Okeechobee County School District

Seminole Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Seminole Elementary School

2690 NW 42ND AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://seminoleelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Seminole Elementary to ensure high levels of learning in a safe, respectful environment where all achieve personal and academic success. All means all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The academic focus at SEM is streamlined and reflects our commitment to ensure high levels of learning for all students. We are all committed to:
• working together in collaborative teams
• learning at high levels to ensure success at each grade level
• following these expectations: Be READY – Be RESPECTFUL – Be RESPONSIBLE

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
Ziolkowski, Robyn	Principal	School / instructional leadership
VanderMolen, Sonya	Assistant Principal	School / instructional leadership
Altman, Sandra	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach - Supports ELA and Math instruction
Gaucin, Pamela	Other	Supports Attendance and ELL
Peaden, Cassie	Teacher, K-12	MTSS Coach, Team Leader 2nd Grade - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle
Woodham, Bridgette	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader Kindergarten - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle
Gonzalez, Maribel	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader 4th Grade- lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle
Hubbard, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader / Instruction - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle

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.

Administration, grade-level team leaders, the guidance counselor, the resource specialist, and the instructional coach work together to develop the first draft of the SIP through leadership meetings. District administration is also a stakeholder in developing the SIP by reviewing and providing suggestions to the leadership team during the developmental process. ALL SEM staff are provided with a draft of the SIP during the first September staff meeting. The working draft is developed to drive discussions on SEM's state testing outcomes for K-5th grade, SWD ESSA support needs, and curriculum/intervention supports. Staff feedback is provided during the meeting or, if appropriate, at a later date via email to the principal. Parents and community partners serve as active participants and decision-making partners in developing the SIP during the first SAC meeting of the year (where they can attend either in person or by Zoom). Participants receive a copy of the working draft to formulate discussions related to SEM's state testing outcomes for K-5th grade, SWD ESSA support needs, and curriculum/intervention supports. Additionally, stakeholders can submit their ideas and feedback outside

of the SAC meeting by submitting written information/suggestions, emailing the principal, or contacting the principal directly.

The SEM leadership team reviews all feedback, incorporates the information, and drafts the final submission. A final draft of the SIP is presented to ALL SEM staff via a staff meeting and through a standing section in our weekly staff newsletter. Stakeholders have access to the final copy of the SIP via a link to the school's webpage posted on Facebook, Talking Points, and DoJo and by a paper copy that is placed in the office.

The SIP is a standing topic on the leadership team, SEM staff meetings, and SAC agendas. If revisions are appropriate based on ongoing data collection, the leadership team will revisit the SIP and take appropriate action to revise.

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 SEM leadership team regularly attends morning PLCs and monitors PLC documents for completion and TEAM focus. The administration utilizes leadership and grade-level meetings to inform TEAMs of positive findings and possible areas for growth from the monitoring process. The SEM leadership team will monitor the SIP through classroom walkthrough data, student progress monitoring and testing data (i.e., Common Formative Assessment data, unit assessment data, STAR, FAST), and the MTSS process using Branching Minds intervention outcomes. In addition, the Okeechobee County Schools District Administration works with the school administration and the school leadership team to review the SEM school improvement plans and ensure progress on the areas identified to improve instruction at their school through the Stocktake meeting. The district stakeholders and the school leadership team problem-solve to ensure the areas of focus in the SIP are progressing. Seminole Elementary schedules two Stocktake meetings a year to support RAISE requirements.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: 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	33	20	25	15	18	11	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	38	9	5	1	6	1	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	28	5	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	14	20	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	9	24	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	25	27	33	22	21	19	0	0	0	147
	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	18	7	10	10	5	15	0	0	0	65

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	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	21	22	15	13	17	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	12	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	11	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	41	14	24	27	8	16	0	0	0	130

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	6	6	8	1	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	21	22	15	13	17	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	12	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	11	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	41	14	24	27	8	16	0	0	0	130

