Neptune Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Neptune Elementary School

1200 BETSY ROSS LN, Saint Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola 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.

Neptune Elementary provides challenging and engaging standards-based instruction through data driven decisions, collaboration, problem solving, and a shared vision for success in a nurturing inclusive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Neptune Elementary School will encourage all students to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere.

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
Mahoney, Shannon	Principal	Meet with coaches and teachers to monitor Tier 1 implementation and CIMs through team meetings and walkthroughs. Monitor CIM data during the weekly leadership team meetings and make adjustments accordingly.
Loew, Diann	Assistant Principal	Meet with coaches and teachers to monitor Tier 1 implementation and CIMs through team meetings and walkthroughs. Monitor CIM data during the weekly leadership team meetings and make adjustments accordingly.
Blake, Stephanie	Reading Coach	Meet with teachers during PLC planning to monitor Tier 1 instruction is being implemented with fidelity. Planning will also occur for the CIMs. Ms. Blake will gather the data to submit to administration and present at our weekly leadership meetings and interventions will be adjusted according to the data.
Hogan, Sandra	Math Coach	Meet with teachers during PLC planning to monitor Tier 1 instruction is being implemented with fidelity. Planning will also occur for the CIMs. Ms. Hogan will gather the data to submit to administration and present at our weekly leadership meetings and interventions will be adjusted according to the data.
Kincade, Sabrina	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Kincade monitors student's behaviors creating necessary intervention plans to ensure that students are in classrooms learning. She will also assist teachers on working with students so that all students are receiving Tier 1 instruction, CIMs, and interventions.
Mostoufi, Leila	Other	Ms. Mostoufi is our MTSS Coach, her responsibilities include putting students in Tiers based on data. Leading interventions, planning with teachers, providing resources and monitoring the data. This is presented at our weekly leadership meetings.
Guasp, Dara	Other	Ms. Guasp is our Resource Compliance Specialist and monitors our Students with Disabilities. Ms. Guasp is responsible for monitoring the ESE student's success in school. She monitors closely their data, meets with parents and the VE teachers to adjust accommodations and interventions to achieve student success.
Alden, Jaclynn	Other	Ms. Alden is our testing coordinator. Her responsibilities include training teachers to implement the state required testing with fidelity, stay in compliance with testing requirements, accommodations and that all students are tested in the testing window. Ms. Alden will also gather and desegregate the data to present at our leadership team meetings as well as stocktake. Ms. Alden is also our Leader in Me coordinator which ties into our positive culture area of focus. She will monitor the implementation where students become leaders and ownership of their learning. She will also monitor the student's WIGs (wildly important goals).

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Salinas, Ruby	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms Salinas will monitor our data for our ELL students, inform parents of their progress and support teachers with instruction.

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.

To involve our stakeholders and families, there are family empowerment evenings planned to educate and involve our families in their education. We will also have monthly SAC meetings that are lead by administration as well as a teacher leader. Based on the community input, families want more of the family involvement nights as well as student led conferences as it empowers them to help their students with academics and feel more connected.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored weekly at our weekly leadership meetings and revisited during Stocktake focusing on the data and working with the coaches and teachers to adjust interventions to close the gaps. This will be revised as needed.

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	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)

	Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: 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	28	53	40	60	46	31	0	0	0	258
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	6	2	1	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	15	43	35	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	19	12	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	53	40	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	26	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	34	36	49	19	16	34	0	0	0	188

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	3	1	1	23	14	0	0	0	42

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	26	12	15	25	22	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	24	13	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	9	12	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	45	36	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	62	47	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	5	3	35	17	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	26	12	15	25	22	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	24	13	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	9	12	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	45	36	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	62	47	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	5	3	35	17	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
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*	42	44	53	47	48	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				57			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			34		
Math Achievement*	50	46	59	51	44	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				57			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			25		
Science Achievement*	37	43	54	55	46	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	59	59	56			58		

