

Sarasota County Schools

Englewood 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Englewood Elementary School

150 N MCCALL RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/englewood

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Englewood Elementary School is to provide students with a solid educational foundation to promote active, lifelong learning in a safe, respectful environment. This mission will be accomplished through the commitment of staff, students, parents, and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Englewood Elementary School students will experience a safe, respectful environment which promotes active learning in a supportive, community atmosphere.

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
Schwartz, Curtis	Principal	Evaluate, revise, and manage the overall direction of the SIP as it is being implemented throughout the 2022-2023 school year.
ziarnicki, ellen	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in evaluating, revising, and managing the overall direction of the SIP. Responsible for leading the Guiding Coalition and PBIS Team in tracking and monitoring all student behavior data in order to inform decisions that improve the learning of all students. Works with the SWST team and social worker to provide specific and targeted assistance for those students needing specialized and immediate care.
Lehman, Jeremy	Instructional Coach	Supports the principal and assistant principal in developing, evaluating, and revising the overall direction of the SIP. Participates in grade level team meetings, data analysis and problem solving. Supports teachers directly through observation and feedback, modeling, partnering with teachers, debriefing, and data analysis.
Giesel, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	ESE Liaison. Member of team leader and Data/ Assessment teams. Responsible for monitoring our ESE k-5 inclusion model. Keeps teachers informed about their students' IEP goals in reading/math. Provides strategies for teachers to reach these goals.
Shank, Kristen	SAC Member	SAC Chair: Kristen Shank. Helps to develop, monitor and keep SAC committee informed throughout the year.
shaer, penny	School Counselor	Member of PBIS and SWST team. Will identify students needing tier 2/3 support. Will also offer social/emotional trainings/workshops as needed.

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.

Stakeholders are involved in evaluating and revising the SIP plan as a part of the School Advisory Council meetings. the school leadership team presents elements of the SIP plan to members in attendance, which include teachers and school staff, parents and families, and business or community leaders. Members give input and/or modify elements of the plan. This is followed by votes for consensus.

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))

SIP monitoring will include student progress monitoring, common planning minutes/input, staff feedback, and parental and community input. Data be shared and discussed with the leadership team prior to monthly guiding coalition meetings. The Leadership Team to make adjustments based on incoming data and feedback.

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	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
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) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	0	6	24	0	0	0	36	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	4	18	20	18	13	19	0	0	0	92	
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	4	1	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	7	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	0	6	24	24	0	0	0	60	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	1	4	5	9	19	15	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	11	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	36
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	4	18	20	18	13	19	0	0	0	92	
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	4	1	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	7	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	0	6	24	24	0	0	0	60	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	1	4	5	9	19	15	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	11	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	36
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*	64	65	53	70	66	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				65			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			35		
Math Achievement*	69	68	59	68	52	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				52			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			28		
Science Achievement*	61	69	54	63	67	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	68	59	75			45		

** 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	324
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
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	481
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	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	47			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	71			
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	55			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	59			

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	64			69			61					57
SWD	26			36			17				4	
ELL	22			22							3	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	51			46			31				4	
MUL	77			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			74			70				4	
FRL	57			61			50				5	55

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	70	65	49	68	52	39	63					75
SWD	30	48	47	35	36	26	35					
ELL	52	50		48	38		42					75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	57	58		51	46		50					68
MUL	73			71								
PAC												
WHT	73	65	46	71	55	50	63					
FRL	66	68	57	61	46	36	56					81

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	66	43	35	65	31	28	40					45
SWD	36	22		41	44		11					
ELL	40			50								45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	62	55		56	27		45					44
MUL	58			75								
PAC												
WHT	67	40	33	66	33	33	42					
FRL	60	41	42	60	35	40	33					50

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	54%	67%	-13%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	67%	1%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	70%	-1%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	70%	12%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	66%	-9%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	51%	8%

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.

We had an ESSA subgroup SWD at 37%. This is 4 points below the federal Index target of 41%. This has been a trend in the same subgroup for 2 consecutive years (not exiting). We had a long-term sub serving as ESE resource. She ended up accepting a full time position at another school. This left us with having to fill that position with two other subs to complete the school year. This caused inconsistencies in staffing for the support of students.

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

Looking at our 2021 to 2022 data, all of our scores increased. However, the overall ELA and Math achievement had the smallest increase. ELA went from 66% to 70% and Math went from 65% to 68% indicating a need for improvement in student achievement. We contribute the gain to beginning the implementation of grade level intervention blocks.

