

Sarasota County Schools

Tatum Ridge 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 | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 24 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 26 |

Tatum Ridge Elementary School

4100 TATUM RD, Sarasota, FL 34240

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/tatumridge

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 Tatum Ridge Elementary School is to provide a welcoming, supportive climate of the highest expectations that enable students to become self-confident, independent thinkers. This is accomplished through parent and family engagement and the collaborative efforts of the Tatum Ridge Community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tatum Ridge Elementary School will provide support and encouragement to students, staff, and families by facilitating active thinking and lifelong learning. Pride in accomplishments and respect for others will enable the Tatum Ridge community to successfully face the challenges of the future.

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 |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dunn, Barry | Principal | |
| Hansen, Emilie | Assistant Principal | |
| Powell, Angela | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Reading Recovery Teacher |
| Wible, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | Literacy Coach |
| Sheffield, Tiffany | Instructional Coach | Instructional Facilitator |

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 School Advisory Council reviews the plan with administration to understand the data and strategies for addressing needs. SAC votes to approve the plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

Data is consistently analyzed as it is collected throughout the school year. At PM2, administrative leadership team will look at data to adjust small groups, materials, and resources.

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 | 23% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 31% |
| 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 | 1 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 26 | 27 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |

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 | 4 | 49 | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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 | 3 | 19 | 30 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 6 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |

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 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 22 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 6 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| 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 | 19 | 30 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 6 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |

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 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 22 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 6 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| 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* | 73 | 65 | 53 | 73 | 66 | 56 | 73 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 70 | | | 49 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 70 | 68 | 59 | 76 | 52 | 50 | 76 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 74 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56 | | | 46 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 78 | 69 | 54 | 69 | 67 | 59 | 68 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 65 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 60 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 80 | 68 | 59 | | | | | | |

* 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 | 75 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 373 |
| 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 | 67 |

| 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 | 466 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| 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 | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 60 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | |
| FRL | 69 | | | |

| 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 | 45 | | | |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 79 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| 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 | 73 | | | 70 | | | 78 | | | | | 80 |
| SWD | 33 | | | 35 | | | 42 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 50 | | | 53 | | | | | | | 4 | 80 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | | | 61 | | | 67 | | | | 5 | 73 |
| MUL | 74 | | | 68 | | | 76 | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | | | 73 | | | 81 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 62 | | | 58 | | | 73 | | | | 5 | 83 |

| 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 | 73 | 70 | 48 | 76 | 74 | 56 | 69 | | | | | |
| SWD | 37 | 56 | 43 | 49 | 53 | 33 | 46 | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 61 | 83 | | 64 | 63 | 30 | 64 | | | | | |
| MUL | 76 | 74 | | 82 | 85 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 69 | 44 | 78 | 76 | 56 | 71 | | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 68 | 50 | 63 | 66 | 55 | 47 | | | | | |

| 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 | 73 | 49 | 40 | 76 | 50 | 46 | 68 | | | | | |
| SWD | 44 | 30 | 27 | 44 | 27 | | 26 | | | | | |
| ELL | 60 | | | 57 | | | 40 | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 67 | | 49 | 36 | | 42 | | | | | |
| MUL | 76 | | | 86 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 51 | 42 | 80 | 52 | 53 | 74 | | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 36 | 33 | 59 | 39 | | 57 | | | | | |

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 | 80% | 67% | 13% | 54% | 26% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 67% | 5% | 58% | 14% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 61% | 6% | 50% | 17% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 70% | -4% | 59% | 7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 70% | 8% | 61% | 17% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 66% | 3% | 55% | 14% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 67% | 10% | 51% | 26% |

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.

Fifth grade Math proficiency was Tatum's lowest indicator at 70%. Changes in staff, standards, and familiarity with new instructional resources may be contributing factors to last year's low performance. Fifth grade proficiency in Math dropped by 1%.

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

Tatum's overall Math proficiency score declined from 76% to 73%. Changes in staff, standards, and familiarity with new instructional resources may be contributing factors to last year's low performance.

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.

Tatum performed above the state average in all categories.

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

Tatum's overall ELA proficiency increased from 73% to 76%. Several new actions were taken during the 22-23 school year to improve ELA support and instruction. These include adding an instructional

facilitator, moving to a digital MTSS platform, strategic use of literacy walk throughs and feedback, and contracted support through the JumpStart grant.

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

Tatum has 49 third grade students with two or more indicators in the early warning system. Additionally, 22 students were promoted to fourth grade through good cause exemption, but scored a level 1 on last year's PM3 FAST ELA test.

