

Lake County Schools

Astatula 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Astatula Elementary School

13925 FLORIDA AVE, Astatula, FL 34705

<https://ael.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.

The mission of Astatula Elementary is to encourage creativity, personal pride, and academic excellence. In a safe, caring environment, individuals will be challenged to become productive lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure the success of all students by providing academic and social-emotional support while immersing students in an exciting learning environment that affords them a unique educational experience.

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
Sherman, Robert	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring school safety, standards-based instruction, and stakeholder involvement. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Zeiger, Janice	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for ensuring school safety, standards-based instruction, and stakeholder involvement. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Burris, Cathy	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Christianson, Jacalyn	Other	The ESE Specialist coordinates the services to meet the needs of all students with disabilities. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Marcinkus, Amy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Anderson, Karrie	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Adair, Stacy	School Counselor	The counselor serves as a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. They are 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. Maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services are the responsibility of the school counselor. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.

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 leadership team develops the school improvement plan using several forms of data and information collected that includes academic achievement, climate surveys, and early warning indicators. The leadership team analyzes the data and makes decisions based on areas of need. The plan is presented to SAC, which is comprised of faculty, staff, parents, and community members, and input is provided. Once the plan is published it is available for all stakeholders to view.

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 leadership team actively monitors the implementation of the SIP. The team will engage in data chats with teachers and closely monitor, FAST, STAR, Foundations, and iReady data to determine growth throughout the year. The principal provides updates of the SIP to the SAC.

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)	other
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 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	36	32	28	25	16	34	0	0	0	171	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	16	24	0	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	11	19	0	0	0	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	2	24	24	27	35	0	0	0	115	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	12	18	35	34	42	0	0	0	142

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	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	6	49	39	30	21	38	0	0	0	183	
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	4	8	15	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	2	3	14	9	3	6	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in Math	3	2	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	31	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	30	0	0	0	50	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	0	16	17	23	0	0	0	58	

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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	6	49	39	30	21	38	0	0	0	183	
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	4	8	15	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	2	3	14	9	3	6	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in Math	3	2	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	31	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	30	0	0	0	50	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	0	16	17	23	0	0	0	58	

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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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*	47	47	53	53	50	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				59			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			56		
Math Achievement*	56	55	59	50	46	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				54			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			47		
Science Achievement*	58	52	54	49	52	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	61	59	67			70		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	278
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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
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	19	Yes	2	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			

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	51			

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	47			

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	47			56			58					65
SWD	16			21			15				4	
ELL	30			40			55				5	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			65							2	
HSP	35			52			49				5	62
MUL												

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	52			56			60				4	
FRL	40			49			52				5	64

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	59	56	50	54	33	49					67
SWD	29	47	43	24	37	26	9					
ELL	31	61	67	28	38	25	33					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67	71		33	57							
HSP	41	51	58	42	49	29	43					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	61	45	58	55	28	56					
FRL	42	57	53	41	50	29	39					63

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	54	56	50	57	47	49					70
SWD	22	55		31	55		27					
ELL	28			44								70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			24								
HSP	40	52		46	48		43					74
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	61		57	68		58					
FRL	39	39	40	40	44	45	36					79

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	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	58%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	62%	-13%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	51%	6%

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.

Analysis of end of year state progress monitoring identified Reading Instruction as a critical area of need. 2022-2023 PM3 data shows that 53% of our students in grades 3-5 are still below proficiency in Reading. Specifically 51% of our third graders and 57% of our fourth graders did not score a three or higher on the 2022-2023 PM 3. In addition, the STAR Early Literacy assessment indicates 37% of the students in K-1 that took the end of the year assessment did not score on grade level. Furthermore, out of the students who took the STAR Reading test in grades K-2, 46% scored below proficient. In addition, the Hispanic subgroup under-performed in comparison with other subgroups with 38% proficiency. Contributing factors included foundational gaps and teacher knowledge of standards. Additionally, there

was an influx of English Language Learners, along with a significant increase in students qualifying for ESE services. Attendance continues to be a factor as well.

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

While there was some decline in ELA across the grade levels, the students who moved from 3rd to 4th showed the greatest decline in English Language Arts with 52% proficiency in grade 3 to 44% proficiency in grade 4. There were students with foundational gaps who continued to struggle with interventions in place.

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.

The greatest gap in our assessment data was 3rd grade math, with 49% of students meeting high standards compared to the state average of 59%. Contributing factors included varying levels of expertise among teachers in implementing the new B.E.S.T. Standards.

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

Overall, math showed the most improvement in grades 3 through 5. Fifth grade math increased 19 points from 2022 to 2023. Fourth grade students exhibited a 19 point increase in proficiency from the previous year. Professional development and instructional support on the new standards were provided to all teachers. Common assessment data and iReady results were utilized to determine the academic needs of students. Small group instruction was facilitated by certified teachers in grades 3 through 5 using iReady resources to reteach and enrich.

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

Based on EWS data, attendance and reading deficiencies are two areas of concern.

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

1. English Language Arts (K-5)
2. Hispanic Subgroup for ELA
3. School-wide Attendance

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Analysis of end of year state progress monitoring identified Reading Instruction as a critical area of need. 2022-2023 PM3 data shows that 53% of our students in grades 3-5 are still below proficiency in Reading. Specifically 51% of our third graders and 57% of our fourth graders did not score a three or higher on the 2022-2023 PM 3. In addition, the STAR Early Literacy assessment indicates 37% of the students in K-1 that took the end of the year assessment did not score on grade level. Furthermore, out of the students who took the STAR Reading test in grades K-2, 46% scored below proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of students in grades 3-5 meeting high standards at the end of the year progress monitoring from 47% to 55% or higher. In addition, increase the number of Kindergarten students scoring proficient on the end of year STAR Early Literacy assessment from 63% to 68% and increase the number of grades 1-2 students meeting high standards on the end of the year STAR Reading assessment from 54% to 60%. The literacy leadership team will build a positive school reading culture in our school by promoting book talks, sharing guest reader videos on social media, conducting family reading nights, and showcasing student book reviews on the morning announcements.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor Reading proficiency and learning gains by conducting classroom learning walks, engaging in data driven common collaborative planning, and implementing best teaching practices and standards-based instruction. Teachers will utilize a digital data tracker to help visualize and organize students who have met high standards and those that need additional instruction. The leadership team will engage in data chats with teachers and closely monitor FAST, STAR, common assessments, Foundations and iReady data by reviewing the data during leadership team meetings and common collaborative planning times to determine growth throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cathy Burris (burrisca@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.)

iReady will be used to increase the number of students who meet higher standards in ELA. iReady is an adaptive learning tool and assessment that students and teachers use to support growth in reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady was selected because it provides a wide range of instructional resources, both computer-based and teacher-led designed to increase student achievement and growth. These resources can be student specific and grade level standards.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

1. PD for iReady
2. Quarterly data chats with teachers and administration
3. Weekly common collaborative planning focused on essential standards, learning targets, common formative assessments and plans for instruction utilizing the District Instructional Framework and PLT process

Person Responsible: Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**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.

Analysis of the end of the year FAST assessment identified the Hispanic subgroup as critical. 38% of Hispanic students were proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of Hispanic students in grades 3-5 meeting high standards at the end of the year progress monitoring from 38% to 45% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor Reading proficiency and learning gains by conducting classroom learning walks, engaging in data driven common collaborative planning, and implementing best teaching practices and standards-based instruction. Teachers will utilize a digital data tracker to help visualize and organize students who have met high standards and those that need additional instruction. The leadership team will engage in data chats with teachers and closely monitor FAST, STAR, common assessments, Foundations and iReady data during leadership team meetings to determine growth for grade 3-5 students in the Hispanic subgroup using Performance Matters report filters.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cathy Burris (burrisc@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.)

iReady will be used to increase the number of students who meet higher standards in ELA. iReady is an adaptive learning tool and assessment that students and teachers use to support growth in reading. The resources in iReady will be utilized to reteach and retest students and ensure mastery of the standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady was selected because it provides a wide range of instructional resources, both computer-based and teacher-led designed to increase student achievement and growth. These resources can be student specific and grade level standards.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

1. PD for iReady
2. Quarterly data chats with teachers and administration

3. Utilize the digital data tracker and Performance Matters reports to track this subgroup
4. Weekly common collaborative planning

Person Responsible: Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 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.

