

Lake County Schools

Seminole Springs 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Seminole Springs Elementary School

26200 W HUFF RD, Eustis, FL 32736

<https://sse.lake.k12.fl.us>

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.

To bring our BEST and ensure high levels of learning for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create collaborative learners that achieve excellence socially, emotionally, and academically in order to become the BEST version of themselves.

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
Bracewell, Kyle	Principal	Assistant Principal Support Team Guidance & Mental Health Team Leaders FTE Class Size Title 1 PTO/SAC Media Contact MTSS Contact Allocations Budgets Professional Development Contact School Communication (Facebook, Twitter, Week at a Glance) 3rd promotion
Hargroves, Maria	Assistant Principal	School Safety Chair Facilities/Custodians Cafeteria/Personnel Personnel Awards Health Coordinator Parent Involvement Plan Accreditation Teacher Assistants Duty Roster ESE Contact – train new ESE Specialist ESE Meetings as needed TQR Meetings w/ CRT 5th Grade Promotion Oversee Title 1 Tutoring w/ Lit Coach Oversee Testing Operations w/ Guidance Counselor
Smith, Jessica B.	Reading Coach	Instructional Coaching - K-5 ELA and Social Studies Integration - Foundations, Geodes & Wit and Wisdom MTSS Coordinator Title 1 Liaison Title 1 Tutoring Literacy Week w/ Mrs. Purdham Tropicana Speech 3rd Grade Promotion/Summer Reading Camp
White, Tia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Instructional Coaching K-5 Math and Science STEAM Contact - Award/Binder - STEAM Bowl Teams

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - STEAM Night/Science Fair New Teacher Contact Assist AP as TQR Testing Coordinator (Lead)
Ankeny, Laura A.	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MTSS (PST Team) Assist Testing Coordinator ESOL Contact - Rosetta Stone - WIDA / IPT Testing - ELL Dictionaries 504 Compliance Attendance Meetings Behavior MTSS w/ PASS Case Reviews Articulation Meetings (5th Grade) Families in Transition (FIT) Contact Other duties as needed
Wendt@Lake.K12.fl.us, Mark	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaborates with Life Stream Services Partnership - Develops Multi-tiered System of School Wide Mental Health Support - School Based Crisis Leader - School Contact for Mental Health - Provides Mental Health Professional Development for School Faculty and Staff - Works closely with Guidance, ESE School Specialist and PASS teacher to identify and monitor at risk students - Monitors implementation of Tier 1 – Morning Circles - Restorative Practices with students - Other duties as needed

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 School Improvement Plan will be presented to our School Advisory Council on August 29th. During the meeting, representatives from our school's leadership team, teachers, staff members, parents, business and community leaders will be provided an opportunity to give feedback on this year's plan. Their input will then be added to the plan, as it is an ongoing document.

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 is an ongoing, live document that will be reviewed, revised and improved throughout the school year.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	0	30	39	41	39	34	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	6	10	14	6	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	7	5	9	15	6	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	16	29	16	37	40	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	15	9	7	36	45	0	0	0	112
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	29	16	37	40	0	0	0	138

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	11	8	14	23	16	0	0	0	72

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	21	29	27	22	24	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	8	17	20	20	8	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	8	17	20	19	9	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	14	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	10	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	4	11	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	21	29	27	22	24	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	8	17	20	20	8	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	8	17	20	19	9	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	14	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	10	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	4	11	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	50	47	53	56	50	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				58			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			63		
Math Achievement*	58	55	59	61	46	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				53			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			19		
Science Achievement*	74	52	54	47	52	59	59		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		61	59	64			53		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	233
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

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	51			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	56			

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	50			58			74					
SWD	27			20			69				4	
ELL	32			41							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	38			44			67				4	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			60			80				4	
FRL	42			51			69				4	

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	56	58	52	61	53	64	47					64
SWD	37	59	56	40	63	71	32					
ELL	48	65		52	75							64
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	41	54		46	70	73	36					62
MUL	44	75		38	58							
PAC												
WHT	61	57	50	65	49	50	52					
FRL	46	57	52	55	62	77	38					64

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	59	64	63	64	38	19	59					53
SWD	41	67		42	33	25	22					
ELL	44			47								53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	57	75		50	50		67					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	60	62	69	34	23	56					
FRL	53	54	64	56	35		49					58

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	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	54%	0%	58%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	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.

Our 3rd grade Reading data was the lowest performing group at 49%. This trend was consistent during all three progress monitoring windows. This team was primarily new to the school and new to systems that we have in place that support teacher and student learning.

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

Our overall Math Achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year. During the 2021-2022 school year proficiency was 61% and last year's proficiency was 56%. This decline is attributed to the alignment to new math standards and adoption of the new math curriculum.

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.

Our 3rd grade Math data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. SSES's proficiency rate was 53% and the state proficiency rate was 59%. This low performing trend was consistent during all three progress monitoring windows. This team was primarily new to the school and new to systems that we have in place that support teacher and student learning.

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

Our 5th grade Science data improved from 47% proficiency to 72% proficiency. The biggest contributing factor was placing a teacher that had years of experience teaching 5th grade science.

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

Daily attendance rate continues to be the biggest area of concern for our school. This year, we are putting incentives in place to increase daily attendance. We are also putting systems in place to ensure that parents and guardians are contacted when multiple days in a row are missed.

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

Seminole Springs Elementary is committed to continue our efforts to be a true Professional Learning Community. The systems and structures that we have built over the past four years, will continue throughout this year and we will work to onboard and support our new instructional staff members around the highly effective practices that we implement.

