

Sarasota County Schools

Fruitville Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Fruitville Elementary School

601 HONORE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34232

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville

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.

Fruitville Elementary wants all students to achieve at their academic potential, to love learning, to feel valued as individuals, and to develop healthy self-esteem and good citizenship in a safe environment. We also want parents and community members to feel welcomed and be an integral part of the learning environment.

Core Values

Diversity-Embracing the variety of our cultures while respecting each other and all working towards a common goal.

Belonging-Creating an environment where people from all walks of life including students, families and staff feel accepted, comfortable, safe and part of a family.

Collaborative-Working together to create an environment that respects and enhances our Fruitville community strengths while celebrating differences for success achievement for all.

Integrity-Committing to high morals, honesty and ethics even when no one is watching.

Growth mindset-Encouraging place to grow. We embrace challenges and persevere through obstacles to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To foster productive ethical students working together through respect and integrity for the greater good of all.

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
French, Steven	Principal	The Principal is the head of School Leadership Team ensuring initiatives and programs that support students, teachers, staff, parents, and the overall community. The Principal works with all staff to ensure they have the resources they need for quality instruction in ELA, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and all other elementary standards. The principal analyzes relevant school data for the purpose of problem analysis, intervention development, and goal setting in order to develop and implement the SIP plan. Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) guides discussions on progress towards indicators on the BPIE (Best Practices in Inclusive Education).
Brusoe, Erica	Assistant Principal	Provides support to Head of School ensuring initiatives and programs that support students, teachers, staff, parents, and the overall community. The Assistant Principal attends and assists the School-wide Support Team to ensure Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is in place for all students as well as supporting ESE teams in the IEP process and services.
Mitchell, Bonnie	Other	Guiding Coalition Member: Collaborates with classroom teachers and support staff to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students. Analyzes data, connects staff to literacy resources, develops interventions, provides coaching for instructors in best literacy practices.
Lavallee, Casey	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition Member, representing Kindergarten: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.
Zarife, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition Member, representing 2nd grade: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.
Fusco, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition Member, representing 3rd grade: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.
Smith, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition Member, representing 4th grade: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fraley, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	Guiding Coalition Member, representing ESE resource: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.
McWeeney, Heidi	Teacher, ESE	Guiding Coalition Member, representing our Autism team: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.
Eve, Julie	Teacher, ESE	Guiding Coalition Member, representing our Autism team: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.
Cantwell, Jody	Administrative Support	Guiding Coalition Member, representing our Autism team: collaborates to coordinate the school's effort in implementing the PLC process, which monitors and supports the work of the collaborative teams to analyze student data to meet the needs of all students.

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 school leadership team, the Guiding Coalition, includes teachers and school staff. This groups will review school data to determine school goals, data tracking methods and resource needs at the start of the school year. Additionally, SAC will review the same data to review and provide feedback, providing the perspective of families and different staff members than the leadership team. Collectively, the feedback from these groups will join to form our School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored quarterly by both the SAC and Guiding Coalition. The monitoring will include goal review, progress determination, sharing of any new information (if needed) and resource check in. Data will include state testing information as well as district and site-based data. Any revisions deemed necessary will be made collaboratively.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	12	31	20	29	16	20	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	0	24	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	9	36	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	33	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	82

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	2	63	11	59	0	0	0	139

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	14	27	19	28	30	34	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	4	5	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	9	21	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	18	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	14	19	18	9	16	0	0	0	87

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	6	17	28	53	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	14	27	19	28	30	34	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	4	5	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	9	21	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	18	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	14	19	18	9	16	0	0	0	87

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	6	17	28	53	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	21
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*	63	65	53	61	66	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				64			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			50		
Math Achievement*	64	68	59	67	52	50	67		
Math Learning Gains				62			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			58		
Science Achievement*	68	69	54	52	67	59	64		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	68	59	70			68		

* 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
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	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	2	1
HSP	56			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	57			

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	42			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	61			

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	77			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	58			

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	63			64			68					57
SWD	26			30			24				5	33
ELL	39			39			47				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			15							3	
HSP	56			55			65				5	54
MUL	65			61			68				3	
PAC												
WHT	72			76			77				4	
FRL	56			55			61				5	56

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	61	64	57	67	62	52	52					70
SWD	22	47	61	39	55	39	23					48
ELL	42	60	64	58	73	68	27					70
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	28	48		26	43	31	14					
HSP	52	67	72	59	68	63	36					69
MUL	81	76		81	68							
PAC												
WHT	70	63	41	78	61	46	69					
FRL	52	63	70	59	64	46	40					73

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	61	54	50	67	54	58	64					68
SWD	24	17		44	75							44
ELL	41	52	58	56	50	64	46					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			41								
HSP	45	47	50	55	57	67	47					71
MUL	81			83								
PAC												
WHT	71	57		75	52		78					
FRL	45	40	39	56	48	53	43					67

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	67%	-6%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	67%	-5%	58%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	70%	-4%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	70%	-14%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	66%	-3%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	67%	-1%	51%	15%

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.

During the 2021-2022 school year, math achievement was measured at 67% overall. The overall proficiency percentage dropped to 62% for the 2023-2024 school year in math. In fact, every grade level decreased with 3rd grade (66%), 4th grade (56%) and 5th grade (63%). Contributing factors for this decline may include unfamiliarity with the new district math curriculum and aligning resources.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year 67% of students were proficient in math. The following school year, that percentage fell to 62%. An unfamiliarity with grade level standards and new district curriculum led to lack of clarity by teachers and support staff.

