James W. Sikes Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

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 Sikes Elementary, with the support of the home and the community, is to provide the highest quality education for our students by creating a caring and challenging atmosphere that encourages life long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with home and community, Sikes Elementary is committed to educating productive citizens of tomorrow.

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
Chapman, Kerry	Principal	The Principal promotes data-based decision making, monitors RtI, oversees schoolwide professional development for curriculum and instruction, and ensures recruitment and retention of outstanding teachers. She receives, distributes and communicates information to enforce District and State policies and works with staff to maintain a safe school environment. She manages the budget, promotes and supports the PBiS system, and creates a positive school culture by teaching students and staff to value, respect, and embrace differences. She maintains open lines of communication with stakeholders, building trust and ensuring transparency in progress toward school goals.
Leskis, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	
Marcano, Erica	Math Coach	
Anderson, Renae	Reading Coach	Mrs. Anderson leads ELA collaborative planning with all grade level teams. She observes teachers and provides feedback through coaching cycles based on strengths and weaknesses. She assists with identifying systematic pattern of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Mrs. Anderson organizes the whole school screening program STAR ELA that provides progress monitoring for students, analyzes data for trends and provides support to teachers. She serves as the school's Induction Coordinator and provides differentiated professional learning for teachers based on need and interests. Mrs. Anderson also collaborates with teachers to develop our Reading Family Night.

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.

Each year, administration asks teachers for their input in regards to several areas of school to include School Improvement Plan initiatives, student schedules and resource distribution. This information is discussed with the leadership team to develop a list of strengths and needs assessment. Our parents also complete a Title 1 survey each year in the Spring to provide feedback to administration. Parents provide feedback on the family engagement events such as Open House, curriculum night and the student led conference night.

In addition, our School Advisory Council (SAC) provides feedback during the April end of year meeting specifically on the school's improvement plan goals. Our SAC is comprised of parents, staff, district support personnel and business/community members.

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 strategies used in our School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be monitored through various methods. First, administrators will use the district's Standards Walk Through Tool during weekly observations in classrooms. The observations focus on the alignment of student work with Florida BEST standards as well as implementing formative assessments to direct instruction and equivalent experiences.

Second, we will continue to meet regularly with teachers to discuss student progress during data chats. Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) are our identified ESSA subgroup. Administration will also meet separately with our Inclusion Teachers for data chats specific to students in their caseload. These data chats will provide an opportunity to discuss any interventions needed.

The leadership team reviews student data weekly. Decisions are made to add and/or remove support to individual teachers based on the needs of the students. Resources such as Paraprofessional support are also reviewed and schedule changes made based on data. Also, during weekly collaborative planning, student tasks are revised as needed based on trends from the Standards Walk Through Tool.

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	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%

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: B 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	20	15	23	16	20	19	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	6	3	9	3	4	7	0	0	0	32
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	15	26	30	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	29	27	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	15	14	13	24	25	0	0	0	98

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	6	9	8	15	29	30	0	0	0	97

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	1	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	29	22	27	23	19	23	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in 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	9	5	23	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	11	25	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	33	65	20	20	9	0	0	0	170

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	4	9	12	9	24	29	0	0	0	87

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	29	22	27	23	19	23	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in 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	9	5	23	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	11	25	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	33	65	20	20	9	0	0	0	170

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	4	9	12	9	24	29	0	0	0	87

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	24
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*	53	45	53	54	47	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				57			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			35		
Math Achievement*	52	49	59	55	42	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				63			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			40		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	42	41	54	41	49	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	54	59	66			62		

* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	274
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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	55			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	51			

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	53			52			42					61
SWD	25			25			15				5	40
ELL	45			39			25				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			42			23				4	
HSP	54			47			37				5	61
MUL	60			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	55			57			51				4	
FRL	44			39			40				5	54

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	54	57	44	55	63	62	41					66
SWD	18	27	28	21	53	57	13					50
ELL	34	50	58	42	48	60	29					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	61		45	63		26					
HSP	49	56	53	52	58	56	56					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58	54	29	58	64	67	41					
FRL	45	49	38	45	62	64	45					58