Beginning in August, teachers will participate in professional learning with Sherie Smith, Susan Emrick and our school's Literacy Coach, Jessica Smith around FUNdations, our district's phonics instruction program. Follow up learning opportunities will be embedded throughout the year with the goal of becoming a Model FUNdations School.

Beginning in August, teachers will participate in professional learning with Tracy Wood and our School's CRT, Tia White around math fluency. Follow up learning opportunities will be ongoing throughout 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).

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

Seminole Springs Elementary is committed to continue our efforts to be a true Professional Learning Community. The systems and structures that we have built over the past four years, will continue throughout this year and we will work to onboard and support our new instructional staff members around the highly effective practices that we implement.

Beginning in August, our Kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade teachers will participate in professional learning with Sherie Smith, Susan Emrick and our school's Literacy Coach, Jessica Smith around FUNdations, our district's phonics instruction program. Follow up learning opportunities will be embedded throughout the year with the goal of becoming a Model FUNdations School.

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

Seminole Springs Elementary is committed to continue our efforts to be a true Professional Learning Community. The systems and structures that we have built over the past four years, will continue throughout this year and we will work to onboard and support our new instructional staff members around the highly effective practices that we implement.

This year in grades 3-5, we are starting a reading challenge to increase fluency, comprehension and building life long readers. Students will earn rewards and a chance to win one grade level prize and one grand prize each quarter if they complete the challenge. Here's How:

- Read to your child OR have your child read aloud to you or a sibling every week night.
- Fill out a reading log every week night. This is considered your child's 20 minutes of nightly reading homework.
- 3rd - 5th graders will also have the option of completing a summary digitally or on paper for each book read. Each summary earns them an EXTRA chance to win the grand prizes.

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

Seminole Springs will improve learning and success in the ELA content area from 58% to 62% for K-2nd on the PM3 STAR Test.

- Increase in phonemic awareness and word study
- Increased student achievement
- Increased teacher retention
- Positive school climate

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Seminole Springs will improve learning and success in the ELA content area from 53% to 57% for 3rd-5th grade on the FAST PM3 ELA Test.

- Increase in reading fluency, comprehension and overall love for reading
- Increased student achievement
- Increased teacher retention
- Positive school climate

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.

Seminole Springs will use the following monitoring tools to analyze impact of the areas of focus.

- FAST
- STAR
- Benchmark Assessments through Performance Matters
- Common Assessments
- Teacher retention data
- Principal/ Assistant Principal Surveys

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bracewell, Kyle, bracewellk@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?

Seminole Springs will use the following monitoring tools to analyze impact of the areas of focus.

- FAST
- STAR
- Benchmark Assessments through Performance Matters
- Common Assessments
- Teacher retention data
- Principal/ Assistant Principal Surveys
- All areas of focus meet Florida's definition of a strong evidence based practice/program.
- All areas of focus align with Lake's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan.
- All areas of focus align with the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

Rationale:

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

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

Seminole Springs will use the following monitoring tools to analyze impact of the areas of focus.

- FAST
- STAR
- Benchmark Assessments through Performance Matters
- Common Assessments
- Teacher retention data
- Principal/ Assistant Principal Surveys
- All areas of focus address the needs in K-5 ELA instruction.
- All areas of focus align with Lake's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

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 and Literacy Coaching:

Seminole Springs will improve learning and success in the ELA content area from 58% to 62% for K-2nd on the PM3 STAR Test. This will be achieved through increasing the level of instruction with FUNdations.

Bracewell, Kyle,
bracewellk@lake.k12.fl.us

Our Kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade teachers will participate in professional learning with Sherie Smith, Susan Emrick and our school's Literacy Coach, Jessica Smith around FUNdations, our district's phonics instruction program. Follow up learning opportunities will be embedded throughout the year with the goal of becoming a Model FUNdations School.

Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching:

Seminole Springs will improve learning and success in the ELA content area from 53% to 57% for 3rd-5th grade on the FAST PM3 ELA Test.

This year in grades 3-5, we are starting a reading challenge to increase fluency, comprehension and building life long readers. Students will earn rewards and a chance to win one grade level prize and one grand prize each quarter if they complete the challenge. Here's How:

Bracewell, Kyle,
bracewellk@lake.k12.fl.us

- Read to your child OR have your child read aloud to you or a sibling every week night.
- Fill out a reading log every week night. This is considered your child's 20 minutes of nightly reading homework.
- 3rd - 5th graders will also have the option of completing a summary digitally or on paper for each book read. Each summary earns them an EXTRA chance to win the grand prizes.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

- The School Improvement Plan will be presented to our School Advisory Council on August 29th.
- The School Improvement Plan will be presented to our Faculty/Staff Meeting on September 5th.
- The School Improvement Plan will be presented to all stakeholders on Title I Night on October 5th.
- The School Improvement Plan will be linked on our school website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

- The Parent Family Engagement Plan has been developed which includes the following:
 - * Literacy Night
 - * State Assessment Night
 - * Science/Math Night
- Parents are encouraged to participate in our School Advisory Council and Parent Booster Organization.
- The Parent Family Engagement Plan is on our school website and hard copies are available in the front office.

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

- Common planning in all grade levels, two times per week.
- Ongoing professional development on FUNdations, through district support, in grades K-2.
- Ongoing professional development on math fluency through district support, school-wide.

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

This plan is developed in coordination with parents, community partners, staff and students. To gather input, we will send an end of the year survey to parents, community partners, staff, and students. Stakeholders also give input during SAC meetings and parent events held at the school.

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: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No