Alturas Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Alturas Elementary School

420 4TH ST, Alturas, FL 33820

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

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 Alturas Elementary School is for all of our students to demonstrate academic achievement at or above the expected level of performance as defined by the Florida Department of Education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Working collaboratively with the community to develop life long learners.

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
Pemberton Jr., Charles	Principal	
Reinacher, Shelley	Assistant Principal	
Drawdy, Julie	Reading Coach	
Chance, Brian	Instructional Technology	
Stinson, Terry	Instructional Media	

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 Leadership Team analyzes the data from state assessments, district progress monitoring, and teacher input to develop our SIP plan. Parents and community members are provided opportunities to provide feedback through community forums and Title 1 events.

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 Leadership Team regularly monitors data sources to determine the effectiveness of instruction and make necessary changes as needed when deficiencies are identified.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	27	17	22	14	11	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	4	7	4	8	7	3	0	0	0	33
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	6	1	5	2	3	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	4	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	15	8	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	10	9	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	19	6	12	13	7	0	0	0	66

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	4	13	3	14	12	8	0	0	0	54

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	9	9	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	35	26	27	23	14	16	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	3	4	6	6	5	2	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	9	14	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	7	17	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	11	20	10	7	3	0	0	0	64

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	9	9	6	7	13	20	0	0	0	64

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	35	26	27	23	14	16	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	3	4	6	6	5	2	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	9	14	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	7	17	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	11	20	10	7	3	0	0	0	64

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	9	9	6	7	13	20	0	0	0	64

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	18
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*	49	45	53	45	47	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				48			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			36		
Math Achievement*	53	49	59	54	42	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				64			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			58		
Science Achievement*	66	41	54	39	49	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	54	59	43			35		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
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	48

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
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	16	Yes	3	2
ELL	31	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	49			

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	2	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	44			

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	53			
FRL	49			

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	49			53			66					50
SWD	18			14							2	
ELL	25			17							3	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			41							2	
HSP	50			54			59				5	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52			53			75				4	
FRL	47			50			64				5	45

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	45	48	35	54	64	55	39					43
SWD	25	33		20	33							
ELL	22	38		32	43							43
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				60								
HSP	37	50		45	55		31					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	47	30	58	71	70	45					
FRL	40	47	44	50	66	61	26					55

| 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	50	41	36	57	52	58	60					35
SWD	14			19								
ELL	50			50								35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	55		50	55		50					31
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	41		61	56	60	60					
FRL	44	44		49	44		57					23

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	63%	43%	20%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	58%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	51%	-2%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	44%	14%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	39%	24%	51%	12%

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.

Based on state assessment data, 3rd grade ELA was our lowest performing area. We had a new teacher in that position who was not certified.

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

Based on state assessment data, 3rd grade math had the greatest decline from the prior year. We had a new teacher from another country in that position.

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.

Based on state assessment data, 3rd grade math has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We had a new teacher from another country in that position.

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

Based on state assessment data, 5th grade science showed the most improvement. We had a highly effective teacher in that position.

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

The area of concern is a high number of students with 10% or more absences.

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

1. Grade 3 ELA
2. Grade 3 Math

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 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.

The Early Warning System data showed high rates of absenteeism, specifically K-2. Our school-wide attendance data showed that 119 students were absent 10% or more days. In grades K-2, we had a total of 72 students absent 10% or more days. In grades 3-5, we had a total of 47 students absent 10% or more days.

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

Reduce the number of students who have 10% or more absences by 3-5%.

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

Our attendance manager, truancy officer, teachers, and the leadership team will monitor daily attendance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@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.)

Consistent communication with families of students who have been identified as high absenteeism. School-wide attendance incentives will be implemented.

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

Students are motivated by incentives and parents respond well to consistent communication.

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.

Our registrar will monitor attendance monthly and report to the Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

The Leadership Team will provide monthly incentives for students based on attendance.

Person Responsible: Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. 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.

The focus will be on standards-based instruction in grades K-5. Our FAST ELA proficiency in 3rd grade was 45%, 4th grade was 56%, and 5th grade was 62%. Our school-wide proficiency was 51%.

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

A 3-5% increase in ELA proficiency in grades 3rd-5th on the FAST Assessment.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by administration and our Leadership Team. We will provide modeling and support as we continue the implementation process. Analyzing data from classroom walkthroughs, the standards-based walkthrough tool, and trend data will help with monitoring instruction and alignment of tasks. Feedback will be given to support teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@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.)

We will continue to implement the Daily 5 (ELA) structure and the Learning Arc process. The structure provides time for teachers to focus on whole group and small group standard-based instruction.
The Learning Arc process provides time for teachers to analyze task and assessment alignment of benchmarks.