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	6	6	8	1	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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*	45	44	53	49	50	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				53			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			27		
Math Achievement*	55	49	59	58	44	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				48			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29			13		
Science Achievement*	33	43	54	41	51	59	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					44	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	54	59	53			33		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	240
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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
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	25	Yes	2	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			

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	45			

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	46			

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	45			55			33					62
SWD	10			27			10				5	71
ELL	33			43			24				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45			54			27				5	65
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	52			61			47				4	
FRL	43			52			28				5	61

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	49	53	42	58	48	29	41					53
SWD	17	25	22	28	39	22	15					60
ELL	41	53	50	53	41	13	24					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	54	55	59	46	19	37					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	52	23	58	56	50	52					
FRL	48	54	43	54	46	33	39					53

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	55	48	27	59	44	13	44					33
SWD	24	27		24	13		0					
ELL	48	38		57	38		46					33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	51	46	36	60	47		47					34
MUL	82			64								
PAC												
WHT	58	53		58	33		38					
FRL	52	40	21	55	40	14	39					31

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	45%	43%	2%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	57%	-3%	58%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	41%	4%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	56%	19%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	42%	0%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	42%	-11%	51%	-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.

According to PM3 data, our 3rd-grade ELA and 5th-grade ELA had the lowest performance at 45% proficient. PM1 and PM2 data in the 3rd and 5th grades showed underperformance in proficiency over time compared to the 4th grade.
Contributing factors: BEST standards were implemented using the newly adopted curriculum, including Renaissance (which replaced I-Ready). PLCs were formed and focused on determining essential standards, learning the new curriculum's scope and sequence, and developing one common lesson plan that included the four critical PLC questions (1. What do we want students to know? 2. How will we know if they learned it? 3. How do we respond if they need extra time and support? 4. How do we extend the learning for those who know it?). Walkthrough observations noted grade TEAMs were implementing

tasks aligned with the curriculum, and the curriculum was implemented with fidelity. However, variability was noted in academic collaboration, high-level questioning, checking for understanding, student feedback, and differentiation, indicating grade TEAMs did not demonstrate collective clarity on exactly what students needed to know (teachable concepts) and what students needed to be able to do (specific skills and depth of knowledge) to demonstrate mastery on the essential standards. As a result, students are not clear on what they need to know and do to demonstrate proficiency in their learning.

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

According to PM3 data, our 3rd-grade math proficiency declined from the prior year. Performance decreased 12%, from 67% to 55% proficient.
Contributing Factors: The district math curriculum and supportive curricular components (i.e., Renaissance Freckle and Waggle Math) were newly adopted. The third grade added a new teacher to the team. This was the new teacher's first time teaching third grade. Additionally, walkthrough data indicates that teachers need more collective clarity on exactly what students need to know (teachable concepts) and what students need to be able to do (specific skills and depth of knowledge) to demonstrate grade-level mastery of essential standards.

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.

According to Florida state assessment data, our 5th grade Science showed a 20-point proficiency gap from the state average.
Contributing Factors: Two teachers in the 5th grade were new to teaching the Science standards due to the termination of grade level departmentalization and changing collective TEAM responsibility, so all teachers taught all subjects, aligning our school-wide PLC focus. The teachers needed a collective understanding of mastery related to the standards in student work. Additionally, decreased student-centered tasks, lack of strategies with known high effect on student learning, and reduced student engagement also contributed to the decline in proficiency.

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

Math proficiency improved in the 4th grade from 71% to 75%. Contributing Factors: PLC TEAMs were provided with an extra 60 minutes of grade-level PLC time. When working together to determine essential math standards, the 4th-grade team demonstrated collective teacher efficacy (i.e., the belief that it is the teaching TEAM that causes learning - a high effect size strategy). A common lesson plan was constructed that included the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?). The 4th-grade team implemented the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity and utilized high-impact, visible learning strategies, such as Kagan and AVID, to increase student engagement, self-efficacy, and proficiency. MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions were developed and implemented with fidelity. Parent engagement was high across all classrooms, and teachers were in constant contact should any difficulty with learning arise.