Based on EWS data from the Needs Assessment, our critical areas of focus are students absent 10% or more days and students with a substantial reading deficiency. Analysis of the data for attendance revealed that 171 students were absent 10% or more days and 115 students with a substantial reading deficiency during the 2022-23 school year. If we have a comprehensive plan for tracking attendance data, then we will be able to address attendance issues efficiently. When students arrive at school on a regular basis, they can strive, thrive and achieve academic reading success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on these areas, we expect to see a decrease of 10% in both the number of students absent 10% or more days and the number of students with substantial reading deficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teachers will monitor attendance daily and communicate with parents after the second absence. School counselor will analyze attendance data through Focus and Performance Matters EWS reports and meet with the school social worker on a monthly basis for child study team meetings. Administration and the Literacy Coach will analyze STAR, FAST, Foundations, and i-Ready Reading data during leadership team meetings and common collaborative planning times to determine growth throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Adair (adairs@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.)

i-Ready Reading and Foundations will be used to increase the number of students who meet high standards in ELA. iReady is an adaptive learning tool and assessment that students and teachers use to support growth in reading. Foundations addresses foundational skills in grades K-3. The Attendance Success Plan will be used for students with attendance concerns. The plan utilizes resources from Attendance Works to address chronic absences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady was selected because it provides a wide range of instructional resources, both computer-based and teacher-led, that are designed to increase student achievement and growth. These Reading resources are individualized to address specific skill gaps. Attendance Works features research-based strategies for improving attendance, chronic absences, and truancy.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

1. Provide instructional training and support to teachers regarding attendance
2. Present information on attendance including long-term effects of absenteeism at grade level Curriculum nights
3. Monthly child study team meetings with the school social worker
4. Utilization of community-based programs to improve attendance
5. Creation of a Girls on the Run club that targets students with attendance concerns and promotes exercise and emotional well-being
6. Implement attendance awareness events to encourage positive attendance
7. Quarterly Data chats with teachers and administration
8. Data Analysis by administration and Literacy Coach following each assessment window

Person Responsible: Stacy Adair (adairs@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

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

N/A The percentage of students scoring on or above level three in K,1, and 2 for the Star Assessment were above 50%.

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

According to our ELA FAST data from the 2023 school year, our 4th grade had 57% of the students scoring below proficiency and our 3rd grade students had 53%. With high expectations and a growth mindset, teachers will continue to plan and deliver standards based instruction through authentic literacy utilizing our adopted English Language Arts curriculum. By utilizing the gradual release of the responsibility model, with an explicit focus on creating collaborative learning opportunities consistently throughout all grade levels, teachers will incorporate reading, writing, thinking and talking in every lesson every day. Teachers will incorporate small group instruction in their 90 minute reading block to target students' specific reading needs. In addition to the instructional reading block, students will receive targeted intervention or enrichment in reading for 30 minutes four days a week. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because the data shows a decline in student test scores in grade 4 ELA achievement dropping from 47% to 44% and 3rd grade achievement dropping from 52% to 49% of our students being proficient readers. This area of focus will improve student achievement by ensuring teachers are planning lessons with the district initiative and B.E.S.T standards as their guideline. By ensuring that lessons are standards aligned and follow the district adopted instructional framework, we will provide students with collaborative experiences where students have the opportunity to read, write, think, and talk resulting in student academic success. In addition, small group instruction that is standards aligned and student centered specifically targets student's individual reading needs will grow more proficient readers. The additional 30 minutes will allow teachers to provide data driven instruction based on the students individual needs. Astatula is committed to increasing student achievement by setting high expectations and a growth mindset during the students academic day.

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

N/A The percentage of students scoring on or above level in K,1, and 2 for the Star Assessment were above 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

After an analysis of the 2023 ELA FSA data, we expect to see an increase in our 4th grade ELA achievement grow from 43% proficient to 53% and our 3rd grade ELA achievement grow from 49% to 55% of our students scoring a 3 or higher on the 2024 F.A.S.T assessment.

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.

We will monitor Reading proficiency and learning gains by conducting classroom learning walks, engaging in data driven common collaborative planning, and implementing best teaching practices and standards-based instruction. Teachers will utilize a digital data tracker to help visualize and organize

students who have met high standards and those that need additional instruction. The leadership team will engage in data chats with teachers and closely monitor FAST, common assessments, Foundations and iReady data by reviewing the data during leadership team meetings and common collaborative planning times to determine growth throughout the year. Ongoing monitoring will ensure that students receive the instruction and intervention they need to increase their proficiency.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sherman, Robert, shermanr@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?