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
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	24	Yes	2	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	60			
FRL	43			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	55			
BLK	59			
HSP	51			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	48			

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	42			50			37					62
SWD	15			18			9				5	54
ELL	31			41			25				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			41			21				3	
HSP	38			47			35				5	63

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	36			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			64			56				4	
FRL	38			44			29				5	59

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	47	57	42	51	57	47	55					56
SWD	14	44	41	22	43	36	35					25
ELL	39	54	39	41	58	53	52					56
AMI												
ASN	50			60								
BLK	50	68		52	52		75					
HSP	44	55	42	48	57	51	53					55
MUL	70			50								
PAC												
WHT	53	53		59	52		54					
FRL	40	54	44	42	53	54	44					54

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	46	47	34	43	43	25	39					58
SWD	28	33	33	25	41	29	19					55
ELL	31	43	38	28	32	28	21					58
AMI												
ASN	60			70								
BLK	35			41								
HSP	42	44	30	40	44	24	37					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	61		54	39		54					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	36	43	31	36	36	16	31					53

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	44%	-3%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	48%	17%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	41%	-6%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	40%	-3%	51%	-14%

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.

5th Grade Math proficiency was 35% which is our lowest performing data component. This number was low since we were unable to hire 2 math teachers due to the teacher shortage which affected 80 students out of the 200. This year also did not have a growth component. This year student growth will greatly impact our scores in a positive way.

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

Overall ELA score went from 47% proficiency in 2022 to 44% proficiency in 2023. Our greatest gains are in our growth and this year did not include student growth. The teacher shortage affected fifth grade, there were two substitute teachers for the entire school year. Their behaviors were also challenging even with PBIS interventions and numerous motivational strategies.

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.

Our 5th grade Science scores had the largest gap between the school score (37%) and the state average (51%) with a difference of 14%. Our inability to hire 2 certified teachers in 5th grade resulted in 80 students with a substitute teacher.

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

Our overall math scores increased by 1% with 4th grade reaching a 65% proficiency. The use of interventions during iii and the use of spiral review, monitoring the data and reviewing standards accounted for the high rate of proficiency.

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

Based on our EWS data, attendance is an area of concern. The leadership team will use resources from attendanceworks.org to increase our attendance rates by 5%.This will be the area with intensive support focusing on our students with disabilities to increase our proficiency.

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

1. Leader in Me curriculum with a focus on WIGs (Wildly Important Goals) which has students tracking their own data and being held accountable.
2. Community Involvement/Parent Engagement
3. Student Leadership
4. Leadership tracking spiral data
5. PBIS and Behavior coaching to ensure that students are in the classroom learning.

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.

According to the 2022-2023 school data, 43% were proficient in ELA on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, and the state average was 54%. The ATSI area of focus will be Students with Disabilities with a 15% proficiency accounting for 15% of the school population. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of literacy achievement for all students.

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

Our goal for 2023-2024 will be to meet the state average of 54% proficiency.

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

Literacy coach and/or school leadership will be present during common planning and data chats to support the alignment and rigor of BEST standards.

Leadership team will consistently monitor classroom data from Benchmark, Lexia, FAST, spiral reviews and Checks for Understanding to inform the next steps in instruction including remediation and acceleration.

Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to identify trends and ensure implementation of high-quality instructional practices.

School stocktake model will take place every month to monitor progress on the Area of Focus.

Weekly Common Planning during the PLT process as monitored by the coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Blake (stephanie.blake@osceolaschools.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.)

Lexia Core 5 will be used as an intervention as it is scored high on evidenceforessa.org and has an effect size of 0.23. This will be used during intervention time and before school tutoring. Lexia usage and growth will be monitored and discussed at weekly PLT's.

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

Lexia Core 5 will be used as an intervention as it is scored high on evidenceforessa.org and has an effect size of 0.23.

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.

Provide professional development opportunities for Open Court, BEST standards, Benchmark curriculum, Core Connections, Lexia, and other areas of need as determined by PLT data while incorporating best practices strategies for increasing student engagement through quality to improve student literacy.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Blake (stephanie.blake@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By the end of the first quarter.

