

Monroe County School District

Sugarloaf School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Sugarloaf School

255 CRANE BLVD, Summerland Key, FL 33042

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1469>

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.

Sugarloaf School's mission is to maximize the potential of all students to become lifelong learners and productive members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Our school vision is to embark on an inspiring journey of excellence, fostering a nurturing and inclusive environment that empowers students to discover their passions, unlock their full potential, and become lifelong learners and compassionate 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
Tyler, Trevor	Principal	The principal role is to provide the leadership and management necessary at a elementary/middle/junior high school to maximize the efforts of teachers and students in an environment which is conducive to educational enhancement, growth and achievement for students. This is accomplished through positive leadership and making sure that everyone is loved, respected and valued.
Walden, Kevin	Assistant Principal	The assistant Principal is to assist in the overall administration of assigned elementary/junior high school. The position is responsible for supervising assigned professional, paraprofessional, administrative and support personnel and assisting with the planning, implementation and evaluation of all programs and operations essential to the operation of a responsive, effective and efficient instructional environment which provides maximum opportunity for student growth and development.
Osborn, Rachel	Reading Coach	A literacy coach is an instructional leader with specialized knowledge in the science of reading, evidence-based practices, BEST ELA standards, as well as the knowledge of how to work with educators as adult learners. The coach provides collegial, job-embedded support to ensure literacy instruction is data-informed and student-centered. Coaches accomplish this by collaborating with leaders and teachers, engaging in practices such as co-teaching, co-planning, modeling, reflective conversations and data chats with teachers to build teacher and school capacity to improve student achievement for all.
Meier, Melissa	Math Coach	A math coach is an instructional leader with specialized knowledge in mathematics, evidence-based practices, BEST Mathematics standards (BIG M), as well as the knowledge of how to work with educators as adult learners. The coach provides collegial, job-embedded support to ensure math instruction is data-informed and student-centered. Coaches accomplish this by collaborating with leaders and teachers, engaging in practices such as co-teaching, co-planning, modeling, reflective conversations and data chats with teachers to build teacher and school capacity to improve student achievement for all.

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 plan will be discussed in BLPT and at faculty meetings to get input from all faculty and staff and will be discussed at SAC for them to give input. The SAC board consists of the following community members:

Halley Haack – Chair halleyhaack@gmail.com

Desiree Perez – Vice-Chair desiree.perez@keysfcu.org

Sarah Sheer – Secretary Sarah.Sheer@KeysSchools.com

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 SIP will be monitored weekly by the leadership team and will be discussed in faculty meetings with staff. During these discussions, improvements will be made to the plan and will be updated with evidence-based strategies to improve teacher efficacy and student performance.

The administration will meet daily to reflect on the SIP goals at 3:45 pm, the leadership meeting will occur on Thursdays at 3:30 pm, the BLPT will meet on Tuesdays at 3:45 pm and have standing agenda items, and there will be a monthly data dive by the leadership team, Trevor, Kevin, Melissa and Rachel, to focus on the progress of the SIP goals.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
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	12	25	17	17	16	22	19	16	19	163
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	0	3	8	14	16	45
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	23	22	14	22	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	22	20	73
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	2	2	6	14	10	12	18	64

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	18	8	12	13	13	12	5	8	11	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	2	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	10	13	12	23	15	77	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	12	22	23	12	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	11	7	36

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	1	0	0	0	2	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	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	18	8	12	13	13	12	5	8	11	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	2	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	10	13	12	23	15	77	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	12	22	23	12	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	11	7	36

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	1	0	0	0	2	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	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*	51	50	53	56	54	55	47		
ELA Learning Gains				55			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			26		
Math Achievement*	58	57	55	58	38	42	37		
Math Learning Gains				70			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			9		
Science Achievement*	50	50	52	65	57	54	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	75	68	84	63	59	87		
Middle School Acceleration	42	57	70	73	51	51	43		
Graduation Rate		74	74		56	50			
College and Career Acceleration		51	53		75	70			
ELP Progress	56	64	55		65	70	44		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	63			

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	48			

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	43			
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	55			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	56			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	51			58			50	90	42			56
SWD	17			27			12	75			5	
ELL	19			32							3	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			46							2	
HSP	40			42			41	79			6	58
MUL	65			55							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	55			65			55	93	44		6	
FRL	39			44			38	74	42		7	60

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	56	55	41	58	70	61	65	84	73			
SWD	28	42	33	33	57	50	48	53				
ELL	25	39	33	29	58	70	31					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	51	41	42	66	69	49	72				
MUL	68	71		61	65							
PAC												
WHT	59	55	40	64	72	62	75	87	78			
FRL	44	47	38	48	66	53	60	89				

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	47	36	26	37	20	9	47	87	43			44
SWD	20	21	21	15	18	10	14	73				
ELL	14	31		23	0							44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	36	29	25	24	16	11	20	84				55
MUL	64			69								
PAC												
WHT	51	39	27	41	23	10	52	95	39			
FRL	36	29	24	28	11	0	27	79	58			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	42%	2%	47%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	51%	-7%	58%	-14%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	45%	10%	47%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	49%	9%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	60%	-8%	48%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	51%	1%	61%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	57%	23%	55%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	45%	-1%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	65%	45%	20%	44%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	51%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	53%	47%	50%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	68%	18%	66%	20%

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.

Based on Sugarloaf Schools Spring 2023 assessment data, our lowest area of performance was in 5th Grade Science, with only 40% of students scoring a level 3 (proficient) or above on the 5th Grade Science assessment. This means that 60% of 5th grade students scored at a level 1 or level 2. Based on this data, it can be concluded that students were not receiving Tier 1 instruction that aligned to the 5th Grade Florida NGSSS.

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

Based on the data comparison from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, Sugarloaf Schools area with the greatest decline in student proficiency levels aligns with our lowest area of performance, which is in 5th Grade Science. In 2021-2022, 62% of 5th Grade students scored a level 3 (proficient) or above on the 5th Grade Science assessment. Most recent assessment data (2022-2023) shows 40% of 5th Grade students scoring a level 3 or above on the 5th Grade Science assessment. This is a 22% decrease in student proficiency. Again, based on this data, it can be concluded that students were not receiving Tier 1 instruction that aligned to the 5th Grade Florida NGSSS.

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 assessment data, 44% of Sugarloaf School 4th Grade students scored a Level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA, the state average for 4th Grade ELA was 57%, this is a 13% difference. The same comparison can be seen in our 5th Grade FAST Math scores, for 44% of students at Sugarloaf School scored a level 3 or higher on the 5th Grade FAST Math, and the state average for 5th Grade Math was at 57%. Based on this data, it can be concluded that students were not receiving adequate Tier 1 instruction that aligned to the 4th Grade Florida B.E.S.T ELA and 5th Grade Florida B.E.S.T Math standards.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 state assessment data, 54% of 6th grade students scored a level 3 (proficient) or above on the FAST 6th grade Math. This is a 17% increase from the 2021-2022 school year, where only 37% of 6th grade students scored a level 3 or above on the FAST Math. Based on this data analysis, it can be concluded that the Tier 1 instruction was directly aligned to the 6th Grade Florida B.E.S.T Math Standards.

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

1. Increase in students with 10 percent or more absences went from 100-163 in one year.
2. Suspensions increased from 7 to 45 students in one year

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

1. Benchmark aligned instruction
2. Creating a positive school culture
3. Tiering instruction 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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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 the 2022/2023 Teacher Surveys 56% (44% favorable) of teachers rated the overall working environment as unfavorable and 70% of teachers (30% favorable) receiving feedback and coaching rated it as unfavorable. Positive cultures and environments start with the leader. The ability to lead by example with the use of active and empathetic listening is a critical skill for leaders. When leaders listen for understanding, it fosters effective communication, builds trust, and enhances their ability to make informed decisions about teaching and learning. Through this effective listening model, school leaders have the ability to provide ongoing feedback to teachers that is built on a level of trust, respect, and professionalism.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring 2024 Sugarloaf School teachers will increase their favorability of their overall working environment to 60% favorable (16% increase on overall working conditions). The results from the survey will directly correlate to teachers favorability on feedback and coaching using the effective listening model, along with ongoing, timely, effective feedback/support.

Monitoring:

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

We will progress monitor teachers feedback through leadership discussions, informal surveys, and meeting/coaching logs. We will use this formative feedback to make real-time decisions on teachers favorability of the environment. Our summative results (60% favorable towards working environment) will be derived from the Spring 2024 Panorama Teacher Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

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.)

Book study on the "Leaders Eat Last" by Simon Sinek for Administration
 Book study on Positive leadership with the Administration and Academic Coaches
 Journaling/logging the interactions with colleagues and staff members.
 Admin/coaching feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leaders who actively listen for understanding create an environment where open communication, trust, empathy, respect, and collaboration thrive. This not only benefits the leader but also contributes to the overall success and well-being of the team and organization's culture.

