Doris A. Sanders Learning Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Doris A. Sanders Learning Center

1201 ENCHANTED DR, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://schools.polk-fl.net/dslc

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.

To learn, achieve, and believe in our potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will experience success in attaining educational goals, exhibiting universally acceptable social behavior, communicating effectively, participating in community experiences, and becoming productive members of society.

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
Melton, Holly	Principal	Ms. Melton will serve as the instructional leader and ensure evidence-based practices are being implemented for both academic and behavioral growth. She will provide on-going goal setting, implementation, progress monitoring, and data analysis utilizing the Continuous Improvement Model. Ms. Melton will hire school staff based on the instructional needs of the school. She will also facilitate planning meetings and coordinate all professional development. Ms. Melton will evaluate teacher effectiveness through an on-going observations/feedback process. It is Ms. Melton's responsibility to assure that all staff members are working toward the school mission/vision and all decision making is student centered.
Cleveland, Rhea	Assistant Principal	Ms. Cleveland will serve as an instructional leader supporting all academic and behavioral school initiatives. She will collaborate with master scheduling and teacher assignments. She is also responsible for the school safety plans, drills, and supervision schedules. Overseeing testing requirements will be an additional responsibility since the school does not have a testing coordinator allocation. Ms. Cleveland will also work to implement the school mission and vision by conducting classroom walkthroughs, staff evaluations, and providing meaningful teacher feedback.
Harris, Josey	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Harris will facilitate and collaborate with the classroom teacher regarding the development of student Individual Education Plans from elementary to transition services. She will provide support and monthly training to staff regarding IEP development, documentation, and skill based instruction so our students will gain the highest level of independence possible for them. Ms. Harris will also work to expand our transition program to increase job opportunity skills for our students. She is a vital leadership team member that collaborates with others regarding the PBIS program. To assure our mission and vision are being carried out, Ms. Harris also serves in a coaching role for struggling teachers/paraprofessionals.
LeBlanc, Leonard	Behavior Specialist	Mr. LeBlanc is currently under the allocation of VE Teacher but previously served as the Behavior Interventionist before the allocation was removed. He still maintains responsibility for the school-wide PBIS program. He provides support to teachers and paraprofessionals with classroom management. He provides staff professional development with school-wide programs such as "Zones of Regulation" in an effort to have common language amongst all staff. Mr. LeBlanc is a lead member of the crisis team and directs CPI advanced restraints when necessary for student/staff safety.

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.

It is the goal of Doris Sanders Learning Center to have collaboration in goal setting, implementation, and progress monitoring. Members of the leadership team, teachers and non-instructional staff will be providing input to the School Improvement Plan process. Parent concerns and feedback will also be incorporated during the planning process.

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 progress of School Improvement Plan goals will be addressed during leadership meetings. The SIP will be condensed to a quick reference one page guide so they are clear and concise for all employees. This will be disseminated to all employees and posted throughout the campus. With on-going analysis of student performance, any updates or changes needed to the SIP goals will be addressed.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: UNSATISFACTORY
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	0	1	2	3	2	4	5	2	5	24
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	0	4	0	4	4	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	6	3	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	2	3	1	1	3	4	4	2	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	8	4	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	9	4	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	4	2	2	6	7	9	6	66

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	2	3	1	1	4	4	4	2	37

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	2	3	1	1	3	4	4	2	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	8	4	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	9	4	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	4	2	2	6	7	9	6	39

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	2	3	1	1	4	4	4	2	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	10	48	53	8	51	55	17		
ELA Learning Gains				52			20		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	8	49	55	11	37	42	23		
Math Learning Gains				32			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		47	52	9	48	54	23		
Social Studies Achievement*		68	68	16	53	59	38		
Middle School Acceleration		61	70		43	51			
Graduation Rate	67	54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress		50	55		55	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	85
Total Components for the Federal Index	3

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	128
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	92
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	28	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	4	2
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	5	Yes	4	4
FRL	11	Yes	4	4

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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	3	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	19	Yes	3	3
FRL	18	Yes	3	3

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	10			8						67		
SWD	10			8							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27										1	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0			10							2	
FRL	10			12							2	

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	8	52		11	32		9	16				
SWD	9	52		12	32			18				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				20								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0	33		8	36							
FRL	6	57		0	15			10				

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	17	20		23	43		23	38				
SWD	17	20		23	43		23	38				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	15	25		19	50							
FRL	19	20		17	40							

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.

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.

Students at Doris Sanders Learning Center are assessed by the FSAA Performance Task or through the Datafolio process. Trends are difficult to determine due to the students' varying exceptionalities and cognitive abilities.

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

No information pertaining to the FSAA was provided under the Grade Level Data Review of State Assessments (nothing pre-populated).

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.

Students at Doris Sanders Learning Center are assessed by the Florida State Alternative Assessment and Datafolio process. Data components within the FSAA are not compared to the state average.

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

Students at Doris Sanders Learning Center are assessed by the Florida State Alternative Assessment and Datafolio process. Data components within the FSAA are not compared to the state average.

