervention specifically for students are not meeting grade level benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/25/2024

The leadership team will utilize the book "Taking Action" as a guide to support differentiated instruction on campus.
-Teachers will be responsible for determining acceleration block focus areas as tier 2 support for students based on the essential standards/benchmarks selected
-The leadership team will provide tier 3 instruction for students who need support with universal skills that are preventing them from being successful with grade level instruction

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/25/2024

The MTSS problem solving team will monitor and support tier 2 and tier 3 interventions specifically designed to increase proficiency of the lowest quartile. The team will meet after each universal assessment to progress monitor students and determine who will need more intense supports.

Teacher directed lessons and Fundations curriculum will be used to target gaps in foundational reading skills.

Person Responsible: Kara Stratton (strattonk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/25/2024

Teachers will utilize resources and information gained from Write Score data to determine supports and reteach opportunities with an specific focus on students score a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment. Write Score will support students with both reading and writing.

Person Responsible: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/2023-5/25/2024

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

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

Through the PLC framework and the implementation of our core behavior program (Leader in Me and Harmony), we will foster a positive school community and culture where we are collectively committed to the success of all students. If we have high expectations and foster positive relationships, we will make Sawgrass Bay a place where people are collectively committed to the success of all students.

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

Through consistent instruction of Harmony and daily practices of Leader in Me strategies such as the morning meeting and LEAD time we will expect to see a continued increase in student attendance and a decrease in the percentage of students receiving one or more referrals.
Attendance Rate: 92% to 95%
Percent of Students with Referrals: 13% to 9%

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

-Early Warning Signs data specifically referrals, and attendance data
-Morning Meeting tracker
-Classroom Walkthroughs during LEAD time
-Tracking Behavior Incident Log

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Fulton (fultonn@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

We will utilize our core behavior programs:
-Leader in Me
-Harmony
-Daily Morning Meetings
-Restorative Practice

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

Students will want to come to school to receive instruction and practice what they have learned through Harmony and Leader in Me.

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 and staff will use the Covey Habits through the Leader in Me framework in all classrooms and common areas that set expectations for positive student behaviors and relationships.
-We will involve families through Weekly Updates that include a LIM home-school connection
-We will host a Family Mission Night to introduce families to the 7 Habits and Mission Statements
-Student leaders will be celebrated monthly for following the & Habits at our Leader of the Month Ceremony

Person Responsible: Nicole Fulton (fultonn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/23-5/26/24

-Teachers will implement a core program to teach behavior, social and life skills through Harmony and LEAD Time (a block of time designated for the mentioned activities). Our school counseling department has created a pacing guide for LEAD time.
-SMILE Mentorship (Student Mentorship for Improving Leadership and Empathy) - using data from our behavior log, students will be assigned to a teacher or staff member mentor to have a weekly check-in. Mentor teachers will be provided with guiding questions to utilize during the check-in. The purpose is to allow students to build relationships and have multiple staff they can connect with in a positive way.

Person Responsible: Nicole Fulton (fultonn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/23-5/26/24

-School based counseling clerk will monitor weekly attendance. Guidance Counselors will develop a system for monitoring attendance and collaborate weekly on Fridays to review the data and determine next steps.
-Teachers will contact families after three days and guidance will reach out after five.

Person Responsible: Nicole Fulton (fultonn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/23-5/26/24

Incorporate restorative practices across campus to promote respect, relationships, responsibility, repair, and reintegration. The instructional dean, PASS teacher, school counselors, and mental health liaison will implement restorative practices and trauma informed practices with students receiving multiple referrals and help decrease the number of students serving OSS.

Person Responsible: Nicole Fulton (fultonn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: When: 8/10/23-5/26/24

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

The school did not answer this question.

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

The 2023 PM 3 Star (FAST) data for students in K-2 indicated the following:
Kinder: 47%
1st Grade: 52%
2nd Grade: 58%
As evidenced by the data above, instructional practice specifically related to Reading/ELA is a critical area of focus. This was identified as a critical area of focus because the 2023 PM 3 Star (FAST) Kindergarten Reading data revealed less than 50% of students met reading proficiency.
We will utilize Fundations as our systematic phonics and phonemic awareness program for instruction and provide small group or individual support to students who need additional instruction in foundational reading skills.

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

The 2023 PM3 FAST data for student in grades 3-5 indicated the following:
3rd Grade: 58%
4th Grade: 53%
5th Grade: 39%
As evidenced by the data above, instructional practice specifically related to Reading/ELA is a critical area of focus. This was identified as a critical area of focus because the 2023 PM 3 FAST 5th Grade Reading data revealed less than 50% of students met reading proficiency.

By focusing on this area we will improve student learning and success by ensuring we are intentional in planning for and utilizing appropriate instructional strategies. In addition, we will use data to identify instructional needs, progress monitor frequently, provide timely supports/interventions to students and make adjustments to instruction as needed. Students will receive additional support in foundational reading skills as needed. Admin, academic coaches, and teachers will participate in professional learning webinars, book studies, and article studies provided by the state/region/district.

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 focusing on this area we expect to see the following increases in the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher on the 2024 Star (FAST) Reading (PM3) Assessment:
Kinder: 47% to 55%
1st Grade: 52% to 65%
2nd Grade: 58% to 65%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By focusing on this area we expect to see the following increases in the percentage of students scoring a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the 2024 FAST Reading (PM3) Assessment:
3rd Grade 58% to 65%
4th Grade 53% to 65%
5th Grade 39% to 50%

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 state progress monitoring FAST/Star for K-2 along with i-Ready will be utilized to monitor progress towards the goal of increasing proficiency for all students. Students who have been identified as at-risk and in need of additional interventions will be monitored monthly through the i-Ready progress monitoring assessment. In addition, teachers will use ongoing common formative assessments to ensure students receive additional support and/or instruction and provide targeted interventions as needed.

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

Nelson, Andrea, nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us

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?

-Teachers will plan reading instruction in the six components of reading and implement core ELA materials aligned to standards that incorporate the science of reading and integrate content-rich texts while students engage in authentic literacy through reading, writing, thinking, and talking.
-Teachers in each grade level will utilize common formative assessment data to appropriately group students to receive targeted and timely intervention for 30 additional minutes outside of the ELA block, 4 times per week.
-Teachers will provide systematic, explicit, and interactive small group instruction targeting foundational/ barrier skills. Intervention groups will be fluid, flexible, allowing students to rotate based on evidence of their learning.
-The following evidence-based programs will be utilized: i-Ready Tools for Instruction and Magnetic Reading, Fundations (in addition to core instruction), FCRR - Florida Center for Reading Research, and Fundations
-Leadership and Teacher Teams will participate in state webinars focused on reading instruction

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?

If teachers plan for and engage in instruction that incorporates the science of reading and integrates content-rich texts then we will ensure all students receive a high-quality instruction. In addition if we provide systematic, explicit, and interactive small group instruction based on students' needs as evidenced by data, we will ensure we close gaps and continue to move students towards proficiency.

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
Professional Learning: Literacy Coach and Admin will attend FLDOE facilitated RAISE Webinars throughout the year to deepen understanding of the components of effective reading instruction. The learned practices will be applied to instructional practice and feedback throughout the year.	Nelson, Andrea, nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us
Assessment: Teachers will utilize diagnostic and other pre-assessment data to determine students' needs and form appropriate groups. Based on the data, students will be grouped and receive instruction or intervention specific to their individual needs or gaps in learning. Formative assessments will be used to shift student groups as they master skills/benchmarks. Students needing intensive support will receive additional reading instruction or intervention by a reading endorsed instructional staff member. The following intervention programs will be implemented with fidelity 2 to 4 times per week in 30 minute blocks to provide explicit instruction targeting foundational skills and comprehension as needed: -i-Ready Tools for Instruction -Fundations -FCRR Data will be analyzed bi-weekly or monthly depending on the standard or skills students are working on. Students will rotate groups as needed or indicated by the assessment data. Groups will target students with significant gaps, students close to proficiency, and also those who are on grade level or above.	Nelson, Andrea, nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching: Instructional coaches will implement the coaching cycle in order to focus on continuous improvement of instructional best practices as needed. Teachers will be selected based on evidence and feedback collected during learning walks and other classroom visits. Instructional coaches will also provide support through modeling and side-by-side teaching.	Nelson, Andrea, nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership: Our Region 3 Program Specialist and school-based instructional coaches will support K-2/3-5 grade level teams with data analyses and collaborative planning. They will conduct learning walks to determine transfer of planning to instruction and provide feedback and next steps to individual teachers.	Nelson, Andrea, nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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