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.

A gap we noticed when comparing our school data to state averages in need of the greatest improvement is the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in both ELA and Math. This has been the greatest area of need for the past couple of years, which indicate a need to improve classroom instruction through collaboration that focuses on what students need to learn, what the learning looks like, and how to work with the students who have not yet mastered it. This would be a shift in focus from what is taught to what is learned, with the focus being collaborative.

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

Our ELA and Math learning gains both had an increase of over 20 percentage points. We included grade level intervention blocks on the master schedule utilizing Jump Start funds to bring in additional support staff members to allow homeroom teachers the opportunity to work with small groups of students to provide targeted and purposeful interventions.

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

The number of students who were absent 10% or more days was a potential area of concern. The number of students with a substantial learning deficiency in the upper grade levels was another potential area of concern.

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

1. SWD
2. Third grade ELA and Math achievement
2. Evidence based tier 2 Interventions
3. Positive culture and environment

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.

Looking at our progress monitoring data, we need to increase the overall learning gains and proficiency of our students with disabilities. We will intentionally implement a targeted planning framework that ensures high levels of student learning through the Professional Learning Communities model. Teams will collaborate and share ideas to improve and reflect on teaching practices in order to facilitate high learning for all students. This will give our teams the opportunity to collaborate on data analysis of learning targets, develop small group and individual student interventions that are targeted to the student needs. Each grade team will have a common intervention block where they will be developing lessons to help decrease skill deficits, provide opportunities to reteach lessons, and enrich student learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the achievement of ESE students with disabilities from 37% at or above proficiency to 41% at or above proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the grade level progress monitoring spreadsheet, look at the growth Florida Fast and classroom assessments. Data will be reviewed regularly at our twice monthly guiding coalition and weekly collaborative planning meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@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.)

Master schedule has been developed that includes a grade level intervention block where teachers are collaborating and working together, using the PLC process, to implement evidence-based interventions for small groups and individuals, targeted to student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's research, the effect size of intervention is 1.29 and collective teacher efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. When looking at the learning gain, achievement levels and learning gains of our lowest quartile, intervention also has an effect size of .77 for ESE students.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Guiding Coalition to meet twice monthly to make recommendations and provide feedback for leading PLC support and implementation.
2. Master Schedule with common intervention block.
3. Utilize Jumpstart to hire additional support staff to help implement the intervention block.
4. Meet with each grade level team to begin understanding and implementing PLC systems while providing ongoing, embedded PD.
5. Work with teams to develop their intervention blocks.
6. Meet with Guiding Coalition and grade level teams to monitor data and develop interventions and intervention groups.
7. Increase understanding of high effect size instructional strategies that can support growth for all learners as shared by the team members' post tier 1 conversations regarding data.
8. Send Guiding Coalition to a Model PLC school.
9. Share professional development offerings that are geared toward inclusion/ESE students.

Person Responsible: Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: The end of the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

We will intentionally implement a targeted planning framework that ensures high levels of student learning through the Professional Learning Communities model. Teams will collaborate and share ideas to improve and reflect on teaching practices in order to facilitate high learning for all students. This will give our teams the opportunity to collaborate on data analysis of learning targets, develop small group and individual student interventions that are targeted to the student needs. Each grade team will have a common intervention block where they will be developing lessons to help decrease skill deficits, provide opportunities to reteach lessons, and enrich student learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the achievement in ELA and Math by 4%.

We will increase the achievement of ESE students with disabilities from 37% at or above proficiency to 41% at or above proficiency.

We will also increase the learning gains of all of our students.

ELA- Learning gains of the lowest quartile percentage will increase by 4%.

Math- Learning gains will increase by 4% and lowest quartile percentage will increase by 4%.

Monitoring:

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

Will use grade level progress monitoring spreadsheet, look at the growth within F.A.S.T. testing, grade level learning target assessments. Data will be reviewed regularly at bi-weekly Guiding Coalition meetings and at weekly collaborative PLC meetings and SWST meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@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.)