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

The Learning Arc is a collaborative process that guides thinking, learning, and understanding of on-grade level, content area benchmarks to assist in planning for instruction. The intended outcome of the learning arc process is to ensure equitable, on-grade level learning experiences which includes benchmark aligned tasks, formative/summative assessments, and opportunities for equivalent experience for all students. The Daily 5 (ELA) structure is designed to teach students to build stamina and independence when completing standard-based tasks so they can fully engage in meaningful, authentic reading and writing for an extended time.

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.

Administration and our reading coach will provide time and support in the Learning Arc process during collaborative planning. We will ensure alignment of tasks to benchmarks. Our reading coach will also support teachers with implementing Daily 5 structure for ELA.

Person Responsible: Julie Drawdy (julie.drawdy@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Administration and our reading coach will meet monthly to analyze data from the school walkthrough tool, classroom walkthroughs, and trend data through the Qualtrics platform. We will also analyze work samples, learning arcs, formative and summative assessments, and data including STAR and district progress monitoring. Instructional changes will take place based on this analysis.

Person Responsible: Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

#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.

The focus will be on standards-based instruction in grades K-5. Our FAST Math proficiency in 3rd grade was 49%, 4th grade was 61%, and 5th grade was 60%. Our school-wide proficiency was 56%.

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

A 3-5% increase in Math proficiency in grades 3rd-5th on the FAST Assessment.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by administration and our Leadership Team. We will provide modeling and support as we continue the implementation process. Analyzing data from classroom walkthroughs, the standards-based walkthrough tool, and trend data will help with monitoring instruction and alignment of tasks. Feedback will be given to support teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@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.)

We will continue to implement the Daily 3 (math) structure and the Learning Arc process. The structure provides time for teachers to focus on whole group and small group standard-based instruction.
The Learning Arc process provides time for teachers to analyze task and assessment alignment of benchmarks.

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

The Learning Arc is a collaborative process that guides thinking, learning, and understanding of on-grade level, content area benchmarks to assist in planning for instruction. The intended outcome of the learning arc process is to ensure equitable, on-grade level learning experiences which includes benchmark aligned tasks, formative/summative assessments, and opportunities for equivalent experience for all students. The Daily 3 (math) structures are designed to teach students to build stamina and independence when completing standard-based tasks so they can fully engage in meaningful, authentic mathematical thinking for an extended time.

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.

Administration will provide time and support in the Learning Arc process during collaborative planning. We will ensure alignment of tasks to benchmarks. Our Administration will also support teachers with implementing the Daily 3 structure for math.

Person Responsible: Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Administration and our reading coach will meet monthly to analyze data from the school walkthrough tool, classroom walkthroughs, and trend data through the Qualtrics platform. We will also analyze work samples, learning arcs, formative and summative assessments, and data including STAR and district progress monitoring. Instructional decisions/changes will take place based on this analysis.

Person Responsible: Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

#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.

The focus will be on standards-based instruction in grades K-5. Our statewide science proficiency in 5th grade was 65%.

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

A 3-5% increase in Science proficiency in 5th grade on the statewide Science Assessment.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by administration and our Leadership Team. We will provide modeling and support as we continue the implementation process. Analyzing data from classroom walkthroughs, the standards-based walkthrough tool, and trend data will help with monitoring instruction and alignment of tasks. Feedback will be given to support teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@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.)

We will continue with science being a protected time for all grade levels, including using the Learning Arc process during collaborative planning to focus on standards-based instruction. Specifically in 5th grade, we will provide hands-on learning, use science journals to show evidence of learning science benchmarks, and increase the amount of reading in science (nonfiction) so student have in depth discussions about scientific concepts.

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

Students learn by doing, so students need an abundance of hands-on learning opportunities. Students can also provide evidence of their learning by reading and writing about scientific concepts. Science journals will provide this evidence.

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.

Our administration will provide one-on-one planning time using the Learning Arc process and modeling in the classroom. We will ensure alignment of tasks to benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

The focus will be on standards-based instruction in grades K-5 for our Inclusion Students With Disabilities.
Our FAST ELA proficiency for Inclusion Students with Disabilities was 19% in ELA and 14% in Math.

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

A 3-5% increase in ELA and Math proficiency for our 3rd-5th grade Inclusion Students with Disabilities on
the FAST Assessment.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by administration and our Leadership Team. We will provide modeling
and support as we continue the implementation process. Analyzing data from classroom walkthroughs,
the standards-based walkthrough tool, and trend data will help with monitoring instruction and alignment of
tasks. Feedback will be given to support teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@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.)

We will continue to implement the Daily 5(ELA)/Daily 3(math) structures and the Learning Arc process.
The structure provides time for teachers to focus on whole group and small group standard-based
instruction.
The Learning Arc process provides time for teachers to analyze task and assessment alignment of
benchmarks.