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	41	34	35	40	34	40	38					62
SWD	5	7	13	12	29	50	0					50
ELL	25	31	47	31	43	50	25					62

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			26			40					
HSP	35	31	40	37	46	53	24					62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	34	20	46	26		45					
FRL	32	27	36	33	32	43	30					62

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	48%	43%	5%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	58%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	42%	22%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	51%	20%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	56%	-16%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	39%	2%	51%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our fourth grade math scores and fifth grade science scores were the lowest scores during the 2022-2023 spring testing window. Only 41% of fourth grade students scored proficient on the FAST Math assessment. In 5th grade science, 41% of students earned a proficient score. Our Science scores from the past two years have averaged 41%.
One of the contributing factors to the low math scores is a substitute teacher covering a 4th grade class for math from March through the testing window in May. Although our math coach went in and taught each day, the scores in that class were still very low.

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

Our 4th grade math scores showed the greatest decline from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year. 4th grade math proficiency in 21-22 was 52% while the 4th grade math proficiency in 22-23 decreased to 41%. The same two teachers taught math in 4th grade both years. However, one of the teachers was out on maternity leave for two months prior to, and during, testing for the 22-23 school year. While our math coach was in to offer support and teach lessons daily, the instruction declined during this time.

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.

4th grade math scores had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our school had a 41% average proficiency while the state average was 61%. This discrepancy is significantly higher than any other when comparing our data to the state averages. The same two teachers taught math in 4th grade both years. However, one of the teachers was out on maternity leave for two months prior to, and during, testing for the 22-23 school year. While our math coach was in to offer support and teach lessons daily, the instruction declined during this time.

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

Third grade scores for reading and math increased the most from the 2021-2022 school year. Third grade reading increased 7% from 58% to 65%. Math scores increased 12% from 60% to 72%.

During the 2023-2023 school year, we added targeted small group instruction during the intervention block for identified students based on FAST data. These small groups focused on reading strategies. We added this intervention strategy to 4th and 5th grades as well. Identified students were either right at proficient scores or just under by 10 percentage points.

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

Based on the Early Warning System, one area of concern is the number of students who had one or more discipline referrals. Another concern is for the achievement levels of our 3-5 students, 23% of tested students scored below proficiency level for their grade in reading and math on the FAST assessment.

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

1. 5th grade math due to low proficiency scores for these students in 4th grade 22-23 year.
2. 5th grade science due to continued low proficiency
3. Upcoming 3rd graders are entering third grade lower than previous year's group
4. Reduce the amount of students receiving office discipline referrals, therefore disrupting instructional time.

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, 41 students received a discipline referral. Of these students, 18 are Students with Disabilities (ESSA subgroup), this comprises 44% of the total students with referrals. The majority of these referrals were written for disruptive behavior. Disruptive behavior includes anything that stops the flow of instruction and student learning. Some examples include student running around the room, student yelling or arguing with the teacher or refusing to participate. Multiple disruptions by students cause a loss of instructional time for all students in the classroom. Therefore, it is crucial to support students with regulating their emotions and providing specific strategies to assist teachers.

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

The end of year data for 2023-2024 will show a decrease in the total number of students earning a referral from 41 students to 28 students; a reduction of 5%.

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

When a teacher submits a referral, it will be reviewed by administration for compliance with our PBiS handbook for office managed behaviors. In addition, all discipline data will be reviewed monthly by the PBiS team to discuss supports for specific students and/or teacher supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@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 follow the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) when implementing behavior interventions based on student need. All students will receive Tier 1 supports daily through meet ups using Harmony strategies. Tier 1 strategies also include earning a PRIDE stamp daily based on the student showing expectations. A monthly PBiS event is earned when students earn 80% of PRIDE stamps for the month.

In addition, Tier 2 students will receive additional social skills and a daily point sheet. Tier 3 students will have personalized behavior plan which is shared with all staff who interacts with the student.

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

According to board-certified behavior analyst, author and speaker, Jessica Minahan, about 10% of a school's population is struggling with mental health problems. The outcomes for these students are bleak. Usual methods like sticker charts and rewards do not work with many of our challenging students. The emphasis should be on how to change the dynamic between the student and teacher.

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.

1. Review of 2022-2023 discipline data with focus on: most common types of behaviors and areas on campus where behaviors are being seen.

Person Responsible: Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 3, 2023

2. Review of PBIS and discipline handbook with emphasis on: teacher managed behaviors vs office managed behaviors and process of tracking forms.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Leskis (lindsey.leskis@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

3. Faculty book study using research based book: The Behavior Code by Jessica Minahan and Nancy Rappaport, MD

Person Responsible: Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 7, 2023 Chapter 1 August 25, 2023 Chapter 2 October 16, 2023 Chapter 3 January 3, 2024 Chapter 4

4. Monthly PBiS committee meetings to review and discuss discipline data looking for trends and areas to improve. The committee will also prepare for monthly schoolwide PBiS reward activity.

Person Responsible: Erica Marcano (erica.marcano@polk-fl.net)

By When: Aug. 30, 2023 Sept. 27, 2023 Oct. 25, 2023 Nov. 29, 2023 Jan. 3, 2024 Feb. 28, 2024 Mar. 27, 2024 Apr. 24, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Excluding 4th and 5th grade Math, each area of proficiency in ELA and Math showed an increase from 21-22 state assessments. Our 3-5 grade percent proficient in ELA is 57% and Math is 56%. More than 40% of our 3-5 grade students are not reading on grade level or performing in math on grade level. Our students can do better than this.

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

Our ELA and Math grades 3-5 proficiencies will increase to 60% on FAST PM3 in the Spring of 2024. This is an increase of 3% for ELA and 4% for Math.

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

Monitoring individual students from PM1 to PM2 on FAST ELA and Math will allow us to identify areas of weakness for students and to plan accordingly. These scores will be reviewed by the Leadership Team and with individual teachers.
In addition, more frequent monitoring will occur based on Unit Assessments for Math and Florida Wonders assessments for ELA. The results of these assessments will be discussed during planning with teachers and coaches. The data will be used to guide small group planning.
When students are not showing increases or proficient on assessments, additional supports will be added.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@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.)

1. Monitor classroom instruction using the District's Standardized Walkthrough Tool. This tool will aisst in identifying students' access and engagement in equitable experiences based on the state benchmarks and standards.
2. Utilize the learning arc framework during collaborative planning to ensure alignment of student tasks and assessments to BEST benchmarks.

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

1. Use of the Standardized Walkthrough tool will allow leadership to monitor student access to tasks that are aligned to benchmarks. By ensuring alignment of tasks with benchmarks, students will have the opportunity to develop proficiency on state benchmarks and experience the benchmark tasks similar to what they will see on the state assessment.
2. Through the use of the learning arc framework during collaborative planning, our teachers will have the opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of the state benchmarks. They will utilize the progression of benchmarks as well as the clarifications to plan instruction and assessments that ensure students are given the opportunity to develop proficiency of benchmarks.

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.

1. Calibrate with Leadership team on the use of the Standardized Walkthrough Tool (Principal, AP, ELA and Math Coaches). Once the team reaches 90% consistency with scores, create a monthly calendar for the team to conduct walk throughs using the tool.

Person Responsible: Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

By When: Aim to meet 90% consistency on calibration walks by September 8, 2024.

2. Leadership team reviews data from Qualtrics bi-weekly to address trends and make changes as needed during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

By When: Starting Thursday, August 31, 2023 and bi-weekly through May 2024

3. Review Learning Arc steps 1-7 with teachers during preplanning week, including the template for each grade level to save completed arcs.
Focus for the 23-24 year during Collaborative Planning are steps 6 and 7: formative assessments and equivalent experiences.

Person Responsible: Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

By When: Review Learning Arc: August 3, 2023 Collaborative Planning: *ELA Tuesdays beginning August 15, 2023 weekly through April 2024 * Math Wednesdays beginning August 16, 2023 weekly through April 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

After STAR testing, students are tiered by the state in regard to reading proficiency. The students needing explicit interventions are considered Tier 3. In Spring 2023, 62 students were identified by the state as needing Tier 3 Reading Interventions. Currently, these students are in grades 3, 4 and 5. Thirty-two of these are Students with Disabilities (SWD), our identified ESSA subgroup scoring below their general education peers.

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

By Spring 2024, we will reduce the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) requiring Tier 3 Reading Interventions by 15% (5 students) as compared to the Spring 2023 data.

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

Administration will conduct weekly observations during the intervention schedule to ensure fidelity. ESE Teachers serving Students with Disabilities (SWD) receiving Tier 3 interventions, will meet with administration and Reading Coach to develop a plan for interventions. ESE Inclusion Teachers will participate in data chats to discuss student progress.
ESE Inclusion Teachers will review their students' Florida Wonders reading comprehension assessments biweekly to identify deficient skills for reteaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@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.)

For phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency, we will use Florida Wonders materials from the intervention kits. Students with comprehension interventions, will use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) by Fountas and Pinnell.

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

Both intervention pieces, Florida Wonders and LLI are scientifically researched and evidenced-based reading instructional and intervention programs that incorporate explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and text comprehension and incorporate decodable or phonetic text instructional strategies.

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.

Identify Students with Disabilities who need Tier 3 Reading Interventions.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Leskis (lindsey.leskis@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 21, 2023

Conduct Data Chats with Teachers to discuss scores and area of intervention needed. Provide Teachers with materials and fidelity papers. Begin interventions with identified students.

Person Responsible: Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 11, 15, and 18, 2023

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

The planning for school improvement started in the spring when our school's leadership team completed a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) to review student progress and district led initiatives. During the Summer Leadership Retreat in June, administrators were able to learn about available resources such as the improved Standards Based Observation Tool and Interventions like the Corrective Reading program. The intervention resources will be distributed based on school need and all materials used at the school level must be vetted through our district's PURE process to ensure it is relevant for student use.

Once our school completed the School Improvement Plan in CIMS, our Regional Supervisor reviews it and provides specific feedback. Each school also provides feedback on strategies and resources from district personnel during Data Com. Our ESSA identified subgroup, SWD students, benefit from this process as intervention materials are vetted to ensure they are research based and support our student 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

At the end of 22-23 school year, 31% of kindergarten students, 33% of first grade students, and 39% of second grade students performed below the 40th percentile on STAR Early Lit and/or STAR

Assessment. We believe our primary students need a deeper understanding of phonics with targeted phonics instruction based on data. Our instructional practice for K-2 students for 23-24 school year will be systematic phonics instruction.

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

On Spring 23-24 FAST Reading, 35% of 3rd grade students were below proficient, 46% of 4th grade students, and 51% of fifth grade students. We believe our intermediate students need additional support with reading comprehension strategies. Our instructional practice for students in grades 3-5 will be reading comprehension.

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

Using the progress monitoring FAST data, we will increase the number of students "on level" by 5% from the August 2023 assessment to the May 2024 assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Using the progress monitoring FAST data, we will increase the number of students scoring a Level 3 or higher by 5% from the August 2023 assessment to the May 2024 assessment.

No grade level will have more than 50% of students scoring below a level 3 on the spring FAST assessment.

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.

Our school's areas of focus will be monitored using the following:
*Regularly scheduled data chats with teachers to discuss the progress of students identified as needing Tier 3 interventions based on the state's criteria. ESE Inclusion Teachers will also monitor progress with interventions and meet with administration and academic coaches to change interventions based on student progress.
*For students in K-2, we will monitor the progression of phonic skills using Florida Wonders phonics inventory.
*For students in grades 3-5, Florida Wonders comprehension tests will be monitored for students in grades 3-5.

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

Chapman, Kerry, kerry.chapman@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?

For K-2 focus on phonics, our teachers will use the district core materials, Florida Wonders. Specifically the phonics inventory. At this time, we are not provided with any additional supplemental resources from the district. The phonics inventory provides more information about a child's ability to understand words in the English language and give data to help the teacher group students based on need. We are able to track progression through the phonics skills and adjust interventions as needed.

For 3-5 students, teachers will use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) materials from Fountas and Pinnell that provide explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing. Lessons will be provided on the student's level during Tier 3 intervention time.

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: Childrens' reading development is dependent on their understanding of the alphabetic principle — the idea that letters and letter patterns represent the sounds of spoken language. Phonics instruction teaches children to decode letters into their respective sounds, a skill that is essential for them to read unfamiliar words. In Florida Wonders, explicit, systematic foundational skills instruction is built during routines in core instruction as well as intervention time.

3-5: Without comprehension, children gain no meaning from text. Comprehension strategies are used to increase childrens' understanding of text to help them become active readers by engaging with text. Readers who have strong comprehension can draw conclusions about what they read. The What Works Clearinghouse and the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) found (LLI) to have a positive effect on reading achievement and fluency based on a comprehensive review of evidence.

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
During Pre-planning week Train Teachers: state criteria for Tier 2 and 3 interventions background information on the continuum stages of literacy best practices on how to teach intervention strategies (K-2 phonics, 3-5 LLI) where to start on the continuum (phonics)	Chapman, Kerry, kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net
After FAST Assessment Sept 2023 Administration and Academic Coaches work with Teachers on: reviewing data identifying students requiring Tier 2 or 3 interventions developing groupings for interventions reviewing fidelity paperwork to track progress with teachers	Anderson, Renae, renae.anderson@polk-fl.net
Throughout the year Monitor interventions by: administrative observations during Tier 3 times academic coaches modeling interventions for teachers reviewing data during regular intervals and changing intervention based on student need reviewing progress on December FAST scores	Chapman, Kerry, kerry.chapman@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 is available on our school's webpage for our stakeholders. In addition, we create a condensed, more reader-friendly version as a brochure that we share with staff, district personnel and other

stakeholders such as our School Advisory Committee (SAC). The SIP is shared during our pre-planning week with staff. It is then reviewed throughout the year during Professional Development with staff, weekly Leadership Team meetings where data and progress/action steps are monitored, and quarterly SAC meetings where we share data and progress toward our goals. Additionally, the principal holds a "State of the School" meeting upon return from winter break in January where staff discusses progress and next steps at our half-way point of the school year.

Progress on School Improvement Goals is shared with families on social media such as number of students making their quarterly AR goal.

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))

There are many ways our school builds positive relationships with our families. We host several family nights each year to engage our families. These include curriculum nights to encourage learning at home and provide support with homework help, a Fall Festival and student led conference night where students review their portfolios with parents. Our music teacher also hosts several musicals through out the year as well. In addition to family engagement events, our parents have opportunities to serve on important committees such as the School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).

Feedback collected from our parents is used to make many decisions for our school. We plan events based on their needs. Parents also provide feedback on the Title 1 Compact to set expectations for teachers, our school and our families. We have a very active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) that supports our students by celebrating their accomplishments, providing fellowship through family events and purchasing much needed materials for students.

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))

During the 2023-2024 school year, we plan to continue using the district's Learning Arc framework to develop lesson plans in all subject areas. Our focus area for this year is to include more formative assessments and work with teachers on how to use this data to improve instruction in the moment.

We have also streamlined our Tier 2 and 3 ELA Interventions using Florida Wonders materials. Our goal is to provide better support for our teachers with choosing the deficient skill and appropriate intervention to use. During intervention time, students not receiving interventions with the teacher will rotate through differentiated centers to meet their needs, as well as enrich and accelerate.

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))

na

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

na

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

na

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Sikes Elementary School implements a schoolwide tiered model of support for academic, behavior, and attendance in conjunction with Polk County Public Schools resources as follows:
* PBiS
* RTI
* MTSS
* Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

na

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

na

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$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.

Yes

https://www.floridacims.org