Instructional coaches with administration will support weekly grade level planning to develop Benchmark aligned lessons to ensure high quality, differentiated instruction and push in support by including varied, research based instructional strategies as determined by data in all classrooms with intense focus on Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Blake (stephanie.blake@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly until 12/23

Incorporate effective AVID strategies including but not limited to the incorporation of the Critical Reading Process and WICOR strategies in all classrooms to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible: Jaclynn Alden (jaclynn.alden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly until 12/23

High quality ELA instructional materials and resources found in the curriculum unit plans will be used with fidelity for all students.

Person Responsible: Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Daily walkthroughs through 5/24

Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and determine next steps as needed such as coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Blake (stephanie.blake@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly through 12/23

Students will receive targeted, specific interventions through the utilization of the MTSS process and data collection.

Person Responsible: Leila Mostoufi (leila.mostoufi@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly through 12/23

CIMs and spiral review started the first week of school and the data will be collected by the coaches and reviewed weekly by the leadership team.

Person Responsible: Shannon Mahoney (shannon.mahoney@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly until PM 2 (approximately December, 2023)

VE support will be monitored to ensure that small group instruction is occurring for all of our ESE students that receive support.

Person Responsible: Dara Guasp (dara.guasp@osceolaschools.net)

By When: VE teachers will turn in weekly logs of the times and students they've supported.

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 school data, Neptune experienced a staggering increase of approximately 150% in students with more than 10% absence rate. This put our rate of students with at least 90% attendance at approximately 76%. The ATSI area of focus will be Students with Disabilities and monitoring these students' attendance rates. According to our 2022-2023 early warning school data our students with at least 90% attendance was at 75%.

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

Our goal for 2023-2024 will be to have our students with at least 90% attendance to 80%.

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

All students in grades K-5 will have academic goals with actionable lead measures and informal & formal assessments data to track.
Students will track their lead measure towards their wildly important goal daily.
Students will track daily attendance and tardies for each subject area.
Teachers will engage students in weekly Leader in Me lessons to increase awareness of their leadership capabilities and how they can take control and improve their daily life.
Teachers will track classroom progress towards the class goal that 100% of students will show growth in their subject area by May 2024 weekly.
Leadership will monitor teacher's implementation of Leader-in-Me and goal setting via monthly walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaclynn Alden (jaclynn.alden@osceolaschools.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.)

Studies show that when students are more engaged with their learning and more connected with their school, teacher, and peers they achieve higher academic success. Leader in Me is a proven program which increases student engagement by increasing self-esteem, motivation, and general outlook on education. Research also indicates that if a student has at least one trusted adult in the school building they are more likely to succeed.

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

Leader in Me is an effective program which establishes a foundation of solid habits which will lead to academic and personal success. Through the use of Leader in Me curriculum and goal setting teachers and students will get to know one another, forming relationships, and helping students to feel more connected to the school and have better control over their learning.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

According to the 2022-2023 school data, 50% were proficient in Math on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. The ATSI area of focus will be Students with Disabilities with a 19% proficiency accounting for 15% of the school population. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematical achievement for all students.

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

According to our 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. school data our Math proficiency is at 50%, the state average is 58%. Our goal for 2023-2024 will be the state average of 58% proficiency.

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

Math/Science coach and/or school leadership will be present during common planning and data chats to support the alignment and rigor of BEST standards.

Leadership team will consistently monitor classroom data from Math Tasks, Dreambox, FAST, spiral reviews and Checks for Understanding to inform the next steps in instruction including remediation and acceleration.

Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to identify trends and ensure implementation of high-quality instructional practices.

School stocktake model will take place every month to monitor progress on the Area of Focus.

Weekly Common Planning during the PLT process as monitored by the coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandra Hogan (sandra.hogan@osceolaschools.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.)

