

Sarasota County Schools

Island Village Montessori 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Island Village Montessori School

2001 PINEBROOK RD, Venice, FL 34292

www.islandvillage.org

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 Island Village Montessori School community is dedicated to providing all families with the gift of a Montessori education through dynamic learning experiences where children flourish in a safe learning environment that fosters independence, self-direction, excellence, creativity, and responsibility, as well as to prepare students for the 21st Century through a balance of traditional Montessori methodology with a contemporary, technology-infused curriculum, providing the world a working model of school reform that integrates academic levels from early childhood through middle school. Island Village encourages students to reach out into the community through service projects and performances. Parents are encouraged to be active participants in all aspects of their child's experience at Island Village by volunteering in the classrooms, organizing social events, and community service projects.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's School for Tomorrow's World™

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
Ocana, Jennifer	Principal	Head of School - Quarterly Stakeholders participant, budget planning Leadership Administration, Curriculum development, Parent and community Engagement, School Safety participant.
Gronland, Beth	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline, Faculty supervisor/evaluator, ESE liaison for grades 5-8
Vitiello, Michelle	Administrative Support	Director of Operations. Human Resources, Facilities
Criswell, Megan	School Counselor	Student mental health, suicide risk assessments, threat assessment manager
Sessa, Jennifer	Administrative Support	
Heden, Aimee	Administrative Support	

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 Island Village school improvement plan development is a collaborative process that engages various stakeholders, including board members, faculty, parents, students, and local businesses. Recognizing the importance of a comprehensive approach to education, the school seeks to incorporate diverse perspectives and expertise to ensure a well-rounded and successful plan.

Board members play a crucial role in setting the overall direction of the school improvement plan. They provide strategic guidance, allocate resources, and ensure that the plan aligns with the school's mission and long-term goals. Their experience and knowledge of educational policies and best practices help shape the vision for the school's future.

Faculty members are at the heart of the educational process. Their daily interactions with students give them valuable insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. Their involvement in the development of the improvement plan allows them to voice their ideas, propose innovative teaching methods, and contribute to curriculum enhancements that meet the needs of the students effectively.

Parents, as primary stakeholders, have a unique perspective on the school's performance. Their involvement in the improvement plan development is essential to ensure that the plan takes into account the concerns and expectations of the community. Through surveys, town hall meetings, and focus groups, parents can express their views, suggest improvements, and collaborate with educators to foster a more nurturing and supportive learning environment.

Incorporating student voices is another fundamental aspect of the school improvement plan. Students are the ones directly experiencing the educational process, and their input can shed light on areas that may need improvement, such as school facilities, extracurricular activities, or student support services. By involving students in the planning process, the school promotes a sense of ownership and empowerment among the student body.

Local businesses also play a vital role in the development of the improvement plan. Their engagement reflects the real-world needs and expectations of the job market. They can offer internships, mentorship programs, and expertise in relevant fields, which enriches the educational experience and ensures students are prepared for their future careers.

The school fosters collaboration between stakeholders through regular meetings, workshops, and brainstorming sessions. Open communication channels, such as online platforms or newsletters, allow stakeholders to remain informed about the progress of the plan and provide feedback at any stage of its development.

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))

****Data Collection and Analysis:**** The school will regularly collect academic performance data, including standardized test scores, formative assessments, and other relevant metrics. This data will be

disaggregated to identify specific groups of students who are not meeting the State's academic standards, with a particular focus on those experiencing the largest achievement gaps.

****Benchmarking and Targets:**** The SIP will set specific and measurable targets for improvement in student achievement. These targets will be based on state standards and may also consider other relevant benchmarks. Regular assessments will be conducted to gauge progress towards these targets.

****Performance Reviews and Reporting:**** The school leadership, in collaboration with teachers and other stakeholders, will conduct periodic reviews of the SIP's implementation and its impact on student achievement. Progress reports will be prepared and shared with relevant stakeholders.

****Identifying Effective Strategies:**** The school will identify and assess the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions implemented as part of the SIP. This will involve analyzing which approaches are yielding positive results and which ones may need adjustments.

****Professional Development and Support:**** Teachers and staff will receive ongoing professional development and support to ensure they have the necessary skills and knowledge to implement the strategies outlined in the SIP effectively.

****Parent and Community Engagement:**** The school will actively engage parents and the broader community in the SIP's implementation and monitoring process. This includes soliciting feedback, sharing progress reports, and involving them in decision-making when appropriate.

****Data-Driven Decision Making:**** The SIP monitoring process will be guided by a data-driven approach, where decisions are based on evidence and performance trends. This ensures that adjustments to the plan are informed and targeted.