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

Student attendance is a concern. 37% of Kindergarten, 25% of 1st grade, 26% of 2nd grade, 16% of 3rd grade, 31% of 4th grade and 16% of 5th grade 10% or more of the school year.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming school year are:
1. Collaborative planning with a clear focus on unwrapping essential standards to attain collective clarity on exactly what students need to know (teachable concepts in the essential standards) and be able to do (specific skills and depth of knowledge) in order to demonstrate mastery of essential standards in ELA .
2. Developing interventions and systems of support to ensure high levels of learning for students with disabilities.
3. Coaching new teachers to ensure student learning is at high levels

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Math achievement in the 3rd grade was 4 points below the state average of 59%, and 5th grade proficiency was 13 points below the state average of 55%. PM1 and PM2 data in the 3rd and 5th grades showed underperformance in proficiency over time compared to the 4th grade. Students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile in grades K - 5th demonstrated minimal growth.

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

By the end of the 2023-2034 school year, math achievement will increase by at least 20% and students in the lowest 10% will improve their math achievement by at least 20%.

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

- Monitor PLC unwrapping the standards/learning goals/depth of knowledge/benchmarks mastery documents for completion and team focus
- Monitor growth over the school year using STAR Math diagnostic assessments at each QUARTER for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards (Data Sheet)
- Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST MATH) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 (Data Sheet)
-Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in grade level lesson plans as they focus on the PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions) and high level instructional expectations/strategies via the District Walkthrough document
-Monitor implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with fidelity on Branching Minds

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.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.)

-High impact strategy (Hattie, 2021): Utilize collaborative planning to attain collective clarity on exactly what students need to know (teachable concepts in the essential standards) and be able to do (specific skills and depth of knowledge) to demonstrate grade level mastery on essential standards in ELA (i.e., unwrapping of the standards and construction of Common Formative Assessments with set proficiency levels and protocols indicating how and when to assess).
-Continue to refine and develop lesson plans that include the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure, including evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)
-Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level
-Implement high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2021), AVID and Kagan strategies to increase student engagement, self efficacy, and proficiency
-MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be developed based on progress monitoring data, assessment outcomes and the What Works Clearinghouse Guide: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades.

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

When using the high impact strategy (Hattie, 2021) teacher clarity, we expect to improve student learning and mastery of essential standards in reading. This strategy has an effect size of .84 or up to two years growth. TEAMs use the teaching-assessing cycle to formulate evidence of student learning so team members
can determine what skills remain unmastered, provide interventions (MTSS Tier 2), and identify students who require intensified interventions (MTSS Tier 3). Instruction/interventions are based on high-impact strategies and research.
Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D
Learning By Doing - DuFour et al., 2016
RTI at Work - Buffum et al., 2018
Assisting Students Struggling wit Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades (What Works Clearinghouse/IES Practice Guides for Math)

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

The SEM leadership team regularly attend morning PLCs and monitor PLC documents for completion and team focus. Leadership and/or team meetings serve as a platform for informing teams of positive findings and possible areas of growth.

Person Responsible: Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Review data in October Review data in January Review in March Final review in May

The SEM leadership team will monitor the SIP through classroom walkthrough data, student progress monitoring data (i.e., Common Formative Assessment data, grade level unit assessment data, STAR, FAST), and the MTSS process using Branching Minds intervention data/outcomes. Leadership and/or team meetings serve as a platform for informing teams of positive findings and possible areas of growth.

Person Responsible: Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Review data in October Review data in January Review in March Final review in May

Ensure students scoring in the 25 percentile are supported by a federally required student plan, such as an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) or an individualized progress monitoring plan, or both, as necessary in accordance with state law.

Person Responsible: Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: September January

#2. 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.

Student attendance is a concern at SEM and is impacting student achievement. 37% of Kindergarten, 25% of 1st grade, 26% of 2nd grade, 16% of 3rd grade, 31% of 4th grade and 16% of 5th grade were absent 10% or more of the school year.