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, Tier 1 instruction implemented with fidelity, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

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

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William, 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

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.

Provide professional development opportunities for Math Tasks, The Big M, Dreambox and other areas of need as determined by PLT data while incorporating best practices strategies for increasing student engagement through quality to improve student mathematical excellence.

Person Responsible: Sandra Hogan (sandra.hogan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By the end of the 1st quarter

Instructional coaches with administration will support weekly grade level planning to develop benchmark aligned lessons to ensure high quality, differentiated instruction and push in support by including varied, research based instructional strategies as determined by data in all classrooms with intense focus on Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Sandra Hogan (sandra.hogan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monitored weekly by December 2023

Incorporate effective AVID strategies including but not limited to the incorporation of the Critical Reading Process and WICOR strategies in all classrooms to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible: Jaclynn Alden (jaclynn.alden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monitored weekly by December 2023

Students will receive targeted, specific interventions through the utilization of the MTSS process and data collection.

Person Responsible: Leila Mostoufi (leila.mostoufi@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monitored weekly by December 2023 adjusted after PM 2

CIMs and spiral review started the first week of school and the data will be collected by the coaches and reviewed weekly by the leadership team.

Person Responsible: Shannon Mahoney (shannon.mahoney@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly until PM 2 (approximately December 2023)

VE support will be monitored to ensure that small group instruction is occurring for all of our ESE students that receive support.

Person Responsible: Dara Guasp (dara.guasp@osceolaschools.net)

By When: VE teachers will turn in weekly logs of the times and students they are supporting.

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 school data, 37% were proficient in Science on the Florida Statewide Science Assessment. The ATSI area of focus will be Students with Disabilities with a 10% proficiency. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematical achievement for all students.

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

According to our 2022-2023 FSSA school data our Science proficiency is at 37%, the state average is 51%. Our goal for 2023-2024 will be the state average of 51% proficiency.

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

Math/Science coach and/or school leadership will be present during common planning and data chats to support the alignment and rigor of the Sunshine State Standards.

Leadership team will consistently monitor classroom data from Common Assessments, spiral reviews and Checks for Understanding to inform the next steps in instruction including remediation and acceleration.

Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to identify trends and ensure implementation of high-quality instructional practices.

School stocktake model will take place every month to monitor progress on the Area of Focus.

Weekly Common Planning during the PLT process as monitored by the coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandra Hogan (sandra.hogan@osceolaschools.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.)

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, Tier 1 instruction implemented with fidelity, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

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

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William, 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

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.

Instructional coaches with administration will support weekly grade level planning to ensure high quality, differentiated instruction and push in support by including varied, research based instructional strategies as determined by data in all classrooms with intense focus on Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Sandra Hogan (sandra.hogan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monitored weekly through December 2023

Incorporate effective AVID strategies including but not limited to the incorporation of the Critical Reading Process and WICOR strategies in all classrooms to support focused engagement for all subgroups.

Person Responsible: Jaclynn Alden (jaclynn.alden@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By 9/30/23 with ongoing observations.

Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and determine next steps as needed such as coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly through December 2023

CIMs and spiral review started the first week of school and the data will be collected by the coaches and reviewed weekly by the leadership team.

Person Responsible: Diann Loew (diann.loew@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monitored weekly until December 2023.

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).

Neptune Elementary has a Literacy Coach that plans with teachers weekly, collaborates with grade level teams, conducts walkthroughs and works intensively with new teachers. The Literacy coach and MTSS coach collaborate and determine what additional supports are needed for students not showing proficiency in grade level benchmarks. The MTSS coach meets monthly with teacher teams to review data and to adjust groupings as well as resources based on the CIM data. Also working with the VE teachers and determine the necessary needs of our SWD subgroups.

The math and literacy coach meet weekly with teams to create CIM resources, review of the benchmark started the 2nd week of school. The math, literacy, MTSS, and Testing Coordinator will also work with groups of students that require intensive support and focus on our SWD subgroups.

