Belleview Santos Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Belleview Santos Elementary School

9600 SE US HIGHWAY 441, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

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.

At Belleview-Santos Elementary, we are committed to creating a safe, well-rounded learning experience that encourages all students to reach their highest potential and helps them to be productive, responsible, and compassionate members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing the tools to achieve infinite possibilities.

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
White, Kimberly	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services to optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. She supervises administrative, instructional, and non-instructional personnel assigned to the school.
Warren, ShawnaMae	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. She further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of interventions and necessary documentation, and assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in the specified areas.
Suranni, Joseph	Dean	The dean works to implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition, he works with students and parents in creating educational and behavioral plans for students that ensure improved academic success.
Haworth, Angelique	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on need for the specific content area.
Polish, Alison	School Counselor	The school counselor provides students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Paige, Dana	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on need, for the specific content.

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 SIP is developed using feedback from the school's leadership team, Literacy Leadership Team that includes teachers and leadership team members, and School Advisory Council which includes parents and community members. School data is presented to the various groups and then stakeholders discuss suggestions for improvement based on that data.

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))

Belleview-Santos Elementary's Leadership and Literacy Leadership Team will monitor SIP goals through monthly data reviews of FAST/STAR assessments, district Benchmark Assessments, and District Progress Monitoring Assessments. Each group will look at trends and make adjustments based upon those trends.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	29	32	16	31	16	23	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	12	13	10	9	7	3	0	0	0	54
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	23	12	38	10	4	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	3	8	13	8	4	4	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	56	26	22	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	22	20	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	12	33	59	45	49	0	0	0	216
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	24	36	42	45	38	39	0	0	0	224

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	4	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	49	26	32	29	22	34	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	5	4	9	19	8	33	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA	6	32	33	35	10	13	0	0	0	129
Course failure in Math	7	20	31	24	6	36	0	0	0	124
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	49	25	37	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	22	33	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	21	29	33	10	33	0	0	0	134

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	8	21	29	33	10	33	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	23	1	0	0	0	0	29
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	49	26	32	29	22	34	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	5	4	9	19	8	33	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA	6	32	33	35	10	13	0	0	0	129
Course failure in Math	7	20	31	24	6	36	0	0	0	124
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	49	25	37	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	22	33	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	21	29	33	10	33	0	0	0	134

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	8	21	29	33	10	33	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	23	1	0	0	0	0	29
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*	36			32	47	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				42	56	61	42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34	51	52	39		
Math Achievement*	47			41	54	60	41		
Math Learning Gains				63	62	64	52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64	52	55	50		
Science Achievement*	40			27	42	51	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	53			69			53		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	211
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
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	17	Yes	4	1
ELL	25	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	45			

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	36	Yes	1	

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	42			

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	36			47			40					53
SWD	13			27			19				4	
ELL	17			31			10				5	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			30							2	
HSP	34			44			36				5	55
MUL	36			64							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
PAC												
WHT	39			51			50				4	
FRL	30			38			35				5	50

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	32	42	34	41	63	64	27					69
SWD	9	34	20	20	48	77	13					
ELL	10	17		17	52		0					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	47		23	60		25					
HSP	27	34		32	70	64	21					69
MUL	25			50								
PAC												
WHT	38	47	33	47	58	59	31					
FRL	27	38	27	35	62	66	19					61

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	40	42	39	41	52	50	36					53
SWD	26	33	40	25	38							
ELL	19			15								53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			30								
HSP	40	35		34	56		26					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42	45		45	57		43					
FRL	32	38	40	35	48	47	34					53

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	42%	49%	-7%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	48%	-9%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	39%	-8%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	43%	-10%	51%	-18%

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.

ELA proficiency data showed the lowest performance with only a 5% gain from the previous year. While this is a gain from the previous year it is still at only 37% of students in grades 3-5 being proficient. Within this data, 3rd grade showed the lowest percent proficiency with only 31% of students scoring a Level 3 or higher. Contributing factors to this data include poor foundational skills instruction in previous years and the effects of COVID distance learning protocols that limited student exposure to effective ELA instruction.

