

School District of Osceola County, FL

Mater Academy At St Cloud School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Mater Academy At St Cloud

1925 NORA TYSON RD, St. Cloud, FL 34771

www.materstcloud.com

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.

The Mission of Mater Academy St. Cloud is to seek:

- Meaningful achievement of
- Academics facilitated by
- Teachers, administrators, parents and the community
- Enabling students to become confident, self-directed and
- Responsible life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mater Academy St. Cloud our students SOAR to Success. Our students
Strive for success,
Own their choices,
Aspire to lead, and
Respect others.

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
Castillo, Alexandra	Principal	Instructional Leader on campus

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The development of the SIP takes place using multiple stakeholders. Our School Advisory Council works together with the administration to actively monitor, update and develop the goals and action steps for the SIP. Our school leadership team, instructional grade level and department leaders as well as student services coordinator work together to identify the needs and develop SIP.

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))

Our instructional goals and priorities will be discussed at monthly SAC meetings and progress towards our goals will be reviewed at our monthly faculty meetings. Each department will understand the instructional priorities and goals and will track their progress towards these goals through their department PLCs. Individual student data for those identified in the MTSS process will be reviewed at monthly MTSS committee meetings. The plan will be revised as needed based on progress and after every PM assessment.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	71%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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
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	25	20	19	21	15	17	9	14	173	
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	2	3	7	3	6	3	30	
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	2	3	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	13	13	17	17	81	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	24	28	16	12	104	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	

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	2	1	1	3	11	9	8	7	8	50

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	6	1	0	0	0	0	9
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	18	25	14	16	15	11	0	1	1	101	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	16	14	18	16	85	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	22	27	30	17	11	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	0	1	0	0	6	6	0	3	0	16

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	6	2	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	18	25	14	16	15	11	0	1	1	101	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	16	14	18	16	85	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	22	27	30	17	11	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	0	1	0	0	6	6	0	3	0	16

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	6	2	0	0	0	0	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	

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	48	53	44	50	55	38		
ELA Learning Gains				59			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			45		
Math Achievement*	44	47	55	35	42	42	27		
Math Learning Gains				51			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			26		
Science Achievement*	26	46	52	33	45	54	24		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	67	68	67	53	59	83		
Middle School Acceleration	0	75	70		45	51			
Graduation Rate		77	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		59	53		67	70			
ELP Progress	45	53	55	48	73	70	64		

* 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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	278
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
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	14	Yes	2	2
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	47			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			
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			44			26	75	0			45
SWD	17			17			0				4	23
ELL	33			39			22	61	0		7	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			45							2	
HSP	40			41			24	73	0		7	44
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56			47			31				5	50
FRL	40			40			21	69	0		7	41

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	44	59	53	35	51	45	33	67				48
SWD	10	46	60	7	19	25						
ELL	34	56	52	33	48	46	22	52				48
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP	44	60	50	34	51	48	29	66				44
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	54		32	52		31					64
FRL	41	57	50	31	49	43	33	59				52

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	38	47	45	27	25	26	24	83				64
SWD	7			0								
ELL	25	48	47	24	33	36	6					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20											
HSP	37	48	50	24	27	24	16	83				65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	32			29								
FRL	36	44	50	23	20	36	26					64

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%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	39%	5%	47%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	31%	40%	-9%	47%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	58%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	39%	7%	47%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	40%	5%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	39%	14%	48%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	61%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	41%	-12%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	28%	35%	-7%	44%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	40%	-17%	51%	-28%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	63%	14%	66%	11%

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 our 2022- 2023 school wide assessment data, Science proficiency was our lowest performance at 25%. Contributing factors to our low performance in science was having out of field educators in the tested area as well as difficulties with student engagement.

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

According to our 2022 - 2023 school data, the only decline in proficiency from the prior year was Science. Science proficiency decreased from 33% to 25% proficiency. The main contributing factor was lack of student engagement, continuity between grade levels in science instructions as well as minimal hands on experiences.

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 our 2022 - 2023 school data, the factor that contributed to the greatest gap is our performance in 5th Grade Math which showed a -26% difference in scores when compared to the state average. The main contributing factor was high teacher turnover in that grade level.

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

According to our 2022 - 2023 school data, the component that showed the most improvement was the proficiency in Math which demonstrated a 10 % increase from 35% in 2021 -2022 to 45% in 2022 - 2023. Implemented a schoolwide emphasis on foundational Math skills, data analysis and fidelity with respect to differentiation.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data the overall greatest concerns across all grade levels is the rate of absenteeism. In addition to attendance, we identified the reading deficiency in our 22-23 third grade proficiency to be about 30% of our population at a level 1.

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

1. Student engagement
2. Increase attendance rates across all grade levels
3. Increase hands on science experiences and continuity across all grade levels
4. Data analysis with an emphasis on standards mastery
5. Increase PLC opportunities to develop understanding of explicit standards based instruction

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**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 area of focus for the 23-24 school year will be to improve explicit instruction across the school, by establishing a coaching framework led by experienced educators trained in explicit instruction techniques. Our goals include fostering teacher professional growth, raising student achievement, and promoting equity.

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 academic year, we will increase ELA assessment proficiency to 51% and Mathematics proficiency to 52%.

Monitoring:

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

The progress toward the goal will be monitored through regular data collection and analysis. We will conduct classroom observations and provide targeted feedback, use data to tailor coaching strategies, and foster collaborative learning communities. Throughout the year, we will refine the coaching model based on assessment data and teacher feedback to ensure consistent, high-quality explicit instruction practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Goal Setting: Teachers and coaches collaboratively set specific, measurable, and achievable goals for instructional improvement.

Data-Driven Coaching: Coaches collect and analyze data on classroom practices and student outcomes to inform coaching sessions.

Reflection and Action Planning: Teachers and coaches engage in reflective conversations to identify areas for improvement and develop action plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The approach's effectiveness lies in its personalized and ongoing nature, making it a valuable evidence-based intervention for schools looking to enhance teaching practices and, ultimately, student learning outcomes in the context of explicit instruction.

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

An area of focus will be focusing on teacher turnover and collective efficacy within the education system, which is crucial for improving the overall quality of education. Teacher turnover can disrupt the continuity and stability of a school's environment, impacting student learning and school culture.

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 academic year, we aim to reduce teacher turnover by 20% and increase the average collective efficacy score among teaching staff by 15%, as measured by anonymous surveys and retention data analysis.

Monitoring:

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

The progress toward the goal will be monitored through regular data collection and analysis. Teacher turnover rate will be calculated annually, and changes in collective efficacy will be tracked using pre- and post-surveys, with results analyzed to assess the effectiveness of implemented strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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. 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.

Increasing student attendance through a multifaceted approach that promotes a positive school environment and addresses potential barriers to regular attendance.

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 school year, achieve a minimum 90% average daily attendance rate across all grade levels, as tracked and recorded through the school's attendance tracking system that is class wide, grade level, school wide.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through daily classroom attendance tracking, monthly grade level tracking and EWS reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Spedding (aspedding@materstcloud.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Early Warning Systems: Schools can implement early warning systems that track student attendance and identify patterns of chronic absenteeism. When students reach a certain threshold of absences, teachers and school staff can intervene with appropriate support.

Parent and Family Engagement: Building strong relationships with parents and families is crucial. Schools can conduct regular parent-teacher conferences, send attendance reports home, and communicate the importance of attendance to parents.

Positive Reinforcement: Schools can implement incentive programs that reward students for good attendance. This could include certificates, awards, or special privileges for students with excellent attendance records.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance-based interventions are strategies and programs designed to improve and maintain student attendance in educational settings. These interventions aim to reduce absenteeism and increase regular school attendance, which is essential for academic success and positive social development.

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed at the beginning of the year parent meetings and based on needs assessments completed the year prior.

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

Based on our Progress Monitoring Assessment (iReady), grades K-2 did not show less than 50 percent proficient in any grade level.

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

Our Area of Focus for Grade 3-5 Reading/ELA will be the implementation of Explicit Instruction and the Science of Reading in instructional practice. During Pre-Planning teachers received a 6 hour training on the Science of Reading and the use of Explicit Instruction and will receive a Part B during the scheduled October planning date. In addition, the universal template for the school's lesson plans now uses explicit instruction and all lesson coaching as well as walkthroughs includes the same as a focus point. Student learning in literacy is expected to improve as Explicit Instruction incorporates systematic and highly structured teaching methods which will result in student achievement at the Tier 1 level. The data demonstrated that more than 50% of our students were below grade level.

Data:

3rd Grade - On the statewide FAST Assessment, 3rd Grade had 57% of students score below proficiency

5th Grade: On the statewide FAST Assessment, 3rd Grade had 54% of students score below proficiency

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

Grades K-2 did not score below 50% proficiency on either the Statewide (STAR) or progress monitoring assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the Statewide FAST 2022 - 2023 ELA Assessment, Grades 3-5 had a 46% proficiency rate. The measurable outcome for 2023-2024 is 51% 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.

Monitoring will be done through progress monitoring, walkthroughs and data chats. Data-driven-instruction will be reinforced to ensure that student achievement outcome is impacted.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Castillo, Alexandra, acastillo@materstcloud.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence-based practices that are being implemented to achieve measurable outcomes include Explicit Instruction and Literacy Coaching.

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?

Implementing evidence-based practices to increase reading achievement is crucial for improving literacy outcomes for students. The school identified and selected resources that were evidenced based.

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 - The leadership team will participate in literacy based training with a focus on Explicit Instruction.	
Literacy Coaching - School based Literacy Coach will participate in monthly PLCs with other coaches to ensure the implementation process is being done with fidelity and is effective.	Castillo, Alexandra, acastillo@materstcloud.com
Assessment - Progress Monitoring using the school based tool as well as using the statewide progress monitoring assessment.	
Professional Learning - Scheduled professional learning training throughout the year for teachers on teacher planning days and during common planning.	Castillo, Alexandra, acastillo@materstcloud.com

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated to all necessary stakeholders through parent meetings, printed material, the school website as well as our school messenger application.

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))

The school as well as the families will work together to create the compact and will meet monthly during PALS meetings to build a positive relationship between as stakeholders involved.

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)

On a monthly basis, students will meet with their teachers to update their data folders. Parent/ family data nights are scheduled on a quarterly basis to strengthen the academic program in the school. The school will also have an emphasis on attendance and work with families to make sure that students are attending school regularly.

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))

This plan is developed using the guidelines provided by the Title 1 team of Osceola County.

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: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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.

No