Southside Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Southside Elementary School

1901 WEBBER ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside

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.

We exist to educate and ensure high levels of learning for ALL students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southside Elementary will be an exemplary educational community of life-long learners grounded in a legacy of academic excellence and citizenship.

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
Hannon, Jamie	Principal	The Principal of Southside Elementary School serves as the instructional leader for the school, which includes creating a leadership team comprised of teachers representing each grade level and department within the school. The team meets each week to discuss academic and procedural topics, implement the SIP, and facilitate PBS/RtI. Additionally, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation and makes sure adequate professional development is offered to support RtI implementation. The principal communicates with parents on a regular basis and oversees building operational decisions. The Principal also serves as the instructional leader for the administrative team which meets regularly to discuss academic and procedural topics.
Miller, Kent	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal works directly with the principal to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensure that the school-based team is implementing RtI; ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation to make sure adequate professional development is offered to support RtI implementation; communicate with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities, as well as oversee building operational decisions. The Assistant Principal also serves as an instructional leader on the leadership team, which meets weekly to discuss academic and procedural topics.
Buffaloe, Krista	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Kindergarten on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
West , Carol	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents 1st Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hazelton, Kirsten	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents 2nd Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Holman , Stacey	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents 4th Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
DeNegris, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents 5th Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Wiemken, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher- K-5. Represents our ESE staff on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics as they relate to our ESE population: provides information about supporting core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides guidance and support of Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions/instruction; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the ESE teacher serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and supports the ESE team and general education teachers in providing the research-based lessons required for students, dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Perry, Kyla	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents 3rd Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Green, Marissa	Reading Coach	A Literacy Coach is an instructional leader with specialized knowledge in the science of reading, evidence-based practices, English Language Arts state standards, as well as the knowledge of how to work with educators as adult learners. Marissa will closely monitor school-wide data to help identify areas that need support. In her roles as Literacy Coach, she provides collegial, job-embedded support to ensure literacy instruction is data-informed and student-centered. Coaches accomplish this by collaborating with leaders and teachers, engaging in practices such as co-teaching, co-planning, modeling, reflective conversations and data chats with teachers to build teacher and school capacity to improve student achievement for all.
Anderson, Jessica	Instructional Coach	An instructional facilitator is an instructional leader with specialized knowledge in evidence-based practices, English Language Arts state standards, as well as the knowledge of how to work with educators as adult learners. Jessica will closely monitor school-wide data to help identify areas that need support. In her role as the instructional facilitator, she provides collegial, job-embedded support to ensure instruction is data-informed and student-centered. Jessica will accomplish this by collaborating with leaders and teachers, engaging in practices such as co-teaching, co-planning, modeling, reflective conversations and data chats with teachers to build teacher and school capacity to improve student achievement for all.

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.

Our SIP was developed through work done by stakeholders analyzing data and developing ideas/plans to address the needs of our students as well as looking at ways to maintain or exceed our areas of strength.

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 reviewed/monitored throughout the year to check the progress of all our students as well as closely monitoring the students in areas with the greatest achievement gaps. Based on data from progress monitoring we will adjust/revise the plan as needed to make sure the needs of all our students are being met.

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	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: A 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	0	21	10	13	12	12	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	2	9	0	0	0	13

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

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	3	11	12	13	12	19	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	7	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	5	4	20	18	16	0	0	0	83

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	2	0	0	3	11	12	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	3	11	12	13	12	19	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	7	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	5	4	20	18	16	0	0	0	83

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	2	0	0	3	11	12	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
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*	84	65	53	85	66	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				76			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			40		
Math Achievement*	89	68	59	86	52	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				76			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			44		
Science Achievement*	83	69	54	72	67	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	70	68	59	53			67		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
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	49			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	76			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	72			

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	43			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	60			

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	75			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	63			

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	84			89			83					70
SWD	48			52			46				4	
ELL	59			71							3	70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	75			82			83				5	62
MUL	77			77			82				3	
PAC												
WHT	87			92			83				4	
FRL	69			75			83				5	57

