

Lake County Schools

Sorrento Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Sorrento Elementary

24605 WALLICK RD, Sorrento, FL 32776

<https://sel.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.

Sorrento Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success. Our school promotes a safe, orderly, caring, and supportive environment. Each student's self-esteem is fostered by positive relationships with students and staff. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with parents and the community, and with the belief that all children are capable of success, we, the teachers and staff at Sorrento Elementary, commit to: foster each child's full academic potential; build each child's self-esteem; and empower each child to become a responsible, respectful, and contributing citizen.

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
Brouhard, Nicole	Principal	<p>To administer the coordination and management of Sorrento Elementary's campus and academic activities and success. Responsible for developing, administering and monitoring educational programs and systems. Responsible for optimizing academic opportunities and promoting safe and successful development for each student. Accountable for enforcing and ensuring academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic standards through instructional programs and best practices and accomplishes such in coordination with the Lake County School Board goals and initiatives.</p> <p>In addition more specific duties and responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversee IEP K-5 PLC Facilitator K-5 Wolf Pup Academy SAC Operations Budgets Data
Myers, Lori	Assistant Principal	<p>To assist in the administration, coordination and management of Sorrento Elementary's campus and academic activities. Assist the principal in the development, administration, and monitoring of educational programs and best practices. To optimize academic opportunities, and promote a safe and successful development of each students.</p> <p>Accountable for enforcing academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic standards through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Lake County School Board goals and initiatives.</p> <p>In addition more specific duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K-2 Discipline IEP meetings K-2 MTSS meetings K-2 PLC K, 2, 4, 5 Performance Matters SAI Health Coordinator New Teacher Induction
Carpenter, Amanda	Assistant Principal	<p>To assist in the administration, coordination and management of Sorrento Elementary's campus and academic activities. Assist the principal in the development, administration, and monitoring of educational programs and best practices. To optimize academic opportunities, and promote a safe and successful development of each students.</p> <p>Accountable for enforcing academic integrity, compliance with the faculty</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic standards through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Lake County School Board goals and initiatives.</p> <p>In addition more specific duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-5 Discipline IEP meetings 3-5 MTSS meetings 3-5 Social Media PLC 1, 3, 4, 5 Drills Safety Textbooks Facilities Grounds
Cubbage, Colleen	School Counselor	<p>Serves in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. Monitor student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success.</p>
Pallitto, Stacy	School Counselor	<p>Provides direct support to schools and serves in a liaison role with various district departments to effectively manage and coordinate school based mental health services.</p>
Harlee, Jueanette	School Counselor	<p>Serves in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. Monitor student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success.</p>
Key, Ania	Staffing Specialist	<p>Coordinate educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Mentors and demonstrates evidence based strategies that are effective with students who are exceptional. Utilizes behaviors consistent with facilitated IEP training to conduct efficient and productive IEP meeting in which all participants feel valued and heard. Assists staffing committee/IEP team members in developing, implementing, and monitoring progress of IEP goals to ensure IEPs are implemented with fidelity. Utilizes district-wide data management systems to collect and analyze data to inform decisions related to student needs.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Edwards, Heidi	Behavior Specialist	Provides a supervised and structured environment for students assigned to the in-school suspension program working with classroom teachers to coordinate the academic activities of assigned students and support students in completing the assigned work along with the implementation of social, emotional learning and behavioral and academic support.
Frazier, Whitney	Instructional Coach	<p>Model enthusiasm, commitment and intensity for focused reading instruction. Visit classrooms to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -encourage and support teachers in their efforts to implement targeted reading instruction and Professional Learning Communities. -Support teachers in their use of data analysis in order to drive instruction. Demonstrate strategies teachers can utilize to drive instruction. -Observe and problem solve with teachers on how to overcome student literacy learning obstacles. -Model Scientific based reading research. -Work directly with students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Organize and lead staff development programs -Provide for screening and follow up assessment as needed to organize the assessment of the reading benchmarks. - Facilitate grade level professional learning communities to ensure the reading standards and student data drive our instruction. -Continually improve literacy and instruction knowledge and skills. -Report student assessment data to the principal the central office reading program specialist, the testing and evaluation office and others designated. - Ensure effective communication with the principal, Assistant Principal and central office reading program specialist. -Assist teachers with analysis and instructional use of student formative reading assessments.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The Leadership team is comprised of ten members that represent several departments of our school. Through collaboration, the team determines the areas most in need based on the data. Data is shared to all stakeholders, including leadership, teachers, parents and support staff to ensure all faculty, staff and parents are aware of the data and goals.