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

No declines were noted this year. Proficiencies in ELA, Math, and Science increased from the previous year.
ELA increased from 32% to 37%; Math increased from 41% to 49%; Science increased from 27% to 39%.
In each grade level, increases were noted as well:
3rd grade ELA from 29% to 33%; Math 29% to 52%
4th grade ELA from 25% to 36%; Math 49% to 50%
5th grade ELA from 39% to 47%; Math 47% to 48%; Science 27% to 39%

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 when compared to state averages are in 3rd and 4th grade ELA proficiencies. There is a 19% gap in these grade levels. For 3rd grade, contributing factors include poor foundational skills instruction in previous years and the effects of COVID distance learning protocols that limited student exposure to effective ELA instruction. For 4th grade, contributing factors include poor foundational skills instruction and teacher mobility within 1 of the 3 classrooms.

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

The most improvement was in 3rd grade math proficiencies. They increased by 23%. This year, our collaborations included a breakdown of the new benchmarks to ensure teachers understood what mastery of the benchmark looked like and then created formative assessments that were aligned to that benchmark. Additionally, teachers were provided professional development on how to provide direct-explicit instruction within the Tier I blocks.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, attendance is an area of concern. The number of students who missed more than 10% of the school year increased from 192 to 347.

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

Belleview Santos' highest priorities for the 23-24 school year are overall ELA proficiencies with a focus on 3rd grade proficiencies and learning gains for all students.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Belleview Santos' subgroups that are below 41% include Students with Disabilities, English Speakers of Other Languages, Multi-racial, and Black students.

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

All ESSA identified subgroups will increase their proficiency levels by 10% as measured by the FAST PM 3 assessment.

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

Quarterly data meetings will be held with teachers in 3rd-5th grades to determine student progress towards proficiency utilizing FAST assessments, Benchmark Assessments, District Progress Monitoring Assessments, and data points from weekly formative checks and online programs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.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.)

UFLI Foundations is an explicit, systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading. It follows a carefully developed scope and sequence designed to ensure that students systematically acquire each skill needed and learn to apply each skill with automaticity and confidence.
Lexia Core 5 is an adaptive blended learning program that accelerates the development of literacy skills for students of all abilities, helping them to make that critical shift from learning to read to reading to learn.
Read 180 is a blended learning reading intervention program that provides reading comprehension strategies and assessment for grades 4 and 5. It is structured around four core activities: individualized instructional software, data-driven small-group instruction , whole group instruction, and independent reading.

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

Students included in each identified ESSA subcategory have a diverse range of needs. For those who are struggling the most, we will be utilizing the UFLI program to boost their foundational reading skills so that they can more successfully access grade level text. Students in this group who have mastered foundational skills will be provided interventions that target their fluency and comprehension needs. Lexia Core 5 and Read 180 will meet these needs by providing strategies and practice both in small group instruction and through software interactions.

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.

Assess students in each subcategory to determine area of need and the intervention that will address that need.

Person Responsible: ShawnaMae Warren (shawnamae.warren@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

Ensure faculty providing interventions are trained to provide the intervention.

Person Responsible: ShawnaMae Warren (shawnamae.warren@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

Monitor fidelity of program delivery.

Person Responsible: ShawnaMae Warren (shawnamae.warren@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly throughout the school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

In 2022-23 there were only 2 days where all staff members were in attendance. The frequency of teacher absences directly affects student performance.

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

Belleview Santos Elementary will increase staff attendance to 95% daily attendance rates for all staff members as measured by Skyward reports.

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

Staff attendance reports will be pulled monthly and discussed in the Leadership Team meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.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.)

Staff who struggle with maintaining a 95% attendance rate will be assigned a leadership team mentor who will provide encouragement and assistance where needed.

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

Employees who struggle feeling connected or supported with their work tend to have the highest absentee rates. By providing support, we will help eliminate that barrier to their attendance.