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

- 1) Supporting third grade ELA proficiency
- 2) Supporting the fourth grade students that were promoted through good cause exemption
- 3) Increasing overall Math proficiency
- 4) Supporting students with disabilities (SWD) to access the general curriculum

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Throughout the 23-24 school year, there will be a focus on providing high quality, differentiated instruction of ELA using the adopted Benchmark Advanced curriculum for core instruction and targeted interventions. Our teachers will focus on utilizing district progress monitoring tools to make informed instructional decisions regarding student groupings. Core ELA instruction will include explicit, daily phonics instruction through structured literacy strategies.

While strategies from Tatum's 22-23 SIP helped our school increase overall ELA proficiency by 3%, 22-23 data from our district progress monitoring tools indicate of need for improved core phonics instruction. By increasing our focus on utilizing progress monitoring data for strategic planning and goal setting, we will increase our awareness of the effectiveness of our core instruction and make adjustments accordingly. With early intervention, targeted small group instruction, and ongoing progress monitoring, striving readers in our bottom quartile will receive purposeful supports.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2024, at least 79% of our students will demonstrate proficiency on the PM3 FAST ELA Spring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will utilize the district progress monitoring tool for all students. Any student receiving strategic tier 2 interventions will have progress monitoring bi-weekly. Progress monitoring for tier 3 students will occur weekly.

Teachers will use our TRE OneNote Notebook, to track and monitor strategic reading interventions.

Teachers will participate in weekly CPTs, monthly planning days, and quarterly data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@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.)

Hattie's research indicates that Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29. Hattie's Glossary defines Response to Intervention as "an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention and frequent progress measurement." Jul 21, 2018

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on increasing the effectiveness and fidelity of implementation of this strategy. Our goals for overall reading instruction and systematic implementation of interventions are to:

1. Increase visibility and collaboration (OneNote Notebook)
2. Move toward a more collaborative mindset - from "My kids" to "Our kids"
3. Establish common intervention time amongst each grade level
4. Foster equitable participation in supporting kids anchored in the idea that we're ALL here to support

ALL
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 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. Use a variety of data points (FAST 2023, Beginning of the year Progress Monitoring data) to identify baseline data on student performance and identify striving readers at every grade level.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: September 25th, 2023

2. Establish MTSS support team. One grade level facilitator will be assigned to each team and attend weekly CPTs. MTSS support team will meet weekly to review student data/progress reviews discussed at the CPTs.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 18th, 2023

3. Two intervention teachers will be contracted through the Jumpstart grant (3 days/week). Intervention support will target foundational reading skills.

Person Responsible: Barry Dunn (barry.dunn@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023

4. Develop a comprehensive, strategic intervention plan for striving readers that: 1) utilizes research-based materials (Benchmark Phonics and fluency kits, Heggerty, ACT, iReady Teacher toolbox, Fountas and Pinnell) and 2) provides multiple layers of support.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Wible (jennifer.wible@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: September 25th, 2023

5. Establish roles and responsibilities for reading coach and instructional facilitator. Schedule weekly administration support team meetings.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023

6. Update the TRE TEAMS/OneNote Notebook for the 23-24 school year. This shared platform will increase collaboration and shared ownership across the grade level, increase visibility for our SWST team, support overall monitoring of our MTSS systems.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023

7. Grade level teams (and ESE teams) will participate in monthly half day team planning. Instructional facilitator and literacy coach will provide support during those planning days.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Wible (jennifer.wible@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly for the 23-24 school year

8. Administrators will meet with teachers quarterly for data chats and to review fidelity of classroom intervention implementation.

Person Responsible: Barry Dunn (barry.dunn@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing quarterly starting October 2023

9. Parents of students that are identified as striving readers, will be contacted monthly regarding their child's progress and performance to grade level standards.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly for 23-24 school year

10. MTSS support team will audit our MTSS rosters quarterly to ensure accurate reporting.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting September 2023

11. Instructional literacy team will meet monthly. Team will share best practices in literacy instruction and review data collected from ongoing assessments and classroom walk throughs.

Person Responsible: Angela Powell (angela.powell@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023

12. ESE liaisons will meet with ESE case managers weekly during CPT. ESE teachers will set goals for individual students, monitor progress, and review during CPT.

Person Responsible: Holly Houghton-Brown (holly.houghton-brown@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing August 2023

13. A comprehensive MTSS system review will be conducted mid-year using PM2 data to determine the overall effectiveness of classroom instruction and interventions. Adjustments will be made for semester 2 as needed.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: January 2024

14. Overall progress monitoring data will be shared quarterly at staff and SAC meetings.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting October 2023

15. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and collect data to determine instructional trends.