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

In Kindergarten 43% of students were below 40th percentile. In 1st Grade, this was 39% of students. In 2nd Grade this was 34% of students.

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

According to the FAST PM 1 data, 269 students or 57% scored a level 1.

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

This year 50% of Kindergarten students will score at grade level as measured by the STAR report.
This year 50% of 1st grade students will score at grade level as measured by the STAR report.
This year 50% of 2nd grade students will score at grade level as measured by the STAR report.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Through the improvement of instructional planning, the goal is to increase student achievement. This year, grades 3-5 will have 54% proficiency as measured on the FAST PM 3. SWD will increase to a 41% proficiency.

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.

The leadership team will meet weekly to review formative assessment data as well as CIM data to determine the needs of the students. Flexible grouping will be used during iii time to meet the needs of all students. MTSS coach will have monthly data chats will teams as well as instructional coaches will meet with teams to review data.

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

Mostoufi, Leila, leila.mostoufi@osceolaschools.net

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?

Instructional coaches will use AVID strategies, Leader In Me Leadership Portfolios and Benchmark and resources from the CUPs as well as the reading plan. The leadership team as well as teacher teams will use Open Court, Benchmark, Lexia to provide interventions for students who are not making progress.

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 interventions listed above coupled with direct instruction have a strong effect size. Phonics instruction has an effect size of .70, Lexia Core has a strong rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.

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
The Literacy Coach will plan weekly with the teams to plan for benchmark aligned curriculum with the necessary rigor.	Blake, Stephanie, stephanie.blake@osceolaschools.net
Administration to conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs, collect data and look for trends	Mahoney, Shannon, shannon.mahoney@osceolaschools.net
Teachers meet Wednesday during PLT with coaches to monitor content planning and to review data.	Blake, Stephanie, stephanie.blake@osceolaschools.net

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.

During the September SAC meeting, Neptune Elementary will present the SIP to all stakeholders and collect feedback. Flyers will be sent home in English and Spanish, send via Remind and Class Dojo and on our school's Facebook page. Hard copies will be available in the front office. Data will be reviewed during the December 2023 SAC meeting.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Neptune Elementary encourages a positive culture with our families and stakeholders and will provide several opportunities to be involved in the development of our Parent and Family Engagement (PFEP). We will also incorporate Leader In Me Student Led Conference Night where families are invited to come

on campus and have their children lead a conference. Notifications of our family nights are sent home in both English and Spanish via flyers, automated texts, and posted on our social media platform.

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))

Neptune Elementary School will implement Leader In Me, AVID and PBIS strategies to foster a positive culture, relationships, participation, and engagement to increase student achievement, create a sense of belonging, and student leadership. School leadership will meet with teams to implement these strategies in the classrooms.

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))

Neptune Elementary School plan is developed and coordinated with Title I to provide supplemental education for disadvantaged students, Title II to provide professional development to support teacher growth. Title III for multicultural services.

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))

Neptune Elementary ensures that student's needs are met outside of academic areas. Counselors provide classroom lessons to meet the social needs of our students. Paraprofessional support is provided to students with high needs, teachers were sent to AVID conferences and MTSS is strategies are provided.

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))

The students at Neptune Elementary School are provided with a STEM block as well as Leader in Me to explore areas in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math as well as developing their leadership skills.

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).

Neptune Elementary has an MTSS coach that works with teachers to collect and monitor data, track student progress and create and implement interventions to support the student's academic success. PBIS is used as a strategy to assist students. We have two counselors, a school psychologist, social worker who assist with addressing problem behaviors as well as a Behavior team who meets to discuss behaviors.

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))

Neptune Elementary provides staff with professional development based on needs and staff surveys. Instructional coaches provide content specific professional development, targeting the needs of our students based on walkthrough data.

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))

Neptune Elementary School has a VPK and pre K ESE program. All students participate in our Leader in Me program as well as our family engagement nights. These programs are supplied with and implement the resources from the district. They also receive coach support with behavior, math, reading and science.