Stonewyck Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Stonewyck Elementary

3001 STONEWYCK STREET, Orlando, FL 32824

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Parker, Lee	Principal	The Principal will be responsible for cultivating, shaping, and ensuring rigorous academic goals are set for all staff and students. The Principal will problem-solve, coach, and build capacity in staff to create a positive and effective school culture. The Principal will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support in order to ensure the school's mission and vision are achieved.
Roman, Faye	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in all instructional and operational duties, act as first designee in the principal's absence, be the main student discipline contact, conduct teacher evaluations/observations and provide instructional feedback, and coordinate the Partners in Education program.
Maneri, Brenda	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support teachers, textbooks, testing coordinator, assist with student discipline, field trips, principal designee in absence of assistant principal, supervision duties.
Djak, Nikki	Instructional Coach	Lead Mentor, teacher coaching/support, PNPA contact, interns, student small group support, supervision duties, PD points, college volunteers, school-wide data analysis, awards coordinator.
Austin, Tasha	School Counselor	Guidance lessons, small group/individual counseling, SEDNET, Child Safety Matters, safety patrols, supervision duties, TAT meetings, homeless/foster care liaison.
Fitzpatrick, Kristin	Staffing Specialist	Staffing and ESE compliance, 504 contact, POPI schedules, teacher support, student support, gifted screenings.
Quinones Viruet, Ruben	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL compliance, entry/exit/extension meetings, MPLC, FTEschedules in Skyward, student discipline assistance, ACCESS/IPT testing, and student supervision.
Burgoon, Rebecca	Instructional Media	Run media center, literacy committee, TV studio, AR, student device contact, and student supervision.
Switzer, Julie	Instructional Coach	Provide T3 interventions, manage school-wide MTSS process, student supervision, 3rd grade portfolios, and good cause.

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.

We used a combination of staff and parent surveys along with our School Advisory Council and PTA input to develop goals.

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 goals will be monitored by the principal and leadership team members most closely associated with that particular goal. The principal will also provide an update to the School Advisory Councel bi-monthly on the SIP goals as well as share student data as it becomes available.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	28	30	18	22	17	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	26	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	18	16	16	19	0	0	0	0	69

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	5	5	4	22	17	0	0	0	53

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	41	26	19	21	24	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	18	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	18	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	10	8	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	29

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	41	26	19	21	24	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	18	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	18	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	10	8	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	29

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55	57	53		56	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	67	60	59		46	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	74	63	54		61	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	72	59	59						

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

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

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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

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	13	Yes	1	1
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	67			
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	55			67			74					72
SWD	10			15							2	
ELL	33			58			71				5	72
AMI												
ASN	55			82							2	
BLK	59			71			72				3	
HSP	53			65			77				5	70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62			68			55				4	
FRL	40			55			63				5	70

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											
SWD											
ELL											
AMI											
ASN											
BLK											
HSP											
MUL											
PAC											
WHT											
FRL											

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students											
SWD											
ELL											
AMI											
ASN											
BLK											
HSP											
MUL											
PAC											
WHT											
FRL											

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	54%	-1%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	51%	17%

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.

Our lowest data component was in 4th grade at ELA (53% raw and 55% scrubbed). Last year was our school's inaugural year so all teachers were working with students at the levels with which they came to us and lots of work was done to fill gaps. While lots of growth was shown (PM1 at 36% to 53% for PM3) this was still our lowest area by 2%.

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

NA - The school does not have prior-year data

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.

If you look at raw data the same component above is below the state average by 1%. If looking at scrubbed data it is above the state average by 1%.

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

NA - The school does not have prior-year data

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

The potential areas of concern is the attendance section and the number of students with a substantial reading deficit.

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

MTSS program, K-2 literacy readiness.

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 ELA

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

Stonewyck Elementary will focus on increasing the overall foundational reading proficiency of students in grades kindergarten through 2nd grade during the 2023-2024 school year There is a need for teachers to consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively plan instruction that supports the delivery of rigorous lessons.

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

Increase the K-2 combined profriciency from 60% to 65% on the PM3 STAR assessment. By grade level we would like to see kindergarten increase thier Early Literacy score from 51% to 56%, first grade from 66% to 71% and 2nd grade from 58% to 63%.