Person Responsible: Barry Dunn (barry.dunn@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting September 2023

#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.

Last year, TRE, began work defining and refining practices as related to Professional Learning Communities. During year 1 implementation, TRE established a guiding coalition and collaborated with other Sarasota County schools to organize a PLC Summer Institute for teachers.

During year 2 implementation, TRE will focus on Big Idea 2- building a collaborative culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2024 school year, grade level teams will have systems/protocols in place to 1) identify essential standards 2) develop common formative assessments aligned to essential standards 3) establish team roles and expectations for data sharing and analysis 4) monitoring progress, and 5) responding to students' learning needs.

Monitoring:

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

Team leaders/ guiding coalition members will meet monthly to monitor progress, review artifacts, and support one another.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@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.)

Hattie's research indicates that Collective Teacher Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. Collective teacher efficacy is "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk Hoy, 2000).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our school is purposefully addressing the need to shift from a competitive climate to one of honesty, vulnerability, support, and collaboration.

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 members will lead back to school professional development at August 3rd, 2023 meeting. Focus will include establishing mission, norms, and collective commitments.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 3rd, 2023

2. Grade level teams will select quarterly essential standards. These will be shared at guiding coalition meetings.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023.

3. Grade level teams will develop/select multiple common formative assessments that align with quarterly essential standards. Assessment data will be reviewed and analyzed during CPTs.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting September 2023.

4. The CPT notetaking form will be revised to reflect TRE's goals, norms, and collective commitments.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023

5. Grade level teams will establish CPT agendas and utilize the revised notetaking form. Weekly CPT agendas and notes will be posted in our shared OneNote Notebook.

Person Responsible: Barry Dunn (barry.dunn@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023

6. Team leaders/ guiding coalition members will meet monthly to monitor progress and support one another.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023

7. Guiding coalition team members will facilitate activities at monthly staff meetings.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023

8. Guiding coalition will plan success recognition as related to our SIP and PLC goals.

Person Responsible: Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to FAST Math data, 73% of students were proficient in mathematics. This was a decrease of 3% from last year. There were no learning gains calculated due to the assessment being brand new.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Concluding the 2023-2024 school year, Tatum Ridge will make a 4%-point increase in the number of students scoring proficient in math as measured by the FAST statewide assessment. Math proficiency will increase from 73% to 77%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring spreadsheets, Dreambox data, data chats, classroom walk-throughs, IPDP's, involvement in professional learning activities, and grade level planning days will include conversations about data with grade level teams as well as individual teachers. Instructional Facilitator and administration meet weekly to discuss updated data points and ideas for problem solving. Jumpstart grant funds will be use for a Math interventionist, who will work with lowest quartile students twice per week.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barry Dunn (barry.dunn@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.)

Hattie's research indicates that Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29. Hattie's Glossary defines Response to Intervention as "an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention and frequent progress measurement." Jul 21, 2018

Our math interventionist is trained on the Sarasota Numeracy Initiative. This math program will be used to assess, teach and progress monitor our students so we can provide them with targeted, individualized interventions based on their needs, and increase probability of making learning gains for our Bottom Quartile students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By starting with the end goal, rather than starting with the first lesson chronologically delivered during a unit or course, teachers design a sequence of lessons, problems, projects, presentations, assignments, and assessments that result in students achieving the academic goals. Knowing what the goal 'looks like' ahead of time helps the teacher teach to the rigor of the standard as well.

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) Analyze PM1 FAST data and create small groups based on need.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Completion of PM1, mid-September.

2) Train staff on intervention strategies and resources used with Sarasota Numeracy Initiative.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Newbanks (jennifer.newbanks@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: End of Quarter 1, mid-October

3) Familiarize staff with new Math series upon adoption

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Upon completion of district textbook adoption.

4) A comprehensive MTSS system review will be conducted mid-year using PM2 data to determine the overall effectiveness of classroom instruction and interventions. Adjustments will be made for semester 2 as needed.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing starting August 2023

5) Analyze math benchmark assessments as well as Dreambox data to identify trends and implications for Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sheffield (tiffany.sheffield@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing for 23-24 school year

6) Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and collect data to determine instructional trends.

Person Responsible: Barry Dunn (barry.dunn@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing for 23-24 school year

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).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

na

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

na

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

na

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

na

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

na

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

-na

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

na

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

na

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No