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	85	76	60	86	76	56	72					53
SWD	49	42	39	48	52	44	27					
ELL	68	72		72	72		42					53
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	79	70		71	67	40	50					40
MUL	75	77		79	67							
PAC												
WHT	87	78	59	89	78	59	76					
FRL	71	70	65	69	68	50	51					

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	81	69	40	79	56	44	73					67
SWD	43	33		49	27		42					
ELL	67	64		67	36							67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	84	68		76	42	40	56					62
MUL	75			79								
PAC												
WHT	83	71	40	81	58	54	81					
FRL	72	65	57	66	38	38	54					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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	67%	15%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	67%	21%	58%	30%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	61%	24%	50%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	96%	70%	26%	59%	37%
04	2023 - Spring	89%	70%	19%	61%	28%
05	2023 - Spring	84%	66%	18%	55%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	67%	15%	51%	31%

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 Science scores were the lowest when compared to our Reading (85%) and Math (90%) scores. However, our Science scores did show a significant improvement from last year as they increased from 72% to 82% as well as outperform the district and state. Our work to improve our science scores through planning days, departmentalizing scheduling, adjusting the specials rotation to allow review of 3rd and 4th content, and allowing our teachers in 3rd-5th to become content experts through strategic teaming is paying off. We expect our scores to continue to rise as we have seen the benefits of these adjustments.

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

Our 3rd grade percent proficient for ELA scores from FSA to FAST did show a decrease from 88% (FSA) to 85% (FAST). We did have a decrease in the number of students in 3rd grade (120 students in 21-22 compared to only 94 students in 22-23) so it was much more difficult to absorb some of the lower scores into the grade level average when looking at the proficiency levels. However, even with that decline from 88%-85% we still placed ahead of the state and district scores and that placed us first among all elementary schools in Sarasota County.

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.

The greatest gap compared to the state average for our school was in Science where our 5th grade students outperformed the state average by 31 percentage points. As mentioned above our strategic planning and teaming of teachers and our adjustment of schedules contributed to this gap plus instituting a Science Boot Camp that reviewed the 3rd and 4th science curriculum for our 5th graders prior to the assessment which positively impacted our scores.

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

Our Science scores increased 10% from 72% to 82%. One action that we took last year (in addition to Science Boot camp, adjusting schedules, utilizing planning days) was to adjust our staffing. Not only did we move to team teaching in 3rd-5th grades to allow for our teachers to become content experts we also made changes to the staff at those levels. In particular our 5th grade staff was changed through movement of existing staff as well as hiring new staff. Last year 5 of the 6 teachers on that team were new to that team and we feel that change also contributed to the improvement.

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

One area of concern is the number of 5th grade students in each of the EWS categories. The highest number of students in each EWS category shows our 5th graders students. In particular the course failures and the amount of Level 1s in both reading and math.

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

1. Continue to build capacity at each grade level team with the PLC process. Teams to answer the following questions about their students: 1. What do we want students to learn and be able to do? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond when students are not learning? 4. How will we enrich or extend the learning for students who are proficient?
2. Weekly metrics -thorough and detailed data analysis by grade level teams and Administration
3. increase in classroom visits and feedback to staff
4. Lowest quartile students: progress monitoring/interventions
5. Continue to improve our ESE inclusion practices

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

As we examined our PBIS program we realized there was a need for improvements. We found that not enough of our students were being recognized for their positive contributions to our learning community and not enough of our staff were participating in our PBIS program.

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

We want to see an increase in the staff participation compared to last year. Last year 60% of our staff participated and this year we are expecting to reach 100% staff participation. We also want to see a 30% increase in the number of students participating in quarterly celebrations when comparing to last year's student participation. We want to move from 50% participation of the students last year to 80% of the students this year being able to participate.

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

Each month the participation and behavior data will be reviewed by at our PBIS meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kent Miller (kent.miller@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.)

We are trying to increase the number of students being recognized for positively contributing to our school community by utilizing our ROAR expectations through our PBIS program.

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

When we realized not enough students were being recognized for their positive contributions, we modified our program to allow greater participation from staff. By making it easier to reinforce positive behavior it will allow more students to be reinforced. We feel this will continue to positively impact our learning community to help our staff focus more on instruction and less on behavior.

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.

PBIS school handbook was created by PBIS team and shared with staff. Classroom lessons are provided for teaching behavior expectations. Weekly reinforcement of our ROAR expectations will be delivered on the news along with sharing Positive Shout-Outs as well as the individual Positive Paws for students going above and beyond. Four quarterly celebrations will be provided for all students demonstrating positive ROAR expectations.

Person Responsible: Kent Miller (kent.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)
By When: Spring 2024.

#2. 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.

We see a need for an overall focus on Math. While we are thrilled with our math scores (we outperformed the district and the state), we know our students will need to show learning gains on their performances from last year thus the need for continued focus. This is also our second year with full BEST math standard implementation. A focus on understanding standards and quality Tier 1 math instruction is key. Our students in the lowest quartile will continue to be an area that we closely monitor and address as this has been a concern for us in the past.

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

By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of 2%-point increase for all students where 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across levels 3,4 & 5) on FAST Math.
By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile on FAST Math.

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

Student data related to fluency of facts, GLOSS of lowest quartile students, DreamBox levels and pass rate, FAST Math scores as well as analysis of grade level assessments will be used to monitor the students that fit into this area of focus for each grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kent Miller (kent.miller@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.)

-CPT days- time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration. GLOSS screen to target interventions. Based on grade level data students will be grouped based on similar needs.

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

Monthly planning time, monitoring common assessments, whole-grade level data analysis leads to collective teacher efficacy (effect size 1.57). Individually targeted interventions delivered during the school day and
during after school tutoring sessions lead to a positive response to intervention (effect size 1.07).

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.

-CPT days- collaborative planning time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration.
-Grade K-5 Math professional development opportunities provided by school district to increase instructional strategies along with greater understanding of Reveal series and the BEST Standards
- Utilizing Math Launch
-Utilizing our Instructional Facilitator to support teachers/teams by sharing and modeling quality instructionas well as support for planning
-Identify lowest quartile students who currently do not receive any additional supports and place them strategically to receive support from a variety of applicable programs (math club, math boot camp, mentoring program, intervention groups, etc.).
- ESE support during math blocks with ESE instructional staff as well as aide support.
-Boot camp/tutoring programs at different grade levels.
-Figure it out Friday on SPNN (weekly math challenge delivered through our morning announcements/news).

Person Responsible: Kent Miller (kent.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Spring of 2024.

#3. 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.

While we are excited about ELA achievement scores (85%) we still see a need for an overall focus on ELA. Not only do we need to improve on our proficiency scores, but our students will also need to show growth over the scores from last spring. In the past we have struggled with showing learning gains for our ELA lowest 25th percentile students. Closely monitoring and supporting these students will be a focus for us this year.

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

By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of 2%-point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain on FAST ELA.
By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of a 2%-point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across 3,4 & 5) on FAST ELA.
By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile on FAST ELA.

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

Student progress monitoring data (fluency, independent and instructional reading levels, phonics as well as analysis of state/classroom assessments will be used to monitor the students that fit each desired outcome mentioned above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@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.)

Leveled Literacy Intervention, inclusion classes at each grade level, before/after school tutoring, mentoring program, as well as purposeful PLCs diving into data.

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

What Works Clearinghouse states that LLI is designed to help struggling readers meet grade-level achievement after short-term intervention. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics,
fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing.

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.

-With FAST and Progress Monitoring data identify lowest quartile students who currently don't receive any additional supports and strategically place students in appropriate programs (LLI, mentoring program, reading or science boot camp, etc.)
-Utilizing our Instructional Facilitator and Literacy Coach to support teachers/teams by sharing/modeling quality instruction and support for planning
-creation of part-time academic interventionists positions to facilitate LLI & instructional strategy groups
-Complete grade level observations of reading K-5 to determine intervention groups
-Implement Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) with select students in lowest quartile
-CPT days- collaborative planning time with administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration. Teacher will calculate points required to show a learning gain and group students with similar needs.
-Grade K-5 ELA professional development opportunities provided by school district to increase instructional strategies along with greater understanding of Benchmark series.
-Literacy modules provided by Reading Recovery teachers

Person Responsible: Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024