****Conduct Root Cause Analysis:**** If the school identifies areas where the SIP is not having the desired impact, they will conduct a thorough analysis to determine the underlying reasons. This could include examining instructional practices, resource allocation, or any other factors contributing to the gap in achievement.

****Modify Strategies and Interventions:**** Based on the root cause analysis, the school will make necessary revisions to the SIP. This may involve adopting new evidence-based strategies, adjusting existing interventions, or reallocating resources to better support student needs.

****Flexibility and Innovation:**** The school will remain open to innovative approaches and flexible in making necessary changes to the plan. This allows for adaptation to evolving circumstances and insights gained from ongoing evaluation.

By following these monitoring and revision processes, the school aims to continuously improve the SIP's effectiveness in raising student achievement and narrowing the achievement gap for all students, particularly those who need additional support. Compliance with ESSA 1114(b)(3) ensures that the school remains accountable for achieving these goals and demonstrates a commitment to data-driven decision-making for student success.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
Charter School	Yes
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) 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	1	23	24	29	14	17	14	9	18	149	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	3	3	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	5	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	0	1	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	0	7	5	4	5	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	15	16	8	5	2	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	40	9	23	12	20	15	119	

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	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	2	21	22	18	13	19	8	12	11	126	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	4	12	
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	1	4	10	7	2	8	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	16	9	8	3	7	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	4	3	4	4	2	1	3	23	

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	0	1	2	7	9	8	2	5	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	13
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	2	21	22	18	13	19	8	12	11	126	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	4	12	
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	1	4	10	7	2	8	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	16	9	8	3	7	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	4	3	4	4	2	1	3	23	

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	0	1	2	7	9	8	2	5	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	13
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*	60	65	53	64	69	55	64		
ELA Learning Gains				53			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			44		
Math Achievement*	55	68	55	57	37	42	53		
Math Learning Gains				70			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			53		
Science Achievement*	67	68	52	48	69	54	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	81	68	73	66	59	80		
Middle School Acceleration	52	77	70	77	45	51	58		
Graduation Rate		91	74		63	50			
College and Career Acceleration		62	53		82	70			
ELP Progress		43	55	56	79	70	70		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	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	375
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	599
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	22	Yes	2	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	71			
MUL	61			
PAC				

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%
WHT	62			
FRL	58			

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	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	53			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	57			

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	60			55			67	86	52			
SWD	29			17			0				4	
ELL	40			40							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	61			51			82	100			5	

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
MUL	58			42			82				3	
PAC												
WHT	61			57			61	83	57		6	
FRL	53			47			69	94	40		6	

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	64	53	35	57	70	66	48	73	77			56
SWD	20	33	32	22	58	58	10					
ELL	57	54		57	69							60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50	43	38	57	70	80	33					
MUL	59	53		50	60							
PAC												
WHT	68	56	34	59	73	67	51	72	73			
FRL	56	54	41	47	64	68	40	77	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
All Students	64	53	44	53	51	53	57	80	58			70
SWD	19	32	22	19	48	53	8					
ELL	62	61		42	39		53					70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	68	66	43	52	41	60	40	80				
MUL	55			68								
PAC												
WHT	63	52	47	52	52	47	63	82	61			

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
FRL	58	51	43	46	49	58	46	71	75			

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	70%	67%	3%	54%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	47%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	47%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	67%	-7%	58%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	47%	61%	-14%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	48%	29%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	70%	-22%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	70%	-24%	61%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	54%	17%	55%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	44%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	67%	8%	51%	24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	65%	16%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	79%	7%	66%	20%

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.

ELA was our low performance component. The contributing factors regarding last years performance learning gains of the bottom quartile in English Language arts. Lowest performance has sown significant decline across grade levels in the last three years.

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

The greatest decline data representation is lowest quartile with the subject being ELA with a decrease of 9%

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 data component of Math has the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

The data component of most improvement is the subject of Math with all students learning gains.

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

The area of concern is achievement of Students with Disabilities.

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

1. Learning gains by the lowest quartile in ELA
2. Learning gains by the lowest quartile for SWD

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 Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the data, less than 20% of students with disabilities are reaching satisfactory achievement (level 3) on the ELA assessment

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 increase in overall achievement in ELA by students with disabilities from 33% to 36%

By the year 2024, there will be a minimum increase in overall achievement in Math by students with disabilities from 33% to 36%

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress Monitoring, Achieve 3000 Literacy

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Sessa (jennifersessa@islandvillage.org)

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.)

Branching Minds - is a system level educational platform used to identify and monitor student academic and behavioral needs. The program identifies student who need support and links the educator to a library of hundreds of evidence based Learning supports and resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The program allows administrators and ESE teachers to set goals, and streamlines communication among educator teams and the families. Auto-generated to do lists for each educator and current graphs that support problem solving assure accountability and fidelity and progress.

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.

- Introduce phonics systematically, teaching letter-sound correspondences and decoding skills.
- Use multisensory approaches like manipulatives, games, and songs to engage young learners, including Foundations (Wilson Language) and the Hegerty programs.
- Incorporate hands-on activities to explore sight words, high-frequency words, and word families.
- Differentiate activities to meet individual needs and encourage independent exploration.

Home-School Connection

- Provide parents with information about the literacy skills being taught and suggest ways to support their child's learning at home.

Assessment and Differentiation

- Use formative assessments, such as the FAST and Renaissance Star to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.
- Differentiate instruction based on individual needs, providing targeted support for struggling readers and additional challenges for advanced readers.
- Use educational apps, interactive eBooks, and digital resources to enhance engagement and reinforce literacy skills. Programs such as Smarty Antz, Renaissance, and Learning Ally enhance the curriculum.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Sessa (jennifersessa@islandvillage.org)

By When: March 2024

#2. 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.

Achieving a more positive culture and environment for Students with Disabilities based on the fact that is a required component and the plan cannot be submitted without it.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will have a more positive school culture and environment.

Monitoring:

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

Walk throughs, newsletters, social media, assemblies

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)

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.)

Caring School Community curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is a curriculum that aligns to the the mission and philosophy of our Montessori School. It is appropriate for all grades that we serve.

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.

Promote Clear Values and Expectations by encourage respectful and supportive relationships among students, staff, and parents.

Empower Student Leadership by offering opportunities for students to take on leadership roles, such as student council or peer mentoring programs.

Promote Wellness and Mental Health by prioritizing student and staff well-being by offering access to counseling services, stress management workshops, and mental health resources. Create a stigma-free environment for discussing mental health.

Involve Parents and Guardians by engage parents and guardians through regular meetings, workshops, and events. Encourage their participation in school activities to strengthen the sense of community.

Create a Safe Physical Environment by ensuring that the school's physical spaces are clean, well-maintained, and safe. A comfortable and aesthetically pleasing environment contributes to a positive atmosphere.

Continuous Improvement

Regularly assess the efforts to improve the school's culture and environment. Make adjustments based on feedback and data to ensure ongoing positive growth.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ocana (jenniferocana@islandvillage.org)

By When: ongoing, March 2024

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The process of reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on needs involves a thorough assessment of the school's performance and identification of areas requiring improvement. Additionally, a focus on addressing the needs of the lowest subgroup, which in this case is students with disabilities, is crucial to promote inclusivity and equitable education. The following steps outline this process:

1. **Data Collection and Analysis:** The first step is to collect and analyze relevant data related to the school's performance, student outcomes, and academic achievement. This includes data on standardized test scores, attendance rates, discipline incidents, and specific performance data for students with disabilities. The analysis will help identify areas of concern and areas of strength within the school.
2. **Needs Assessment:** After analyzing the data, the school leadership team, in collaboration with teachers, staff, conducts a comprehensive needs assessment. This assessment aims to identify specific challenges faced by the school and its students, especially those in the lowest subgroup (students with disabilities). It helps to pinpoint areas that require improvement and informs the allocation of resources.
3. **Prioritization of Interventions:** Based on the needs assessment, the school leadership team identifies key areas of focus for improvement. These areas include enhancing teaching and learning strategies, providing professional development for teachers to address diverse learning needs, creating a positive school climate, and implementing evidence-based interventions to support students with disabilities.
4. **Budget Allocation:** The school allocates funding and resources in alignment with the SIP's goals and priorities. Funding considerations prioritize interventions targeted at improving outcomes for the lowest subgroup, students with disabilities. This involves hiring additional support staff, investing in assistive technology, providing specialized training for teachers, and ensuring accessibility in school infrastructure.
5. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Continuous monitoring and evaluation of the SIP's implementation are essential. The school regularly reviews progress toward achieving the set performance targets. Data-driven assessments help identify successful strategies and areas needing adjustments. This iterative process allows the school to make informed decisions about resource allocation based on demonstrated effectiveness.
6. **Reflection and Adaptation:** Regularly reflecting on the effectiveness of interventions and resource allocation helps the school make data-informed decisions. If certain approaches are not yielding the expected results, adjustments can be made to improve outcomes for all students, particularly those in the lowest subgroup.

In conclusion, the process of reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are

allocated based on needs requires a data-driven and collaborative approach. By focusing on the specific needs of the lowest subgroup, students with disabilities, the school can promote inclusivity and provide targeted support to create a supportive and conducive learning environment for all students.