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

Reduce the percent of students with 21+ absences from 25% of the student population to 5% of the student population by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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

Monitored through truancy procedures and attendance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Gaucin (gaucinp@okee.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.)

This randomized controlled trial, finds that a single postcard encouraged guardians to improve their student's attendance reduced absences by roughly 2.4 percent. SEM guidance and administration will send educational materials indicating the academic impact to student learning along with district truancy letters home encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance. Provide parents with information about how decreased attendance negatively impacts student learning during parent truancy conferences that are held when attendance is an issue.

Implement PBIS for Attendance: Attendance awareness month will be recognized at Seminole Elementary School during the month of September and January for the 2023-2024 school year. It will consist of a month long, school wide push to improve overall attendance rates at Seminole Elementary School. School wide and classroom based initiatives will be introduced throughout each of these months.

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

In the research study, guardians received one of two types of message: one encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance or one encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance that also included specific information about the student's attendance history. There was no statistically significant difference in absences between students according to which message their guardians received. The effect of the postcard did not differ between students in grades 1–8 and students in grades 9–12. (West, 2020 IES).

Research suggests the following for reducing absenteeism: 1) Establish Positive, Supportive and Engaging School Climate, 2) Establish Positive Relationships with Students and Families, 3) Clarify Attendance Expectations nd Goals, 4) Educate and Engage Students and Families About the Impact of Attendance on Achievement, and 5) Recognize Good and Improved Attendance (What Works Clearinghouse)

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.

Information related to the negative impact of chronic attendance on student learning will be published on an ongoing basis in the school newsletter, on Classroom DoJo/Talking Points, and on social media.

Person Responsible: Sonya VanderMolen (sonya.vandermolen@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly in Newsletter

Attendance Awareness Month will be recognized at Seminole Elementary School during the month of September and the month of January. Parents will be informed of Attendance Awareness month at all school functions, through social media, and the schoolwide newsletter. Attendance Awareness Month will consist of a month long, school wide push to improve overall attendance rates at Seminole Elementary School. School wide and classroom based initiatives will be introduced throughout the month, including: 1) Principal's Pizza Party for the grade level with the highest attendance, 2) Attendance Poster Contest with Dairy Queen and Book Token reward, 3) Student Individual Attendance Awards (Perfect Attendance Certificates/Book Tokens), and 4) Grade level incentives such as extra recess.

Person Responsible: Cassie Peaden (cassie.peaden@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: September and January

Postcards/Informational letters will be sent indicating educational impact to student learning along with district truancy letters home encouraging guardians to improve their student’s attendance.

Provide parents with postcard indicating educational impact to student learning during parent conferences that are held when attendance is an issue.

Person Responsible: Pamela Gaucin (gaucinp@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: For students with 10+ days absent

Postcards/Informational letters will be sent indicating educational impact to student learning along with district truancy letters home encouraging guardians to improve their student’s attendance.

Provide parents with postcard indicating educational impact to student learning during parent conferences that are held when attendance is an issue.

Person Responsible: Pamela Gaucin (gaucinp@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: For students with 10+ days absent

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

The ESSA Federal Index has identified a substantial gap in achievement in ELA (12%), Math (28%), and Science (13%) for students with disabilities.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, students identified as having a substantial deficiency in ELA, math, or science will meet the 41% or higher threshold for the ESSA federal index for subgroup achievement.

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

- Monitor data sheet for student proficiency on progress checks, fluency, and growth on standards
- Monitor Skyward for grades
- Monitor growth over the school year using STAR diagnostic assessments at each QUARTER for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards (Data Sheet)
- Monitor student proficiency on science using NWE
- Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 (Data Sheet)
-Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in grade level lesson plans as they focus on the PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions) and high level instructional expectations/strategies via the District Walkthrough document
-Monitor implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with fidelity on Branching Minds

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.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.)

