

Lake County Schools

Altoona School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Altoona School

42630 STATE ROAD 19, Altoona, FL 32702

<http://altoonaschool.org>

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 Altoona School mission is to provide a high-quality, comprehensive, and meaningful education for all students. Each student will be expected to succeed within the bounds of their abilities and the school's educational goals. Each student will be treated individually, given the tools to be a lifelong learner, and be taught to function as a member of a group and as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Altoona School to help students master academic skills, to educate them to the greatest extent possible so that they become active learners, and to teach them to be responsible citizens.

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
Cerney, Dawn	Principal	Principal serves as the coordinator and manager of the school campus and academic activities. Principal is responsible for developing, administering and monitoring educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student.
Tabb, Nikki	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal is responsible for assisting in the administration, coordination and management of all school campus and academic activities. Assistant principal is to assist the Principal in the development, administration, and monitoring of educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student.
Scott, Misty	Teacher, ESE	Provides academic instruction to students through educational interventions and accommodations as set forth by the student's Individualized Education Plan.
Lovoy, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Provides academic instruction to students according to the B.E.S.T. standards.
Nelson, Beth	SAC Member	Serves on the governing board for the school. The board oversees the operations of the school.

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.

School leadership met with the school's governing board, teachers, support staff and parents to discuss the Early Warning Indicators from the pervious school year. After these round table discussions, the input collected was used to develop the 2023-2024 SIP.

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))

Teachers will participate in nine grade level data analysis meetings during the 23-24 school year. At these meetings, teachers will meet with administrators to review progress monitoring data provided by: benchmark assessments with myVIEW, iReady Reading and Math, FAST, to identify BEST standards that need to be retaught through intervention block or direct instruction during the core instructional blocks for ELA or math. At these meetings attendance records will also be reviewed to see if attendance is contributing to achievement gaps.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) 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: B 2019-20: C

	2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	16	11	20	10	13	14	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	16	6	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	4	19	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	15	10	22	16	6	0	0	0	84

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	5	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	15

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	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	19	21	11	12	11	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	3	7	8	4	10	7	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	2	0	4	4	4	6	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	6	5	7	7	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	5	5	3	1	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	19	21	11	12	11	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	3	7	8	4	10	7	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	2	0	4	4	4	6	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	6	5	7	7	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	5	5	3	1	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3

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*	56	47	53	57	50	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				58			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56					
Math Achievement*	76	55	59	68	46	50	69		
Math Learning Gains				62			78		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65					
Science Achievement*	53	52	54	57	52	59	55		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		61	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	245
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	65			
FRL	56			

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	54			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	53			

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	56			76			53					
SWD	25			50							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	33			50							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61			79			54				4	
FRL	49			72			46				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	58	56	68	62	65	57					
SWD	47			60								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	54			69								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58	53	53	67	63	58	59					
FRL	40	57		53	57		58					

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	56	44		69	78		55					
SWD	39			50								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45			64								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	48		73	87		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
FRL	45	48		62	81		55					

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	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	80%	62%	18%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	51%	5%

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.

The data component showing the lowest performance was 3rd grade Math. The beginning of the year math diagnostic test showed this group of students in third grade had significant gaps in their math fundamentals. Simply put there were huge gaps in their learning. We also feel we are still trying to make up from the learning time lost due to COVID.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was 3rd grade ELA. Factors that contributed to this decline in ELA were as follows: student attendance, still transitioning to the BEST standards, and learning time lost due to COVID.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Grade 4 ELA Level 5's. The factors that contributed to this were poor attendance across the grade level, lower than average BOY diagnostic scores, and a significant number of students working at or below grade level. These factors combined made it difficult to make the gains necessary to show proficiency.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was 5th grade Math. Actions that contributed to this improvement were continued mandatory K-5 30 minute intervention block, mandatory hands on math practice weekly, monthly Math growth monitoring, collaborative planning meetings and dedicated data analysis meetings

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, our team feels the areas of concern are student attendance and course failures in ELA.

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

Attendance
Course Failures in ELA

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.

An Area of Focus for our school this year will be attendance. We know the significance attendance plays on the success of a student. When our students are absent on a regular basis we see a decline in test scores and grades.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Each grade level, K-5, will have less than 10% of its population with an absenteeism rate greater than 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be monitored on a weekly basis. Attendance percentages for each grade level will be displayed on a board in the cafeteria. Grade levels with the highest attendance each week will be rewarded. Families of students who attend school on a regular basis will be rewarded.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Tabb (tabbn@altoonaschool.org)

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.)