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the 4th grade math proficiency percentage was 5 points below the state, with the state at 61% and the school being at 56%. Contributing factors to this measure would be new district math curriculum and the unfamiliarity that accompanied.

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

The subgroup of white students showed the most growth in ELA proficiency, growing by two percentage points. Strategies that led to this positive trend would be the inclusion of an Instructional Facilitator on staff, a focus on collaborative review of student data and collaboratively identifying of effective teaching strategies.

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

Absenteeism- This was the area with the most students identified at risk. Every grade level held at least 12 students that were absent at least 10% of the school year, which can tremendously impact their learning progress.

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

1. ATSI- Proficiency of black students
2. Math Achievement for all
3. EWS- Absenteeism
4. ELA Achievement for Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

In 2023, the subgroup of black students were identified as performing at 32% proficiency. While this is an increase from the previous year, it is still below the federal index and needs addressing.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, black students will increase proficiency in ELA by 4 percentage points as measured by state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Staff will utilize assessment data to monitor student progress including: i-Ready diagnostic, F.A.S.T./Star, district created and site developed measures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

ELA Instruction will be supported by: county ELA curriculum (Benchmark Advance), the Striving Reader Decision Tree, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, district Instructional Focus Guide ("Hub") with aligning resources, and district Progress Monitoring document. Students requiring Tier 2 or Tier 3 level supports, additional resources will be access including the district progress monitoring guidance document, Reading Recovery, Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (LLI) and aspects of Benchmark Advance curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collectively, these resources provide ample high impact, evidence-based material for instructional staff to utilize with students at all levels. Additionally, these resources have been vetted by our district.

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.

Collaborative planning teams will meet monthly to review data as listed above, identify essential standards for instruction, build common formative assessments and review student performance data. This data review will also drive small group instruction planning for students at various levels of mastery.

Person Responsible: Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing process throughout the school year.

During weekly SWST meetings, student support personnel will meet to review students of concern including representation from the classroom, administration, ESE department, ELL department and district office. This will include a review of student data and review of previous supports/history. This team will determine if tier 2 or tier 3 instruction is needed and plan the next steps for this process, including aligning appropriate resources.

Person Responsible: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing process throughout the entire school year.

Quarterly review of student data is needed to check in and ensure students are making progress toward end of year mastery. Administration will schedule time with each teacher to review their class data over the course of the year and discuss students of concern.

Person Responsible: Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Quarterly throughout the entire school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Per the Early Warning System, student attendance is an area of concern. During the 22-23 school year, a total of 128 students missed at least 10% of the school year, with at least 12 at every grade level. This amount of missed instruction and support is highly detrimental to their learning and progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

128 students equals 16% of our total student population. During the 2023-2024 school year the percentage of students missing 10% or more school days will decrease by 3 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

The SWST team will check students attendance reports weekly to identify students of concern. Working collaboratively with classroom teachers, families, school social workers and other supports this team will determine barriers to attendance and reduce or eliminate concerns. This team will also document steps of supports through weekly notes and other district or state required interventions and tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Preference surveys will be completed with students to determine motivators for their attendance. Students attendance will be tracked daily and rewarded jointly when a positive trend is noticed. This intervention data will be compiled to show progress and drive next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involving students in the development of the tracking and reward system builds 'buy in' and helps the child own their part in the missed school (if any) and provides incentives for attending regularly. Additionally, gathering data is helpful to show trends to varied stakeholders.

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.

The Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) team will review student attendance data monthly to identify trends and build school-wide or grade level incentives to motivate students to attend. In addition to earning individual reward, missed school days will now have an impact on a greater group demonstrating the value of each student on campus.

Person Responsible: Becky Ferreira (becky.ferreira@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing 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.

Overall math proficiency for grades 3-5 decreased by 5% from last school year. Almost every subgroup decreased in proficiency from last year, showing a need in focus in instructional practice.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, overall math proficiency will increase by 4 percentage points from 62% to 66%.

Monitoring:

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

Student math data will be monitored during weekly collaborative planning meetings and quarterly data chats. This data will include Dreambox information, district assessments, common assessments and F.A.S.T. data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

An Instructional Facilitator will support teams to gain clarity on grade level standards, district resources and analyzing of assessment data. Additionally, a contracted provider will support by facilitating data driven small group instructional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Instructional Facilitator will help to build capacity as they support teachers to grow in their learning of effective strategies while the contracted provider will use data identify areas of need and support with effective instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. 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 subgroup of Students with Disabilities reached a proficiency level of 42% during the 2022-2023 school year, almost meeting the ATSI benchmark. As a preventative measure, we will focus on instructional practices in the area of ELA for SWD to raise proficiency by 4 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities will increase by 4 percentage points from 42% to 46%.

Monitoring:

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

Student ELA data will be monitored during weekly collaborative planning meetings and quarterly data chats. This data will include i-Ready information, Benchmark curriculum assessments, district assessments, common assessments and F.A.S.T. data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bonnie Mitchell (bonnie.mitchell@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

The school's Literacy Coach will support teams to gain clarity on grade level standards, district resources and analyzing of assessment data. Resources for support will include resources such as district curriculum (Benchmark), FCRR, LLI.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Fruitville Elementary is an inclusion model school, so all teachers support Students with Disabilities. Additionally, taking the time to focus on this subgroup will prevent the proficiency level from dropping to an ATSI level.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Funding allocations will be presented and reviewed to the following: Shared Decision Making Team (SDMT)/Guiding Coalition, School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and school administrative team. Each group will meet regularly to review information collaboratively and reach a decision by consensus to allocate appropriate resources to support school improvement goals.

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

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

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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