Students with disabilities will receive targeted, standards based interventions provided by teachers and support staff in grades K - 5. Interventions will be implemented during SELA and the intervention time noted by grade level on the master schedule, and during small group centers.

Interventions for students in K - 3rd grade should include the following components:
1) Deeply understand and teach the BEST ELA Essential Standards, including developing student understanding of standards mastery
2) Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity (incorporating the BEST ELA EXPECTATIONS) at every grade level
3) Teach students academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge.
4) Develop awareness of the segments of sound in speech and how they link to letters.
5) Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
6) Ensure that each student reads connected text daily to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

7) Create many opportunities to read a range of text types and a range of text levels Regularly provide opportunities for students to read a variety of texts (Read Aloud A LOT!))
8) Provide explicit instruction that incorporates clear feedback.

High impact instructional practice in reading for students with disabilities in 4th and 5th grades should include the following components:
To engage students in this high-level learning focus, teachers will implement the following:
1) Deeply understand/teach the BEST ELA Essential Standards
2) Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level
3) Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. (i.e., Teach a routine for decoding multisyllabic words; Embed spelling instruction in the comprehension lesson; Engage students in a wide array of activities for practice).
4) Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly (i.e., Provide a purpose for re-reading; Embed prosody in instruction; Regularly provide opportunities for students to read a variety of texts (Read Aloud A LOT!))
5) Routinely use comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text (i.e., Develop world knowledge that is relevant for making sense of the passage; Teach meanings essential for understanding and how to derive meanings of other unknown words using context; Teach prefixes/ suffixes/Latin and Greek Roots)
6) Daily opportunities to practice challenging text above the students' current independent reading level that will expose students to complex ideas/information and increase persistence in making sense of the text.

High impact instructional practice in Math for students with disabilities in K - 5th grades from Assisting students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades Practice Guide Summary (STRONG Evidence)
1. Provide systematic instruction during intervention to develop student understanding of mathematical ideas.
2. Teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts.
3. Use a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures.
4. Use the number line to facilitate the learning of mathematical concepts and procedures, build understanding of grade-level material, and prepare students for advanced mathematics.
5. Provide deliberate instruction on word problems to deepen students' mathematical understanding and support their capacity to apply mathematical ideas.
6. Regularly include timed activities as one way to build fluency in mathematics.

In addition: Implement high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012), AVID WICOR, and Kagan strategies to increase student engagement, self efficacy, and proficiency, and research based interventions on foundational skills.

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

When using the high impact strategies, we expect to improve student learning and mastery of essential standards in reading, math, and science. Recent research has identified interventions, practices, and principles underlying effective small group interventions for students with low test scores in grades K-6 that have improved achievement in mathematics and reading.
Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D, 2012
Learning By Doing - DuFour et al., 2016
RTI at Work - Buffum et al., 2018
What Works Clearing House Practice Guides (Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics:

Intervention in the Elementary Grades; Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in K - 3rd Grade)

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.

The SEM leadership team will monitor intervention implementation during classroom walkthroughs and collect data during the observation (District Monitoring Tool). Data will be discussed and next steps/ feedback for the teacher will be provided.

Person Responsible: Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Data will be discussed and monitored monthly.

The SEM leadership team will monitor student progress through the Data Sheet (i.e., Common Formative Assessment data, grade level unit assessment data) quarterly STAR, and FAST (Sept/Dec/May)

Person Responsible: Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: Data will be discussed and monitored monthly.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

SEM's 2022-2023 science proficiency was the lowest in the district at 31% proficient. This is 20 points below the state average and 11 below the district.

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

--60% of 5th grade students will be proficient in Science by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

- Monitor PLC unwrapping the standards/learning goals/depth of knowledge documents for completion and team focus
- Monitor growth over the school year using NWEA diagnostic assessments in September, January, and May for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards
(Data Sheet)
-Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018,
page 178). (Noted in grade level lesson plans as they focus on the PLC at Work 4
Critical Questions) and high level instructional expectations/strategies via the District Walkthrough document

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.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.)