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.

Book study with administration will be done with Leaders Eat Last by Simon Sinek

Person Responsible: Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

By When: We will be done with the book study by December 23, 2023.

Journaling/logging about the interactions with stakeholders

Person Responsible: Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

By When: The journaling will occur all year and will end May 31, 2024.

Book Study using Positive Leadership for the leadership team

Person Responsible: Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

By When: The book study will be done in the second semester.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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 the Spring 2023 FAST ELA 4th grade data, 44% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher, meaning that 56% of students scored below proficiency. This data reflects the need for improvement in student comprehension. In order to increase comprehension skills, students will need explicit instruction to close the gaps in reading foundational skills. We feel that students' decoding skills need improvement, specifically in the decoding of complex multisyllabic words. Through the improvement of decoding skills, students will increase reading fluency, which will in turn, improve student comprehension across all disciplines.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the Spring 2023 FAST ELA 4th grade data, 44% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher. This is only a (+8%) increase from PM 1 taken in Fall of 2022. For the 2023-2024 school year, 62% of current 5th graders will score a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

A combination of systematic and explicit data driven instruction will be provided to all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students through the Flamingo Literacy Small Group Model and Benchmark Advance daily lessons. Administrative walk throughs, monthly data chats, and targeted teacher learning will be ongoing to ensure that teachers and students are progressing adequately towards our measurable outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

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 the Flamingo Small Group Literacy Instruction Model and Benchmark Advance daily lessons, teachers will implement differentiated literacy centers that target the needs of all their students. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be receiving explicit interventions using UFLI phonics and/or Phonics First instructional materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Flamingo Small Group Literacy Instruction is a comprehensive, research-based, five step model that aligns instruction to student data, a phonics scope and sequence, and emphasizes oral language development through the lesson. Phonics First is an Orton-Gillingham course. Orton-Gillingham is an approach to intervention, not a set of specific lessons. The approach employs multisensory methods that involve body movement & tactile stimulation. Phonics First Reading System is a multisensory, systematic, structured, sequential, phonics-based, direct-instruction approach to teaching beginning, at-risk, struggling, learning disabled, dyslexic and ELL readers. UFLI is a program of fully developed lessons that follow a specific scope and sequence. It is designed for and has been tested with whole-class instruction, but it has also been translated into intervention. UFLI employs multisensory methods that involve the mouth movements used in phoneme production. The approach UFLI uses to teach irregular words is based on the mapping of phonemes and graphemes.

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.

Monthly Data Chats

Person Responsible: Rachel Osborn (rachel.osborn@keysschools.com)

By When: May 31st, 2024

Targeted school-wide professional learning using the Flamingo Literacy Small Group Instructional Model. This will be a three part professional learning, as well as a year long PLC.

Person Responsible: Rachel Osborn (rachel.osborn@keysschools.com)

By When: April, 2024

District-wide professional learning using Phonics First

Person Responsible: Rachel Osborn (rachel.osborn@keysschools.com)

By When: May, 2024

UFLI resource binders provided to K-5 teachers.

Person Responsible: Rachel Osborn (rachel.osborn@keysschools.com)

By When: December, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

School-wide use of manipulatives will provide students the opportunity to make connections through collaborative and active learning. Through the use of the BIG M, teachers will plan direct and explicit concrete and semi-concrete lessons to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures. The reason for this area of improvement is to improve overall math proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Sugarloaf School will increase overall math proficiency of grades 3-8 from 53% proficiency to 62%.

Monitoring:

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

Administrative Walkthroughs

Data Chats

Lesson plans (evidence of manipulative use)

Progress Monitoring (FAST and STAR)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Meier (melissa.meier@keysschools.com)

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.)

Incorporation of Math Centers utilizing the B.E.S.T Instructional Guide for Mathematics with the use of tiered instruction. Teachers will be provided with resources which include an array of examples and descriptions of hands on activities including use of math manipulatives. Teachers will also participate in professional learning focusing on implementation of the BIG M.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The BIG M is directly correlated to the math benchmarks and gives examples of tiered instruction and ways to dispel common misconceptions. Utilizing the math manipulatives provides students the opportunity to learn through a collaborative and multisensory approach.

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.

District Training on the use of the BIG M.

Person Responsible: Melissa Meier (melissa.meier@keysschools.com)

By When: May, 2024

Training/Modeling on effective use of Math Manipulatives.

Person Responsible: Melissa Meier (melissa.meier@keysschools.com)

By When: May, 2024

Professional learning on the development and implementation of small group math centers.