Master schedule has been developed that includes a grade level intervention block where teachers are collaborating and working together, using the PLC process, to implement evidence based interventions for small groups and individuals, targeted to student needs. We are planning to provide each team with a half-day planning period every three to four weeks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's research, the effect size of intervention is 1.29 and collective teacher efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. When looking at the learning gain, achievement levels and learning gains of our lowest quartile, intervention also has an effect size of .77 for ESE students.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Guiding Coalition to meet twice monthly to make recommendations and provide feedback for leading PLC support and implementation.
2. Master Schedule with common intervention block.
3. Utilize Jumpstart to hire additional support staff to help implement the intervention block.
4. Meet with each grade level team to begin understanding and implementing PLC systems while providing ongoing, embedded PD.
5. Work with teams to develop their intervention blocks.
6. Meet with Guiding Coalition and grade level teams to monitor data and develop interventions and intervention groups.
7. Increase understanding of high effect size instructional strategies that can support growth for all learners as shared by the team members' post tier 1 conversations regarding data.
8. Send Guiding Coalition to a Model PLC school.
9. Share professional development offerings related to PLC systems.

Person Responsible: Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: The end of the school year.

#3. 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.

To help promote a positive culture and environment, we are going to utilize the work of our PBIS committee to ensure the use of CHAMPS, celebrations, and monthly family nights. This will help us maintain a positive school climate and culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease the number of student event and discipline reports. We will increase parent and staff involvement during our monthly family nights. As a PBIS model school, we will increase from bronze level to silver level.

Monitoring:

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

Our behavior specialist and PBIS chair will work closely with classroom teachers and PBIS committee to track student behaviors that lead to event and discipline reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@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.)

CHAMPS and PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

CHAMPS and PBIS are both research-based proactive approaches to positive 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.

1. PBIS committee meets bi-weekly with representation from each team.
2. Each team will collaborate to plan one of the family nights.
3. PBIS committee meets to plan and organize celebrations.
4. PBIS chair behavior specialist will proactively monitor implementation of CHAMPS and provide support.

Person Responsible: Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: By the end of this school year.

#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.

We want to increase the the number of students who are reading proficiently by the end of third grade. Over the last few years we have seen a decrease in the number of students who have been meeting proficiency within the school, district, and state.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the number of third grade students who are reading proficiently from 69% to 71%.

Monitoring:

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

We will look closely at our progress monitoring spreadsheets as well as FAST PM1 and PM2 data to determine which standards or skills need to be addressed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

With our added position of literacy coach, we will work closely with classroom teachers to model lessons and to ensure evidence-based interventions are implemented with fidelity. The literacy coach will use the decision tree to help teachers identify the interventions that will best target the weakness. We will also continue working with our literacy leadership team to develop necessary professional development to support our schoolwide target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The decision tree is designed to include a variety of scientific interventions and assessments that guide the teacher in the development of literacy intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Guiding Coalition to meet twice monthly to make recommendations and provide feedback for leading PLC support and implementation.
2. Master Schedule with common intervention block.
3. Utilize Jumpstart to hire additional support staff to help implement the intervention block.
4. Meet with each grade level team to begin understanding and implementing PLC systems while providing ongoing, embedded PD.
5. Work with teams to develop their intervention blocks.

6. Meet with Guiding Coalition and grade level teams to monitor data and develop interventions and intervention groups.
7. Increase understanding of high effect size instructional strategies that can support growth for all learners as shared by the team members' post tier 1 conversations regarding data.
8. Share professional development offerings related to PLC systems.

Person Responsible: Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: By the end of this school year.

#5. 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 want to increase the the number of students who are reaching mastery of grade level math standards by the end of third grade. Over the last few years we have seen a decrease in the number of students who have been meeting math proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the number of third grade students who are proficient in math from 69% to 71%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor FAST data and intervene in the areas of focus that our students need. We will also use classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

During grade level intervention time teachers will use the math curriculum to implement interventions on the essential skills. Teams will be working together to determine what those essential skills are for each unit of study. Teams will work together to create common assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As we continue implementation of the PLC process our common assessments will help us to determine how we need to intervene during our Tier 2 SOAR time. Our instructional facilitator will help facilitate collaboration time to help ensure that interventions are scientifically based.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Guiding Coalition to meet twice monthly to make recommendations and provide feedback for leading PLC support and implementation.
2. Master Schedule with common intervention block.
3. Utilize Jumpstart to hire additional support staff to help implement the intervention block.
4. Meet with each grade level team to begin understanding and implementing PLC systems while providing ongoing, embedded PD.
5. Work with teams to develop their intervention blocks.
6. Meet with Guiding Coalition and grade level teams to monitor data and develop interventions and

intervention groups.

7. Increase understanding of high effect size instructional strategies that can support growth for all learners as shared by the team members' post tier 1 conversations regarding data.

8. Share professional development offerings related to PLC systems.

Person Responsible: Curtis Schwartz (curtis.schwartz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: By the end of this school year.