The School Advisory Council is presented the data and the school improvement plan before it is submitted to the state. This gives parents/stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback to help move student learning.

Climate surveys taken and collected from both parents and students are shared with all staff to ensure student and parents opinions and concerns are addressed within the school improvement plan if 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))

The school improvement plan will be regularly monitored through the process of ongoing data collection through progress monitoring. Implementation of our goals for the school year will be tracked for success based on data collected.

Data chats will take place during the school year, and discussed within the leadership and teacher groups. Also this data will be shared during School Advisory Council meetings as we continuously monitor our improvement of student learning.

The Master schedule has been created to ensure intervention and acceleration takes place each day. Based on data, adjustments will be made throughout the year utilizing common formative assessments leading up to the state progress monitoring.

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	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
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: 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	29	58	55	62	50	65	0	0	0	319	
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	10	13	7	3	1	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	18	24	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	22	28	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	13	33	18	24	0	0	0	96	

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	3	6	12	28	59	80	0	0	0	188

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	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) 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	1	54	40	56	62	53	0	0	0	266	
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	3	2	5	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in ELA	2	6	7	6	1	2	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	29	38	0	0	0	67	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	39	32	0	0	0	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	33	33	62	72	0	0	0	205	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	8	18	31	56	73	0	0	0	188

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	54	40	56	62	53	0	0	0	266	
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	3	2	5	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in ELA	2	6	7	6	1	2	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	29	38	0	0	0	67	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	39	32	0	0	0	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	33	33	62	72	0	0	0	205	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	8	18	31	56	73	0	0	0	188

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	

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*	51	47	53	53	50	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				53			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			27		
Math Achievement*	62	55	59	58	46	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				59			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			31		
Science Achievement*	43	52	54	46	52	59	42		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	61	59	30			77		

** 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	264
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
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	29	Yes	4	2
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	53			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

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	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	42			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	51			62			43					50
SWD	28			42			10				4	
ELL	26			39							3	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			41			42				4	
HSP	51			66			36				5	53
MUL	72			94							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			60			44				4	
FRL	46			51			34				5	53

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	53	53	47	58	59	37	46					30
SWD	21	35	43	34	35	21	14					
ELL	31	26	20	27	45		13					30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	53		54	60							
HSP	49	52	32	58	52	24	34					33
MUL	57	43		73	71							
PAC												
WHT	57	55	52	56	61	44	57					
FRL	40	48	44	45	51	38	31					23

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	52	40	27	58	49	31	42					77
SWD	24	29	25	33	18	18	23					
ELL	33			36			20					77
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47			41								
HSP	42	32	36	57	42	36	23					72
MUL	40			50								
PAC												
WHT	58	46	17	61	59	23	55					
FRL	40	32	29	38	37	32	24					69

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	45%	52%	-7%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	50%	5%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	62%	3%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	51%	-9%

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.

According to data gathered from the FAST PM3 ELA data on Performance Matters, students who receive ELL services scored 6% proficient. The FAST PM3 Math data also indicated the students in the ELL subgroup showed the lowest performance with 12% proficiency.

The main contributing factor for the low performance for our ELL subgroup is the language barrier. We have also noticed a trend in students enrolling in our school directly from other countries with limited proficiency in their native language.

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

Along with the 25 point drop in ELA and 15 point drop in math with our ELL subgroup, the white subgroup decreased 3 percentage points from 57% proficient in ELA in 2022 to 54% in 2023 and the Black population decreased in Math scores from 54% in 2022 to 47% in 2023.

We believe the decrease in proficiency for the students in these subgroups may be related to the increase of excessive absences (students missing 10% or more of the school year).

*All data gathered from the information reported in Performance Matters

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.

State data not provided at this time.

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

In ELA, the largest growth occurred with our 4th grade students and instructional team. The students in 4th grade improved from 55% proficient to 59% proficient while the 4th grade instructional team improved their last year's proficiency scores of 46% to 59%. The team planned 2 times per week utilizing the 4 questions of the PLC process and focused their scheduled intervention time around essential standards and specific students.

There were many areas of growth in Math FAST data including students in the Hispanic and White subgroups improving proficiency scores 8 percentage points. The 4th grade students also increased from their 3rd grade proficiency of 48% in 2022 to 73% in 2023. The math teachers in 4th grade followed the same protocols for planning as the ELA teachers along with implementing a new math curriculum.

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

Our greatest area of concern regarding the Early Warning Systems is the excessive absences among all students K-5.

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

1. Reducing excessive absenteeism
2. Improving science proficiency
3. Improving ELA proficiency

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 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.

Based on EWS data, over a third of our student population (319 students) are absent 10% or more of the school year. This is a factor contributing to the decline in our ELL and White subgroup ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on improving our culture and environment we expect to see a decrease in the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more during the school year. We will see a decrease from 37% missing 10% or more of the school day to 33% of the population missing 10% or more of the school day.

Monitoring:

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

Bi-weekly attendance reports will be reviewed by the guidance counselors and administration to identify any students with declining attendance. In addition, Sorrento Elementary will follow the Child Study Team process to communicate and meet with families to encourage regular attendance. A spread sheet will also be kept to monitor attendance concerns as well as identifying and celebrating grade levels who have high attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jueanette Harlee (harleej@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.)

Visually and verbally celebrating student accomplishments in various areas including academics, citizenship and co-curricular activities. In addition, the master schedule will include time for all grade level teachers to incorporate social-emotional learning and relationship building with their students. This "Den Time" follows the Harmony Social-Emotional Learning Curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reinforcing effort and recognizing achievement is one of Marzano's nine instructional strategies to improve student achievement. When students feel success in school, the more they will want to attend. The Harmony program is guided by research. The program supports the goals of relationship building, inclusion, community building, and culturally responsive teaching so that all students have a safe and engaging place to learn.

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.

Determine areas of recognition and a schedule for announcing the achievements.

Person Responsible: Nicole Brouhard (brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Within the first month of school.

Develop a form for collecting information for student recognition.

Person Responsible: Lori Myers (myersl@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Within the first month of school.

Review components of Harmony curriculum with teachers.

Person Responsible: Stacy Pallitto (pallittos@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: First Day of school

Review other resilience lessons with teachers.

Person Responsible: Heidi Edwards (edwardsh@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

Review the Child Study Tem process with teachers.

Person Responsible: Jueanette Harlee (harleej@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

#2. 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.

Instructional Practice is an area of focus because our ELA test results indicated there was no growth in overall, 3-5 grade proficiency. In addition, there was a decrease in the ELL and White subgroup ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Sorrento Elementary expects to see increases in state assessment data for grade 3-5 as follows:

Third Grade ELA Achievement from 55% to 60%

Fourth Grade ELA Achievement from 59% to 62%

Fifth Grade ELA Achievement from 43% to 47%

3-5 ELL Subgroup Achievement from 6% to 11%

3-5 White Subgroup ELA Achievement from 54% to 57%

Fifth Grade Math Achievement from 61% to 64%

Monitoring:

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

FAST and i-Ready progress monitoring assessments will be analyzed to determine progress towards the goals listed above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Myers (myersl@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.)

Professional Learning Teams will collaborate twice weekly following the PLC process, with support from administration and the instructional coach. The teams will determine essential standards and formative/summative assessments to guide instruction. Teachers and leadership will develop a flexible system of interventions that will support small group instruction focused on the learning targets for essential standards.

This will take place within the reading block. Professional Learning Teams will use intervention data and teacher input to ensure resources such as Foundations, Wit & Wisdom, Reveal math supplements, and i-Ready Tools for Scaffolding are adequately aligned to students' specific needs. In addition, administration will conduct walkthroughs during intervention instruction and team planning as well as review state level assessment data to monitor impact.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to authors of "Learning by Doing", utilizing the PLC process ensures all students learn at high levels while educators work collaboratively and take collective responsibility for all students. Teams will plan based on student performance on formative assessments of the essential standards learning targets and determine best resources to intervene with students who don't master the standard (and for those who do). This will provide targeted instruction to ALL students needing additional support beyond what was provided in Tier 1.

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.

Determine and implement targets and formative assessments based on identified essential standards.

Person Responsible: Whitney Frazier (frazierw@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly throughout the year.

Grade levels meet twice weekly to review data from assessments and determine instructional plan for students who don't get the standard/target and for those who do.

Person Responsible: Whitney Frazier (frazierw@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly throughout the year.

Retest to determine proficiency.

Person Responsible: Whitney Frazier (frazierw@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout year.

Administration and instructional support staff will conduct weekly learning walks to monitor implementation of standards within intervention time.

Person Responsible: Nicole Brouhard (brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

Based on our school data from the 2022-23 Data Report our SWD, ELL, White, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged students were identified as subgroups who made little to no gains in ELA. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring these subgroups of students are receiving targeted instruction through differentiation and interventions in their areas of need.

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 increases in our classroom walkthrough data both qualitative and quantitative and our FAST data from:

Students with Disabilities ELA proficiency from 22% to 25%.

Our ELL Students will increase on school data from 6% to 11%

White students will increase in ELA proficiency from 54% to 57%

Black students will increase in ELA proficiency from 43% to 45%

Monitoring:

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

To monitor walk-to intervention groups, the leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure implementation of flexible intervention groups and provide feedback. The problem solving team will develop and monitor the fidelity of the interventions based on foundational skills and the students' progress monitoring through Performance Matters. In addition, school, district, and state data will be utilized to monitor progress toward the goal of increasing proficiency for our subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Carpenter (carpentera@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.)

Targeted intervention groups will be developed using common formative assessments, diagnostic tests and benchmark summative assessments. Students will be placed in fluid groups and be able to receive intervention and enrichment. They will work on skills specific to their needs during scheduled intervention time. Foundations (Wilson Learning) for K-3, Leveled Literacy Interventions for 3-5 and SIPPS (Systematic Instruction for Phonemic Awareness, Phonics and Sight words) for grades 4-5 will be used to support students in the areas of decoding, fluency, and comprehension. Students needing English Language support will also be using Rosetta Stone and Amira for fluency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor, and support targeted differentiation through the use of walk-to-intervention, there will be an increase in the ELA data achievement for our SWD, ELL, White, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Review data from diagnostic, progress monitoring and common formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Colleen Cubbage (cubbagec@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing support throughout the year.

Develop fluid intervention groups by academic need through iReady, FAST, and common formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Whitney Frazier (frazierw@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Provide interventions in classrooms and adjust as needed based on data.

Person Responsible: Colleen Cubbage (cubbagec@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through the school year.

Conduct walkthroughs during intervention time to ensure fidelity and provide feedback

Person Responsible: Nicole Brouhard (brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through the year.

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).

School improvement funding will be allocated based on the need to continue to support and grow teacher quality and school leadership quality through continued learning and collaboration.

Funds will be utilized to continue the work that we started in the 2021-2022 school year in our Professional Learning Communities to ensure all students learn at high levels, and teachers can learn and grown from best practices within their teams.

Teachers and leaders will continue to attend Professional Learning Communities, workshops and conferences, and High Impact Teams in a PLC at work. This will help and support teachers create classrooms driven by data and standards, with common formative assessments.

In addition, because the team utilizes the four PLC questions, students who need additional support or intervention with the identified essential standards will be supported through the use of common collaborative planning for intervention.

Attending professional learning opportunities supports the goals that continues to move student learning.

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

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST Data Kindergarten End of Year data showed 62% of kindergarten students proficient, 78% of students were proficient for first grade and 47% of students were proficient in reading for second grade. Second grade qualifies for raise status. Instructional practices that will continue to be implemented will be phonics instruction through the use of foundations, small group interventions which include additional supplemental programs such as SIPPS for those most in need. Monitoring the implementation of Wit and Wisdom for core instruction, foundations for phonics and intervention will continue to be monitored and done with fidelity.

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

Based on 2023 FAST data fifth grade is the only grade that did not meet the criteria of scoring 50% or above. The following is the data for the FAST reading proficiency: third grade 55% of students were proficient and scored a level 3 or higher on the state assessment. Fourth grade 59% of students were proficient and scored a level 3 or higher on the state assessment. Fifth grade 45% of students were proficient and scored a level 3 or higher on the state assessment making them fall into raise status.