Person Responsible: Melissa Meier (melissa.meier@keysschools.com)

By When: May, 2024

Use of the internal view for teachers to observe peers' best practices and examples of concrete and semi concrete representation of mathematical concepts.

Person Responsible: Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

By When: May, 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

N/A

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

Based on the Spring 2023 FAST ELA 4th grade data, 44% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher, meaning that 56% of students scored below proficiency. This data reflects the need for

improvement in student comprehension. In order to increase comprehension skills, students will need explicit instruction to close the gaps in reading foundational skills. We feel that students' decoding skills need improvement, specifically in the decoding of complex multisyllabic words. Through the improvement of decoding skills, students will increase reading fluency, which will in turn, improve student comprehension across all disciplines. Students will receive targeted small group interventions using ESSA evidenced based reading interventions.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the Spring 2023 FAST ELA 4th grade data, 44% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher. This is only a (+8%) increase from PM 1 taken in Fall of 2022. For the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of current 5th graders will score a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA PM 2 assessment, and 62% of current 5th grade students will score a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

A combination of systematic and explicit data driven instruction using IES guides will be provided to all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students through the Flamingo Literacy Small Group Model and Benchmark Advance daily lessons. Administrative walk throughs, monthly data chats discussing iStation data, and quarterly data chats discussing FAST data, as well as targeted teacher learning will be ongoing to ensure that teachers and students are progressing adequately towards our measurable outcome.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Osborn, Rachel, rachel.osborn@keysschools.com

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?

Using the Flamingo Small Group Literacy Instruction Model, Benchmark Advance daily lessons teachers will implement differentiated literacy centers that target the needs of all their students. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be receiving explicit interventions using IES guides, and/or UFLI phonics and/or Phonics First instructional materials.

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?

The Flamingo Small Group Literacy Instruction is a comprehensive, research-based, five step model that aligns instruction to student data, a phonics scope and sequence, and emphasizes oral language development through the lesson. Phonics First is an Orton-Gillingham course. Orton-Gillingham is an approach to intervention, not a set of specific lessons. The approach employs multisensory methods that involve body movement & tactile stimulation. Phonics First Reading System is a multisensory, systematic, structured, sequential, phonics-based, direct-instruction approach to teaching beginning, at-risk, struggling, learning disabled, dyslexic and ELL readers. UFLI is a program of fully developed lessons that follow a specific scope and sequence. It is designed for and has been tested with whole-class instruction, but it has also been translated into intervention. UFLI employs multisensory methods that involve the mouth movements used in phoneme production. The approach UFLI uses to teach irregular words is based on the mapping of phonemes and graphemes.

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
Monthly Data Chats discussing students iStation monthly ISIPs will be held with the Reading Coach and Math Coach. These data chats will be ongoing review of student assessment data throughout the school year to address the students learning needs. Quarterly Data Chats will take place, discussing students FAST data, breaking down the students Florida B.E.S.T standards mastery with teachers so they can provide targeted small group instruction.	Osborn, Rachel, rachel.osborn@keysschools.com
Targeted school-wide professional learning using the Flamingo Literacy Small Group Instructional Model. This will be a three part professional learning, as well as a year long PLC. The Flamingo Literacy Small Group Instructional Model was selected in order to provide students with targeted small group instruction. Based on intensive data analysis of students mastery of the B.E.S.T standards, targeted small group instruction will provide students the differentiated interventions they need to help close the gaps, and provide mastery in the Florida B.E.S.T Standards.	Osborn, Rachel, rachel.osborn@keysschools.com
UFLI resource binders will be provided to K-5 teachers. The UFLI resource binder will provide teachers with differentiated phonics resources from UFLI, that will be used during their targeted small group instruction. These binders will be developed and created by the Literacy Coach, who will provide modeling and support in using the resources in the binder.	Osborn, Rachel, rachel.osborn@keysschools.com
Curriculum Leadership Team- a curriculum leadership team will be developed and created to target school-wide curriculum needs (Literacy, Math, & AVID). The Curriculum Leadership Team will compose of K-8 teachers, the literacy coach, math coach, and assistant principal. A Curriculum Leadership Team will not only foster teacher-leaders, but also enhance reading and math instruction by embedding AVID strategies within the core content curriculum. Curriculum leadership team members will develop a plan for targeted small group instruction in all content areas, sharing modeling, strategies, and resources back to their grade level teams.	Walden, Kevin, kevin.walden@keysschools.com

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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)

N/A

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))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes