Rimes Early Learning & Literacy Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Rimes Early Learning & Literacy Center

3101 SCHOOLVIEW ST, Leesburg, FL 34748

https://rel.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.

Rimes' mission is to provide all students with necessary skills to become life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A dynamic, progressive and collaborative learning community embracing change and diversity where every student will graduate with the skills needed to succeed in post secondary and the workplace.

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
Ward, Dominique	Principal	* to establish a safe and welcoming environment. This collaborative attitude enables us to meet the challenges of academic excellence is a positive, fun, and nuturing way. *Oversee, evaluate, provide assistance and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner as an instructrional leader for instructional and non-instructional staff. *Maintain compliance with state and federal policies and guidelines. *Oversee data chats of progress monitoring for both academics and behavior *Facilitate collaborative team meetings, faculty meetings, and leadershiop meetings *Assists in the implementation of the safety plan and safety drills *Oversees budget *Discipline *Learning walks *Attends and participates in Penguin Pride/SAC
Gilbert, Stephanie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	*Set the tone for ensuring a guaranteed viable curriculum with a focus on improved learning for adults and students alike *Provide coaching and mentoring with standards and instructional practices. Support teachers guaranteeing all instruction is aligned to the standard. Collaborate, observe, and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner. *Data chats *Collaborative planning facilitator *Textbook Manager *Learning walks *Title 1 inventory *MTSS team *Testing Coordinator *STEAM coordinator *Tier 3 interventionist *Title 1 tutoring facilitator
Simmons, Paige	Reading Coach	*Set the tone for ensuring a guaranteed a guaranteed viable curriculum with a focus on improved learning for adults and students alike *Provide coaching and mentoring with standards and instructional practices. Support teachers guaranteeing all instruction is aligned to the standard. Collaborate, observe, and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner. *Data chats *Collaborative Planning Facilitator *Master schedule *Monthly data chats *MTSS coordinator *Small group interventionist *Testing coordinator *TEAM Expert *All literacy events

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vachon, Melanie	Instructional Coach	*Provide coaching/mentoring with BEST standards or IEP goals and highly effective insturctional practices through the structures classroom strategies. *MTSS team *Monthly data chats *ESE Coordinator/Support *IEP coordinator *Learning Walks *ESE pre-k and VPK collaborative planning facilitator *New teacher induction team
Widmann, Amy	Instructional Media	*Textbook manager *Interventionist *Morning News *Inventory
Yox, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	*kindergarten teacher
Zamora, Kristy	Teacher, K-12	

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 Advisory Council will include Rimes' stakeholders and will meet regularly to review the School Improvement Plan.

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 reviewed at each School Advisory Council meeting.

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-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*		47	53		50	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		55	59		46	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*		52	54		52	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		61	59	73					

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	73
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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				
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	70			

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												73
SWD												
ELL												73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												70

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												
SWD												
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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.

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.

Second grade math demonstrates the greatest need in Math and Reading.

ELA data demonstrates the greatest need for improvement in Language and Phonics and Word Recognition.

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

The students continued to struggle in decoding words, identifying sight words, and making meaning from text.

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.

Second grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average was 73%, Rimes second grade math percentage was 56% rendering a 17% point deficit. The factors contributing to this decline was the implementation of a new math curriculum and the lack of a designated supplementary support protocol.

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

Kindergarten STAR reading scores showed the most improvement. The kindergarten team was the most cohesive professionaly learning team on our campus. They planned together constantly and consistently implemented best teaching practices as a whole. Kindergarten was also fortunate in recruiting a phenomal academic teacher assistance who strives to see the success of all students.

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

Two potential areas of concern are attendance and course failures.

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

1. Attendance
2. STAR and STAR early literacy reading proficiency
3. STAR math
4. Behavior

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.

Through our PBIS System, we will foster a positive school community and culture where we are collectively committed to the success of all students. If we have high expectations and foster positive relationships, we will make Rimes ELLC a place where people are collectively committed to ensuring high levels of learning for all.

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

By focusing on high levels of learning for all and building positive relationships we expect to see a decrease in the number of students with more than 10% absenteeism from 20% to 15%.

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

EWS data-absenteeism report

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Zamora (zamorak@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.)

Fostering positive relationships, rewarding and recognizing student atendance, and communicating with families regularly will help decrease the number of absent students.

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

Fostering positive relationships, rewarding and recognizing student attendance and communication with families regularly will increase the number of students regularly attending school.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers and staff will continue the implementation of the PBIS STAR frameword to implement in all classrooms. Additionally, new teachers to Rimes will be trained in Sanford Harmony as it continues as a TIer 1 social emotional curriculum. Having a common language across campus will help to set positive expectations for student behaviors as well as build relationships.

Person Responsible: Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/20/2023-5/31/2024

School and faculty will reward and recognize student attendance daily and quarterly, using the PBIS framework.

Person Responsible: Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)
By When: 8/10/2023-5/31/2024

#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.

Based on STAR proficiency scores, instructional practice as it relates to standards aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area was assigned as a criticial area of need because the data shows gaps between Rimes proficiency levels and the county proficiency levels. Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on guided instruction as a strategy to transfer knowledge and responsibility for learning to students by scaffolding through questioning, prompting and cueing.

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

By focusing on this area ,we expect to see an increase in end of year STAR math proficiency from 65 to 80.

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

Common Formative Assessments
Classroom Learning WA
PLC data analysis (questions 3 and 4)
STAR math data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Ward (wardd2@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.)

Teacher will use iReady and explicit instruction, while continuing to work in their professional learning teams during grade level collaborative planning time with an intense focus on student learning and results. The four PLC questions will guide the learning and work within teacher teams as they plan for standards based instruction through establishing purpose, authentic literacy experiences and delving into instructional best practices.

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

Students benefit from explicit instruction and immediate feedback that iReady provides. Lake County Schools is committed to becoming a Professional Learning Community school district.

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.

*Implementation of Wonderful Wednesdays where Kindergarten through second grade teachers will have a complete afternoon of planning time as their students rotate through specials/enrichment
*Weekly PLT meetings will be held every Thursday.
*Intervention will be done for all students on grade level by classroom teachers.
* iReady PD for K-2 teachers

Person Responsible: Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/10/2023-5/31/2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

Instructional staff will use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration activites to increase learning gains for all students. All students will parricipate in "walk to" intervention where teachers will use research based strategies, iReady teacher toolbox lessons, and Reveal math differentiation lessons to reinforce concepts. If teachers use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration for all students, then students will receive effective feedback that will help move their understanding of essential learning targets forward.

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in STAR math proficiency scores from 65% to 80%.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by analyzing grade level formative data (Reveal math diagnostic tools and exit tickets) aligned to essential learning targets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Analyzing and using Reveal math diagnostic tools and exit tickets to inform interventions and acceleration for math will help increase learning gains. this will be evidenced when discussing "What we will do for students who did not get it, and what will we do for those who already know it" (PLC Questions 3 and 4). The progress monitoring data from the frequent common assessments and diagnostic tools will be analyzed on an ongoing basis by coaches, administration, and teachers. This data will be used to group and re-groups students accordingly.

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

If teachers use ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to intervene or accelerate students then students will receive timely and effective intervention. Summer leadership professional development provided specific steps to take within intervention and acceleration per the Taking Action. To monitor this strategy, we will complete classroom learning walks during our intervention/enrichment block, participate in data analysis conversations with teachers, and progress monitor students on mastery of essential learning targets in Math.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

*Complete learning walks during intervention/acceleration block
*Data analysis conversations with teachers using Reveal tests, STAR math, iReady math diagnostic for inter-rater reliability between all scores
*Reveal exit tickets will be used weekly to provide opportunities for flexible walk to groupings.
*Structured Classroom Implementation and Best Practices.

Person Responsible: Dominique Ward (wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/1/2023-5/15/2024

Collaborative planning for ELA intervention with first grade teachers and literacy coach

Person Responsible: Paige Simmons (simmonsp@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 12/2023 (Mid-Year STAR testing)

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).

n/a

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

Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on guided instruction as a strategy to transfer knowledge and responsibility for learning to students by scaffolding through questioning, prompting, and cueing. This will entail grade level professional learning teams analyzing student work on a weekly basis to target phonics and vocabulary instruction.

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

na

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Kindergarten spring 2022 data: 39% were not on track to score a level 3 on a statewide assessment
First grade spring 2022 data: 47% were not on track to score a level 3 on a statewide assessment
Second grade spriong 2022: 53% were not on track to scores a level 3 on a statewide assessment
Rimes ELLC will expect a 5% decrease in the above percentages to show an increase in overall student proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

na

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.

iReady diagnostics
FAST testing
SIPPS screeners/assessments
Formative classroom assessments (Exit tickets)
Fundations tracker

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

Simmons, Paige , simmonsp@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?

Fundations is our core phonics program which will be utilized by all teachers; it provides students with explicit and systematic phonics instruction. iReady is a computer program providing fall, winter, and spring progress monitoring. iReady provides students with a clear instructional pathway for remediation and/or acceleration. Finally, Rimes intervention phonics program is Systematic Instruction in Phonics, Phonological Awareness, and Sight Words (SIPPS). This is in addition to Fundations reteach and Geodes instruction. Students who show a deficit in these areas will receive targeted intervention with a "walk to " intervention format.

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?

Students benefit from explicit and systematic phonics instruction.

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 Leadership meetings will be held monthly. Data chats will be held between teacher and adminstration as well as between student and teacher to provide targeted instructional feedback. Literacy coach will be available to observe Fundations lessons. This will entail modeling and coaching teachers who may need additional support.	Ward, Dominique, wardd2@lake.k12.fl.us
Using SAI funds, a K-2 collaborative planning team will meet four times after hours to disaggregate data to determine next steps to support students earning Level 1 and/or 2 on state assessments (or equivalent in primary grades).	Simmons, Paige , simmonsp@lake.k12.fl.us
iReady PD- Teachers will receive professional development on using the data from iReady to support all learners, especially students below grade level.	Gilbert, Stephanie, gilberts@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 platform (Facebook). Copies will be placed in the front office, and disseminated during the Title 1 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 relationshipos and engaging parents, families, and community stake holders in the education process are essential to improve 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 education children.

To build positive relationships, we will schedule and provide timely notice of School Advisory Council (SAC) and Penguin Pride meetings.Use social media platforms to notify and invite families and otheor key stakeolders of school-wide events and activities. Infomation is shared via the following platfoms - www.rel.lake.k12.fl.us (RImes website), and Facebook (@RImes ELLC) .

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

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

Title 1 Annual Meeting-Meeting to explain the TItle 1 programs and the rights of the parents to be involved.

School-Parent Compact-Outlines how paret, students, and school staff will share the responsiblility 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)

Rimes plans to strengthen the academic program in the school initially by establishing a strong Tier 1 core instruction. This is ensured through weekly professional learning teams. We will also continue to strengthen our intervention/acceleration block using "Taking Action" as our focus. We will start the school year with two days of reading curriculum and two days of math curriculum to ensure equitable learning time for enriched learning. Our resources will include Reveal math, Fundations, and iReady toolbox lessons.

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, commjnity partners, staff, and students. To gather imput, we will send an end-of-the-year survey to parents, community partners, and staff. 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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$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