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.

Bi-weekly data pulled from Skyward.

Person Responsible: Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-weekly on Fridays.

Leadership team reviews data and assigns mentors as needed.

Person Responsible: Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-weekly leadership team meetings.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School funding allocations are reviewed by the school's leadership team to ensure items purchased directly support student success. Literacy needs are the primary area of support and are budgeted first.

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

Reading instruction in Foundational skills is an area of focus for our K-2 classrooms. According to STAR Early Literacy Assessments, only 49% of our Kg students are proficient. According to the STAR Reading Assessment only 37% and 41% of our 1st and 2nd graders are proficient respectively.

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

Aligning instruction to the depth of the benchmark is the focus for reading instruction in 3rd-5th grades. This is evident through grade level proficiencies as measured by the FAST assessment. According to this assessment only 33% of 3rd graders, 36% of 4th graders, and 47% of fifth graders are proficient in reading.

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

BSE will increase reading proficiencies in Kindergarten from 49% to 55% as measured by the STAR Early Literacy Assessment PM3. 1st Grade students will increase from 37% to 55% proficient and 2nd Grade students will increase from 41% to 55% proficient as measured by STAR Reading PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

BSE will increase reading proficiencies in 3rd grade from 33% to 50%, 4th grade from 36% to 50%, and 5th grade from 47% to 50% as measured by the FAST Assessment PM3.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will occur via the STAR Early Literacy Assessment in Kg and 1st grades, STAR Reading Assessment in 2nd Grade, and the FAST Assessments for 3rd-5th grades during PM1 and PM2. Data will also be tracked from weekly formative checks and IXL data during monthly data meetings.

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

White, Kimberly, kimberly.white@marion.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?

BSE will continue to implement direct-explicit instruction in Tier 1 to achieve the measurable outcome in each grade level.

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?

This practice is listed as one of the top 100 instructional practices by John Hattie. If teachers provide direct-explicit instruction to students that is aligned to the BEST benchmarks, then students will be able to better master that benchmark. This is the same strategy implemented in the 22-23 school year and yielded gains in all areas.

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
Review of direct-explicit instructional model for new to BSE instructors.	White, Kimberly, kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us
Integrating direct-explicit instruction that is aligned to the benchmarks into lesson plans during weekly ELA collaboration.	Haworth, Angelique, angelique.haworth@marion.k12.fl.us
Providing all teachers with continuing professional development on how to include student engagement strategies within their direct-explicit instructional model.	White, Kimberly, kimberly.white@marion.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.

Belleview Santos Elementary's SIP, budget, and progress monitoring is made available to all stakeholders in multiple ways. In addition to the school website (https://www.marionschools.net/bse), all parents and stakeholders are invited to quarterly School Advisory Council meetings where the data is shared. Parents and stakeholders will also be provided a paper copy of the SIP, budget, and/or progress monitoring information if requested.

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))

Belleview Santos Elementary provides parents multiple opportunities to connect with the school community through various parent engagement events like Family Game Night where ELA and Math games will engage families in learning together. BSE is also implementing Accelerated Reading and a school-wide read aloud program. Each of these programs will be introduced to parents and them follow up activities sent home to help families engage in the literacy activities. Additionally, BSE families are invited onto campus for fun events like our Safe Trick-or-Treat in October and our end-of-year Awards Ceremonies to celebrate student successes. Community stakeholders are invited to participate in our yearly orientation and open house events. BSE also connects to our community through our annual Career Day. Parents are informed about these events via the school website (https://www.marionschools.net/bse), notices sent home in both English and Spanish, Skylert calls, and School Dojo messages.

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))

Belleview Santos Elementary will strengthen our Tier 1 instruction through improved teacher collaborations. Teachers will develop a comprehensive understanding of the Florida BEST Benchmarks and the develop plans to provide effective direct-explicit instruction to all students in the Tier 1 instructional block.

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))

Not applicable