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

Our entire school represents the SWD subgroup. Instructional delivery aligned to the Unique Learning Systems Benchmark Assessments and use of progress monitoring to drive instruction are areas of concern.

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

The highest priority is to deliver instruction with fidelity utilizing the Unique Learning System. There is also a need to implement scheduled progress monitoring of students to drive instruction along with progress monitoring of teachers to ensure effective instructional delivery.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Focusing on a positive culture and environment is critical for the 2023-24 school year. Doris Sanders Learning Center is in a transitional period having a new Principal and Assistant Principal. It will be their job to establish a positive culture and environment for the students and staff. Relationships will need to be fostered in an effort to gain trust, respect, and high expectations for all. Students and staff need to feel safe to try new things, valued, and heard. Our school motto is: A School With Heart.

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

By Spring of 2024, students and staff will consistently demonstrate behaviors that reflect the school-wide expectations identified by the acronym HEART. Help others, Enter and exit prepared, Always try your best, Respect yourself & others, Treat others with kindness. School climate and culture will be assessed by a variety of measurement tools such as positive referrals, discipline/attendance records, and surveys.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs, Leadership team meetings, PBIS meetings, analysis of discipline/attendance reports, and feedback from climate surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.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.)

Implementation of school-wide PBIS will be used for this Area of Focus with an emphasis on "HEART", the school expectations.

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

School climate and culture is a multifaceted concept. A positive school climate is the product of a school's attention to fostering safety; promoting a supportive academic, disciplinary, and physical environment; and encouraging and maintaining respectful, trusting, and caring relationships throughout the school community. A positive school culture and environment is critical to school success.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Introduction of the new school-wide expectations "HEART". Help others, Enter and exit prepared, Always try your best, Respect yourself & others, Treat others with kindness.

Person Responsible: Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

By When: New school-wide expectations will be introduced to teachers and paraprofessionals during preplanning week. Students will be presented with the expectations during the first week of school and these will be displayed throughout the campus to serve as continuous reinforcement. Each component of the expectations will be highlighted school wide with weekly classroom lessons.

For students, modeling and recognition of desired behaviors are two ways we build a positive culture. We provide several opportunities that allow our students to build relationships with faculty and staff. The opportunities include the use of social stories along with Zones of Regulation to express and promote acceptable behavior, student of the month recognitions, PBIS incentives, academic incentives, and other random events throughout the year. The student recognitions and rewards allow students to feel that sense of success and celebrate with the adults on campus for meeting or exceeding academic and behavioral expectations.

Person Responsible: Rhea Cleveland (rhea.cleveland@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year with various action steps occurring daily, weekly, and monthly.

For adults, we have implemented several items to foster a family environment that builds a strong culture of commitment. This includes staff bonding events, pot luck lunches, friendly competitions, and group support in times of need. We have calendared staff bonding events, such as bowling, staff picnic, and dinner out throughout the school year. Every month we host "Food Fridays" where we encourage staff members to share their favorite dish and everyone enjoys the buffet during lunch. Some of our friendly competitions include things like the hallway who has 100% of staff on duty as assigned or can every staff member write a positive note to another by a certain deadline. The administrative team also focuses biweekly on writing a personalized note of encouragement or recognition to staff members, so they know how essential they are to our school family.

Person Responsible: Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year with various action steps occurring daily, weekly, and monthly.

#2. 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.

Due to the demographics of our school which is fully represented by the SWD subgroup, it is critical that we focus on instructional delivery and progress monitoring so the exceptionalities, medical needs, and cognitive abilities can be addressed with fidelity.

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

Benchmark assessment will be provided to all students within the allotted assessment windows occurring quarterly during the 2023-24 school year. Data will be analyzed to determine student growth and needs. The data will be a valuable resource for planning during the school year and recognizing areas of concern that could possibly be addressed through teacher professional development and/or instructional coaching.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the completion of required benchmark assessments, analysis of the assessment data, and administration will provide ongoing monitoring of effective instructional delivery through classroom walkthroughs and collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.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.)

Progress monitoring is an assessment technique that shows student growth or need of each student based on a set of identified standards. It is also a way to observe instructional delivery so teachers can receive feedback along with possible next steps.

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

The rationale for utilizing progress monitoring is to allow teachers to routinely assess student growth/ needs in an effort to differentiate and drive instruction. Monitoring teacher instructional delivery will also provide opportunity for meaningful feedback and instructional coaching when needed.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

An assessment calendar for FSAA and Datafolio will be developed along with any necessary professional development teachers require to implement with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Rhea Cleveland (rhea.cleveland@polk-fl.net)

By When: The assessment calendar will be developed within the first 4 weeks of school and before the first initial assessment. On going professional development will be scheduled monthly and as needed.

Instructional coaches will provide ongoing professional development for the Unique Learning System Benchmark Assessments and Datafolio process along with effective instructional delivery strategies.

Person Responsible: Josey Harris (josey.harris@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year and during monthly scheduled planning sessions.

The administration will monitor for completion of required assessments, teacher analysis of data to drive instruction, and effective instructional delivery.

Person Responsible: Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year, during the allotted assessment windows, and weekly during classroom walkthroughs.

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).