Instructional practices that will continue to be implemented will include phonics instruction(grade 3) SIPPS and LLI Instruction for intervention for grades 4 and 5. In addition small group walk to interventions which include additional support for those most in need with grade level teachers working with the entire grade level and students specific needs. Monitoring the implementation of Wit and Wisdom for core instruction, foundations for phonics and intervention which include SIPPS and LLI will continue to be monitored and done with fidelity.

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

Measurable outcomes will be tracked by utilizing the progress monitoring test given throughout the year. Based on baseline data for the 2023-2024 school year we will base our outcomes on student proficiency beginning of the year, mid year, and end of year. Based on the 2022-2023 second grade will be closely monitored based on 47% proficiency from the prior year qualifying for Raise.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Measurable outcomes will be tracked by utilizing the new progress monitoring test given throughout the year. Based on baseline data for the 2023-2024 school year we will base our outcomes on student proficiency beginning of the year, mid year, and end of year. Based on 2023 FAST data fifth grade is the only grade that did not meet the criteria of scoring 50% or above. The following is the data for the FAST reading proficiency: third grade 62% of students were proficient and scored a level 3 or higher on the state assessment. Fourth grade 59% of students were proficient and scored a level 3 or higher on the state assessment. Fifth grade 45% of students were proficient and scored a level 3 or higher on the state assessment making them eligible for RAISE.

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.

Monitoring will be done by the leadership team which includes administration, Literacy Coach and ESE school specialist for the fourth grade team. The leadership team will attend weekly professional learning team planning, walk classrooms to ensure implementation with fidelity of core instruction with standard driven instruction and intervention. In addition we will monitor and support fifth grade teachers and classes. Monitoring implementation of core instruction, intervention, and planning will be key to ensure academic growth above 50%.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brouhard, Nicole, brouhardn@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?

Evidence based programs that will be utilized will be Wit and Wisdom for Core instruction. Foundations will be utilized for phonics instruction. In intervention and small groups (GEODES, SIPPS, and LLI) will

be utilized for the students most in need. In addition i-ready data will be utilized to support standards based intervention. All of these curriculums meet the needs of the students and align with both state and district plans and BEST standards.

Rationale:

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

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

The curriculum and intervention programs address the identified needs of the students in grades K-5 but target 2nd and 5th grade students as extra support and resources will be placed in the grade level to help aid in intervention and acceleration.

When done with fidelity the curriculum and programs and designated times for intervention have shown to be effective. In grades Kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th all grade levels showed improvement in reading.

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 Teams - twice weekly to address what we teach and how we teach. Standards based instruction. Literacy Coach and Principal will coach and assist teachers utilizing the district framework and the four PLC questions.	Brouhard, Nicole, brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us
Assessment- Provide Intervention and Extension on Wednesdays centered around essential standards. No new content, instead deepening knowledge around the essential standards identified and intervention and extension around that standard based on formative assessments. This will be monitored through evidence of planning and walk throughs.	Brouhard, Nicole, brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us
Identifying the Den Ten students. 8-10 students on the cusp of proficiency at PM 2. Once determined, those students will be in small groups working on the standards that they are missing so they can be proficient, or at a level 3. Additional supports to help the teacher with these students will be the Literacy Coach, VE Teachers, Teacher Assistance, and Instructional Support Teachers.	Myers, Lori, myersl@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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$8,328.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0069 - Sorrento Elementary	Other		\$8,328.00
			Notes: Instructional staff will attend a Professional Learning Communities at Work Institute to support collaborative planning for standards-aligned instruction and intervention. This is a continuation of the previous years' PLC training so our teachers can strengthen instruction and support students who score at a level 1 or 2 on state assessments.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				\$2,844.52
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Instructional Staff Training		0069 - Sorrento Elementary	Other		\$2,844.52
			Notes: Instructional staff will attend a Professional Learning Communities at Work Institute to support collaborative planning for standards-aligned instruction and intervention. This is a continuation of the previous years' PLC training so our teachers can strengthen instruction and support students who score at a level 1 or 2 on state assessments.			
Total:						\$11,172.52

Budget Approval

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

No