-High impact strategy (Hattie, 2021): Utilize collaborative planning to attain collective clarity on exactly what students need to know (teachable concepts in the essential standards) and be able to do (specific skills and depth of knowledge) to demonstrate grade level mastery on essential standards in Science (i.e., unwrapping of the standards and construction of Common Formative Assessments with set proficiency levels and protocols indicating how and when to assess).
-Continue to refine and develop lesson plans that include the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure, including evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)
-Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level
-Implement high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2021), AVID WICOR and Kagan strategies to increase student engagement, self efficacy, and proficiency

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

When using the high impact strategy (Hattie, 2021) teacher clarity, we expect to improve student learning and mastery of essential science standards. This strategy has an effect size of .84 or up to two years growth. TEAMs use the teaching-assessing cycle to formulate evidence of student learning so team members can determine what skills remain unmastered and targeted, focused interventions and student supports.

Instruction/interventions are based on high-impact

strategies and research.
Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D
Learning By Doing - DuFour et al., 2016
RTI at Work - Buffum et al., 2018
What Works Clearing House Practice Guides for Reading (i.e., Informational Text and Math)

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

The SEM leadership team will monitor the SIP through the NWEA progress monitor. 3rd - 5th TEAMs will evaluate the data for proficiency on the standards and create an intervention/support plan for students who are not proficient.

Person Responsible: Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

By When: October January May

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).

The principal meets with the Title I Grant Coordinator to review funding and discuss allocations to areas of need. Further discussions over school improvement needs and funding allocations are conducted with the leadership team, SAC team, and individual parents. The SAC team votes on how to utilize funds.

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

PLCs at Work structure (Lesson Plans, progress monitoring, and assessment results), including the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle, will be utilized with the 4 Critical Questions to monitor student learning and implement interventions when required. Students need strategic instruction in foundational reading to successfully develop literacy skills. The Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade WWC practice guide (based on the science of reading) presents instructional recommendations for teachers in Kindergarten through 2nd grade. To engage students in this high-level learning focus, teachers will implement the following research-based recommendations:
1) Deeply understand and teach the BEST ELA Essential Standards
2) Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity (incorporating the BEST ELA EXPECTATIONS) at every grade level
3) Teach students academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge.
4) Develop awareness of the segments of sound in speech and how they link to letters.
5) Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
6) Ensure that each student reads connected text daily to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.
7) Create many opportunities to read a range of text types and a range of text levels
8) Provide explicit instruction that incorporates clear feedback.

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

PLCs at Work structure (Lesson Plans, progress monitoring, and assessment results), including the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle, will be utilized with the 4 Critical Questions to monitor student learning and implement interventions when required. Instructional strategies and MTSS interventions can improve reading levels. To engage students in this high-level learning focus, teachers will implement the following:
1) Deeply understand/teach the BEST ELA Essential Standards
2) Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level
3) Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. (i.e., Teach a routine for decoding multisyllabic words; Embed spelling instruction in the comprehension lesson; Engage students in a wide array of activities for practice).
4) Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly (i.e., Provide a purpose for re-reading; Embed prosody in instruction; Regularly provide opportunities for students to read a variety of texts (Read Aloud A LOT!))

5) Routinely use comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text (i.e., Develop world knowledge that is relevant for making sense of the passage; Teach meanings essential for understanding and how to derive meanings of other unknown words using context; Teach prefixes/ suffixes/Latin and Greek Roots)
6) Daily opportunities to practice challenging text above the students' current independent reading level that will expose students to complex ideas/information and increase persistence in making sense of the text.

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

--90% of 1st-grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
--90% of 2nd-grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

--60% of 3rd-grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
--60% of 5th-grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

- Monitor growth over the school year using STAR Reading diagnostic assessments at each QUARTER for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards (Data Sheet)
- Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 (Data Sheet)
-Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in lesson plans: PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions) and the documents related to the TEAMs work on unwrapping essential standards to promote teacher clarity and student mastery.
-Monitor implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions with fidelity on Branching Minds

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

Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.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?

Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in K-3:
1: Teach students academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge MINIMAL; 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters STRONG; and 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words STRONG. Improving Reading Comprehension in K-3: Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies STRONG; Select text purposefully to support comprehension MINIMAL; Establish an engaging and motivating context in which to teach reading comprehension MODERATE; Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text and Part 3A: build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text STRONG 3B: Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read STRONG.

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 programs are based on the science of reading. The IES Practice Guide Recommendations provide rationale to support the use of Lalilo by having students complete activities aligned to phonological awareness, phonics, word recognition, comprehension, and grammar. The IES Practice Guide Recommendations provide rationale to support the use of Freckle by continuously adapting for student practice in ELA activities while offering teachers the ability to focus practice on gradelevel standards. It adapts for the students Zone of Proximal Development while allowing the student to increase proficiency through standards based skill development in ELA.

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership: 1) The SEM leadership team will regularly attend morning PLCs and monitor PLC documents for completion and team focus. 2) We will monitor PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?) 2) The SEM leadership team will monitor the instructional process through ELA classroom walkthrough data 3) In addition, Okeechobee County Schools District Administration works together with school administration and the school leadership team to review the SEM school improvement plans and ensure progress on the areas identified to improve instruction at their school through the school stocktake meeting.	Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching: 1) The instructional coach will regularly attend grade level morning PLCs and assist with facilitating discussions related to essential standards. 2) The instructional coach will develop a schedule and system of support for teachers new to SEM.	Altman, Sandra, sandra.altman@okee.k12.fl.us
Assessment: 1. The SEM leadership team will monitor the SIP tstudent progress monitoring data (i.e., Common Formative Assessment data, grade level unit assessment data, STAR, FAST), and the MTSS process using Branching Minds intervention outcomes.	VanderMolen, Sonya, sonya.vandermolen@okee.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: SEM Leadership will provide teachers with ongoing professional learning opportunities through PLC at Work/Global PD focused continuous improvement of the PLC process. Specifically, teachers will be focused on improving learning by unwrapping essential standards for student mastery, creating CFAs, providing differentiation and interventions when learning has not occurred and exending and deepening learning.	Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.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.

A final draft of the SIP is presented to ALL SEM staff via a staff meeting and through a standing section in our weekly staff newsletter. Community stakeholders have access to the final copy of the SIP via a link to the school's webpage which is posted on Facebook, Talking Points, and DoJo. A copy will be sent to community partners (Our Village and Peaden, Inc.) A paper copy is available for dissemination in the the office.
Webpage: http://ses.okee.k12.fl.us/

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))

Research shows that students receive the following benefits from a collaborative partnership with the school, the family, and the community: higher grades and test scores, better attendance and homework completion, fewer placements in special education, more positive attitudes and behavior, higher graduation
rates and greater enrollment in post-secondary education. The gain for families includes an improved understanding of their child's development, improved parenting ability, improved capability to assist their children with school and learning, and improved relationships among all stakeholders. Parents are invited to
attend APTT, connect with their student's teachers, and engage in daily communication with them through
our online communication tool (DoJo), or hold a parent conference when needed to connect with the teacher or administration. Webpage: http://ses.okee.k12.fl.us/

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))

SEM has two initiatives that families can participate in: Read Aloud A Lot and Attendance Matters.
Read Aloud A Lot: Teachers communicate with parents regarding Read Aloud A Lot, indicating that families need to be reading with their children and have their children read to them. This initiative is school-wide and designed to increase students' independent reading time and get parents involved in the reading process.
Attendance Matters: We need to make sure all students are at school and on time. Research indicates that students' attendance improves when parents get involved!

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))

The principal meets with the Title I Grant Coordinator to review funding and discuss allocations to areas of need. Further discussions over school improvement needs and funding allocations are conducted with the leadership team, SAC team, and individual parents. The SAC team votes on how to utilize funds.

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**

2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System**	**$0.00**
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
4	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$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