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

The Learning Arc process is used to create lesson sequencing that gives students exactly what they need
to learn effectively at different stages of the learning process. The Daily 5 (ELA) and Daily 3 (math)
structures are designed to teach students to build stamina and independence when completing standard-
based tasks so they can fully engage in meaningful, authentic reading, writing and mathematical thinking
for an extended time.

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.

Administration and our reading coach will provide time and support in the Learning Arc process during
collaborative planning. Administration will ensure alignment of tasks to benchmarks. Our reading coach

will also support teachers with implementing Daily 5 structure for ELA. Our administration will provide support with implementing the Daily 3 structure.

Person Responsible: Julie Drawdy (julie.drawdy@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Administration and our reading coach will meet monthly to analyze data from the school walkthrough tool, classroom walkthroughs, and trend data through the Qualtrics platform. We will also analyze work samples, learning arcs, formative and summative assessments, and data including STAR and district progress monitoring. Instructional decisions/changes will be based on this analysis.

Person Responsible: Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The process to review our school improvement allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs is through analyzing the data from our FAST Assessments. Administration also attends our district "Data Com" which focuses on past data trends and current data to drive instructional decisions. Administration also attends the district "Summer Leadership Academy" which provides our school with additional information and data analysis to ensure resources are allocated based on current school needs.

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 grades K-2, the focus will be on increasing proficiency in phonics through explicit phonics instruction.

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

In grades 3-5, the focus will be on increasing proficiency in ELA through comprehension strategies.

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

A 3-5% decrease in the percent of students scoring below the 40th percentile in 1st grade. 1st grade scored at 50% below the 40th percentile in 2023.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

A 3-5% decrease in the percent of students scoring below the 50th percentile in 3rd Grade. 3rd grade scored at 59% below the 50th percentile in 2023.

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.

These areas of focus will be monitored by Administration and our reading coach. We will provide training and support in the Phonics to Reading district supported program in grades K-2 and Comprehension strategies in grades 3-5. When doing classroom walkthroughs, feedback will be given to support teachers. Our reading coach will also provide support when planning lessons and assessments for Phonics to Reading and Comprehension strategies.

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

Pemberton Jr., Charles, charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.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?

In grades K-2, we will implement the Phonics to Reading district supported program that focuses on explicit phonics instruction.

In grades 3-5, we will implement the Comprehension Toolkit that focuses on comprehension strategies and thinking while reading.

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?

K-2 -Phonics to Reading rationale - Phonics instruction in addition to reading practice with decodable text makes a positive impact on spelling ability, which is demonstrated in students' independent writing. It is evident
that using controlled text as an alternative to traditional trade literature for phonics lesson follow-up is preferable for getting young children off to the best start in learning to read. Children also gain reading self-confidence, which then leads to reading enjoyment. Decodable texts can be engaging and motivating to students. Decodable text focused on explicit phonics instruction makes a significant difference in teaching young children to read.

3-5 Comprehension Toolkit rationale - The Comprehension Toolkit focuses on reading, writing, talking, listening, and investigating, to deepen understanding of nonfiction texts. With a focus on strategic thinking, the toolkit lessons provide a foundation for developing independent readers and learners.

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
Administration and the reading coach will work collaboratively with teachers to effectively implement Phonics to Reading (K-2) and the Comprehension Toolkit (3-5).	Reinacher, Shelley, shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net
Administration and the reading coach will monitor implementation fidelity through classroom walkthroughs and collaborative planning.	Pemberton Jr., Charles, charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net
Administration and the reading coach will analyze data from the Phonics to Reading assessments, district ELA assessments, and state (FAST Reading) progress monitoring to determine the effectiveness of Phonics to Reading and the Comprehension Toolkit. Adjustments to instruction will be made as needed based on data.	Pemberton Jr., Charles, charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.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.

Our SIP Plan will be shared at our annual Title 1 meeting and SAC meeting. The details of our SIP plan is sent home with all families and posted on our school website: alturaselementary@polkschoolsfl.com

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))

Alturas Elementary works to build positive relationships with families by offering a variety of school events including many academic nights. Alturas continues to promote a positive culture and environment by reaching out to various stakeholders within the areas, even though we are in a remote area away from businesses. We are adding spirit nights to partner with area businesses as well as communicating and working with area churches to foster a partnership in helping our families. We have helped to develop a stronger PTO so parents and families know they are welcome at Alturas Elementary. We want parents to be involved in their child's learning and we want them to feel a part of the Alturas family. In addition, we have added social media outlets so that we are continually communicating with families and the community.

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))

The mission of Alturas Elementary School is for all of our students to demonstrate academic achievement at or above the expected level of performance as defined by the Florida Department of Education. This is communicated through high expectations for students and staff, effective communication with families, and engaging students in rigorous lessons designed by highly effective teachers.

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))

N/A