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through school-wide initiatives designed to target every student's precise academic need. Wit & Wisdom, students' IReady instructional path, Foundations level 3, and Magnetic Reading will be the main evidence-based instructional tools used at Astatula Elementary. Walk to Intervention time is set aside four days of the week for teachers to implement targeted systematic research based instruction in ELA. Resources that will be used for intervention and to monitor reading proficiency include the following: iReady's Language Arts Florida Standards Tools for Instruction; Quick Reads -Strong ESSA Evidence, iReady Magnetic Reading, iReady Phonics books (iReady personalized instruction -Strong ESSA evidence), and Foundations by Wilson's (Wilson's Academy who created Foundations has a strong ESSA rating) These will be implemented for students who are struggling with foundational skills through small groups led by classroom teachers and coaches. Students with significant reading gaps will receive intervention from reading endorsed or certified teachers.

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?

Wilson's Foundations is our school's adopted instructional material for K-3 foundational skills. Foundations incorporates the Science of Reading and Writing to teach students phonemic awareness, phonics, spelling, and handwriting. Wilson's Academy, who creates Foundations, has a "Strong Evidence" outcome on ESSA. Great Minds Wit and Wisdom is our core adopted instructional material for K-5 ELA approved by the FLDOE. The curriculum incorporates the principles of the Science of Reading into our ELA

instruction. i-Ready teacher directed instruction from the online tools for instruction which includes recommendations for Phonics for Reading, Magnetic Reading, and Scaffold Reading lessons, is computerized evidence-based instruction from Curriculum and Associates for ELA. It has a "Moderate" rating on ESSA. Quick Reads, which focuses on students in the upper grades who struggle with reading comprehension, has a "Strong" ESSA rating.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coach will provide professional development, modeling, coaching and collaborative discussions surrounding core instruction of Wilson's Foundations for 3rd grade and Wit and Wisdom for 3rd and 4th grade.	Sherman, Robert, shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us
Administer the i-Ready beginning of the year diagnostic assessments. Complete i-Ready data analysis to create target instructional groups during our intervention block. Conduct data chats with the teachers to identify targeted areas of need for each student	Sherman, Robert, shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us
Implementation of STEAM Challenge Days- The implementation of STEAM Challenge Days gives each grade level the opportunity to have a full day of planning where teachers can analyze reading data, have time for vertical planning and plan best practices in standards based instruction. During this time, the implementation of curriculum is reviewed as well as data that can be used to drive their instruction.	Sherman, Robert, shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us
Professional Development-. Teachers are preparing to receive training on i-Ready and how they can use the i-Ready assessment data to group students for small group reading practice.	Sherman, Robert, shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us

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.

Copies of the SIP will be disseminated to stakeholders via a link on the school's website and social media platforms (Facebook and Twitter). Copies will be placed in the front office, parent resource center, public libraries and disseminated during the Title I Annual meeting. To ensure goals are met, components of the SIP will be reviewed at monthly scheduled SAC meetings

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))

We believe positive relationships and engaging parents, families, and community stakeholders in the education process is essential to improved academic success for students. We will foster and support active parent and family engagement so that the school and parents work together as partners in educating children.

To build positive relationships we will schedule and provide timely notice of School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Use social media platforms to notify and invite families and other key stakeholders of school-wide events and activities. Information is shared via the following platforms - Astatula Elementary Website (www.ael.lake.k12.fl.us), Facebook @AstatulaElem, X(Twitter) @AstatulaElemen and Peachjar.

Data Parent/Teacher Conferences - Teachers will discuss each child's assessment results, expectations and goals for the school year.

Literacy Night/Curriculum Family Events - Parents will receive materials and modeling of activities that can be used in the home.

A Family School Liaison (FSL) – Link between the school and home. Family liaisons work in the schools and community to help families get the information and assistance they need to support their children and to ensure their academic success.

Title I Annual Meeting – Meeting to explain the Title I programs and the rights of parents to be involved.

School-Parent Compact - Outlines how parents, students, and school staff will share the responsibility for improving student achievement, and describes how parents and teachers will communicate.

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))

Academic achievement data is analyzed to determine the success of instruction, curriculum, strategies, and resources. Data drives the decisions made to determine the success of the academic programs and the amount and quality of learning time. Reading and Math intervention times are provided to the students based on student needs. We implement before-and-after school tutoring programs. Certified teachers are employed as academic tutors to provide support to students for intensive and/or acceleration in reading and math during school hours.

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.