Establishing a contact person at the school for families to work with. Build a strong attendance culture through reward systems and relationships with families and students. Promote attendance through family engagement activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Having an established contact person for attendance will help to build rapport with students and families. This contact person can help with individual needs of families that are struggling to attend school on a regular basis.

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.

Print weekly attendance reports

Person Responsible: Nikki Tabb (tabbn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: Weekly

Display grade level attendance percentages

Person Responsible: Nikki Tabb (tabbn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: Weekly

Reach out to the families of students that are struggling to attend school regularly

Person Responsible: Nikki Tabb (tabbn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: Weekly

#2. 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.

Teachers will intentionally plan and focus on student learning by providing rigorous and relevant tasks aligned to grade level standards. With all grade level teaching to the BEST standards, it is inoperative to ensure that lessons and materials are aligned to the standard. Teachers will begin each new topic/chapter with a focus on the standards and select the lessons from the curriculum that will support teaching the BEST standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will participate in nine grade level data analysis meetings during the 23-24 school year. At these meetings, teachers will review progress monitoring data provided by: benchmark assessments with myVIEW, iReady, FAST, to identify BEST standards that need to be retaught through intervention blocker introduced through direct instruction during the core instructional blocks for ELA or math.

Monitoring:

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

Administration team will create a meeting calendar for the 23-24 school year. Administration will monitor progress monitoring data and create agendas and reports for teachers to review and plan for standards-aligned instruction for the upcoming month. Administration team will preform and review regular classroom walk-throughs to ensure teachers are teaching to the BEST standards and providing rigorous and relevant tasks aligned to grade-level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

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.)

Using collaborative planning as a grade level, individual student as well as grade level data will be reviewed to identify areas of focus for remediation and direct instruction related to the standards with support from leadership including the instructional coach and administrators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Having regularly scheduled time to review data showing student progress towards mastering BEST standards, our school can ensure that classroom time is being used effectively and curriculum and instructional materials are appropriate for teaching the BEST 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 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.

Create master schedule that allows for common planning time for each grade level

Person Responsible: Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: August 2023

Create meeting schedule for the 23-24 school year

Person Responsible: Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: August 2023

Provide teachers access to and training on how to implement the BEST standards and create a pacing guide based on curriculum and standards for the 23-24 school year.

Person Responsible: Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: On-going

Prepare reports that include individual and grade level data that highlights BEST standards

Person Responsible: Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: Monthly

Prepare meeting agendas that include discussion questions that focus on reviewing data and determining next steps for reteaching or introduction of BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

By When: Monthly

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The methods for dissemination of the SIP to stakeholders will be via the school website (www.altoonaschool.org), at the monthly Parent Teacher Organization meeting, at the governing board meeting and notices to parents that they may request a copy will be sent home with students in our monthly school newsletter. Information will also be provided at the Title 1 Annual meeting.

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))

Parent and community involvement is vital to Altoona School. These two groups serve as important stakeholders. Some of our community partners include: Umatilla Kiwanis Club, United Methodist Church of

Altoona, First Baptist Altoona, Astor Kiwanis, Christian Sisterhood Fellowship, Altoona Trail Riders, United Southern Bank in Umatilla, Sunsational Citrus, and The Cross Mount Dora. Many of these organizations give supplies and donations to our clothes closet, financial support, and serve as volunteers for special events held at the school. In our efforts to give back to the community, we open our school up for community events to take place. Our main building is available for community members to use at no charge to host meeting or special events. Many local organizations use the building on a regular basis to accommodate their meeting needs. We host community service events such as: canned food drive for weekend bag program, letters to our military personnel, winter coat drive, and campus clean up days. Although we have a small ELL population, we strive to eliminate as many barriers as possible. All notices are sent home in the student's native language as indicated on the Home Language Survey. When necessary, a translator is made available for phone calls, messages, and meetings. All students identified as ELL are provided additional resources such as (but not limited to) access to Rosetta Stone, word to word dictionaries, and academic glossaries. All materials are inventoried and monitored by our ELL Coordinator. Our Family Engagement Plan is located on our website at www.altoonaschool.org.

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)

In order to accelerate learning in ELA and Math, we will need to continue to have a defined intervention block, monitor student data on a weekly/monthly basis through grade level data chats and individual data chats with students, daily use of iReady. We will also be including the use of Secret Stories to accelerate learning in ELA.

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 is not applicable to our 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: ELA	\$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