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

This will be monitored via STAR PM2, DIBELS, SBUA's, Success Maker and Exact Path.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Djak (nikki.djak@ocps.net)

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.)

A strong Structured Literacy Tier 1 instructional approach via CRMs, Wonders, and Heggerty (K and 1). This will be supplemented with the computer based program Exact Path and Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction for identified students.

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

A structured literacy program is a proven research based approach to teaching early literacy.

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.

Review EOY K-2 data with teachers and discuss the big picture as well as each grade level's performance in comparison to like type schools.

Person Responsible: Lee Parker (lee.parker@ocps.net)

By When: Completed during pre-planning

Kg, 1st and 2nd grades worked with principal during summer planning to choose what will be used to explicitly and systematically teach phonics. Teams were allowed to choose from CRMs or Wonders.

Person Responsible: Lee Parker (lee.parker@ocps.net)

By When: Completed over the summer

Instructional Coach will work with teams during common planning to ensure they remain focused on strategies, activities and resources that support a structured literacy approach to instruction.

Person Responsible: Nikki Djak (nikki.djak@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the year

Formative data from SBUAs, writing prompts, Exact Path, MOY/EOY assessments (FAST, DIBELS) will be examined regularly and discussed to determine instrucitonal changes.

Person Responsible: Lee Parker (lee.parker@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the year

Professional Development targeted specifically for Kg, 1st and 2nd grade teachers. Ex. correct pronunciation of letter sounds when teaching phonics, making better choices for independent work centers, passage studies from "Reading Above the Fray".

Person Responsible: Lee Parker (lee.parker@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the year

#2. 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 our most recent Panorama student survey of 41% of our 4th and 5th graders only 41% responded favorably to the question, "During the past 30 days, how clearly were you able to describe your feelings?". Being able to develop this skill is important for our students so that they are able to form better relationships as they grow as well as helping them learn ways to manage their emotions, attention, and behavior when they experience challenges.

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

We would like the percent favorable score for the above Panorama survey question to increase from 41% to 50%.

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

The school Counselor will develop targeted classroom lessons for 4th and 5th-grade students to address this question. She will also conduct small group sessions with 5th graders based on their individual responses as 4th graders on last year's survey and monitor those classes and students during her visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tasha Austin (tasha.austin@ocps.net)

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.)

The Second Step program is a research based social-emotional educational program. Randomized control trials of Second Step programs provide evidence of the programs' effectiveness. This program is a vetted and approved resource of Orange County Public Schools.

•Social Skills workbook for grades 1st -3rd for Kinder
Lesson 17 "Get in shape- Feel Good drawing activity" (introduction to emotional words and what they mean) (introduction to a "feeling check in" where kinder will learn how to identify current feelings)

•Social Skills workbook for grades 1st -3rd:
Lesson 18 "Expressing Good things about oneself"
Lesson 19 "Feeling Positive about Oneself"
Lesson 20 "Being Positive about Oneself"

•Second Step (Elementary Digital Program)
For 1st grade unit 2 Emotional management - lessons 6-10
For 2nd grade unit 2 Emotional management - lessons 6-10
For 3rd grade unit 2 Emotional management - lessons 6-10

•Social Skills workbook for grades 4th-5th:
Lesson 15 "Feeling Good About oneself"
Lesson 17 "Knowing yourself"
Lesson 18 "Recognizing your strengths and Weaknesses"

•Second Step for 4th and 5th grade

4th grade: unit 2 Emotional management - lessons 6-10
5th grade: unit 2 Emotional management - lessons 6-10

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

Using the Social Skills Lessons & Activities for grades 1st -3rd, and Social Skills Lessons & Activities for grades 4th -5th provides the opportunity to use evidenced based interventions school wide. The curriculum selected provides an opportunity for student to learn how their thoughts, feelings and behaviors are connected. The activities are separated by grade and developmental levels, the interventions are hands on and encourage community/classroom discussions. This method tends to build trust and strong classroom relationships.

Using the Second step digital program, offers a different style of curriculum while continuing to create opportunities for students to express themselves. The Second Step program is designed by grade levels and it helps to reduce impulsive, high-risk, and aggressive behaviors by increasing student's social competence and other protective factors such as trust, confidence, safeness, and community.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus