

Seminole County Public Schools

Bear Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Bear Lake Elementary School

3399 GLEAVES CT, Apopka, FL 32703

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0031>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

At Bear Lake Elementary School we believe that our students are our top priority. Our dedicated teachers and staff work together to ensure success in each and every one of our students. Our school is committed to providing our students a quality education in a safe and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Bear Lake Elementary School, we are committed to excellence always, all students will make "One Year's Growth in One Year's time".

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
Barone, Amy	Principal	Employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, values, and improvement priorities using facts and data. Lead and support a learning organization focused on student success, quality instructional practices based on state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula. Collaboratively develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. Recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. Manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.
Ortiz, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Support Principal in Curricula Implementation, Student Behavior Management. Lead and support a learning organization focused on student success, quality instructional practices based on state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula. Collaboratively develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. Manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.
Hinksman, Daisy	Administrative Support	Collaborate with school personnel, parents, community agencies, and/or students to promote optimal learning outcomes for all students. Implement individual, group, or system-level interventions that are scientifically proven to promote positive social, emotional, behavioral, and independent functioning outcomes.
Gonzalez, Petra	Instructional Coach	Provide teachers and administrators with on-site, on-going professional development related to disciplinary literacy; modeling best practices; assisting teachers in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction; supporting school-wide progress; monitoring programs, content knowledge and resources, specifically aligned to content, and resulting in an increase in teaching and learning proficiency.
Hodges, Janan		
Gregson, Lori	School Counselor	Collaborate with school personnel, parents, community agencies, and/or students to promote optimal learning outcomes for all students. Implement individual, group, or system-level interventions that are scientifically proven to promote positive social, emotional, behavioral, and independent functioning outcomes. Support student attendance by managing truancy referrals that adhere to SCPS procedures for truancy.
Rivera, Noelia	Behavior Specialist	Collaborate with school personnel, parents, community agencies, and/or students to promote optimal learning outcomes for all students. Implement individual, group, or system-level interventions that are scientifically proven

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

to promote positive social, emotional, behavioral, and independent functioning outcomes.

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.

Bear Lake involved parents and the community in developing this plan by surveying parents regarding needs for student success and safety. In addition, members of SAC were involved in helping us determine school needs.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored regularly in leadership team meetings, team leaders’ meetings, and through weekly PLCs with teachers. The administration team will meet quarterly (at the completion of a new set of data points) to review the fidelity with which the SIP has been implemented, it’s impact on student learning, and adjust both instructional priorities and action plans.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
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	16	32	31	29	28	21	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	3	5	4	0	0	0	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	4	18	16	3	1	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	1	4	9	12	1	2	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	35	25	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	44	19	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	15	34	24	27	20	0	0	0	121

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	2	12	24	19	41	27	0	0	0	125

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	2	2	2	4	0	0	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	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 ELA	3	5	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	2	3	4	2	0	5	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	11	38	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	21	37	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	4	3	0	5	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	7	17	3	4	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	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	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 ELA	3	5	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	2	3	4	2	0	5	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	11	38	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	21	37	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	4	3	0	5	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	7	17	3	4	0	0	0	35
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*	54	61	53	55	65	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				48			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			41		
Math Achievement*	57	64	59	56	46	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				54			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			14		
Science Achievement*	48	65	54	56	65	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	72	77	59	80			78		

* 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	53			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	63			

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%
FRL	49			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	46			

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	54			57			48					72
SWD	37			38			34				5	56
ELL	43			41			21				5	72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			41			33				4	
HSP	49			52			44				5	67
MUL	50			69							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	61			66			65				4	
FRL	43			46			39				5	71

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	55	48	31	56	54	34	56					80
SWD	34	29	16	41	43	14	25					50
ELL	36	35	16	38	41	21	30					80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	50	20	38	56	36	29					
HSP	46	45	26	45	47	40	43					78
MUL	48	46		48	38							
PAC												
WHT	66	51	44	72	62		74					
FRL	46	46	30	47	48	33	45					75

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	60	51	41	51	40	14	53					78
SWD	36	50	64	39	29		30					
ELL	40	44		34	39		39					78
AMI												
ASN	80			73								
BLK	49	35		31	15		29					
HSP	48	34	38	36	39	20	46					79
MUL	64			55								
PAC												
WHT	70	63	53	65	45	18	57					
FRL	51	47	39	42	35	15	48					78

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	45%	61%	-16%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	60%	-9%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	66%	-18%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	68%	6%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	22%	44%	-22%	55%	-33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	64%	-18%	51%	-5%

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.

The greatest areas of need are increasing learning gains for all students, increasing proficiency and learning gains for SWD, and increasing proficiency and learning gains for minority students. An explicit focus on SWD and minority groups during grade level PLC and data discussions will help to keep teachers and school leaders focused on the subgroups of greatest need.

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

Across grade levels, subject areas, and races, the percentage of students making learning gains is significantly lower than the number of students showing proficiency. In addition, students with disabilities are scoring lower in both proficiency and learning gains than their non-disabled peers by a difference of more than twenty percentage points. Black and Hispanic students are scoring lower in both proficiency and learning gains than their white peers by a difference of fifteen to twenty percentage points.

The implementation of new B.E.S.T. standards in the upper grade levels along with new instructional materials in both ELA and Math may have contributed to the decline in student scores. Gaps between the prior and new standards created some circumstances in which students were under prepared for grade level content.

In addition, atypical student behaviors increased from the prior year, creating some classroom and campus disruptions that could have impacted the learning of some students.

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.

3rd grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include underperforming sub groups of students.

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

Fourth grade math proficiency and learning gains were significantly higher than other grade levels and subjects. Also, learning gains in retained third graders were high in both reading and math.

The fourth grade team consistently held productive PLCs and worked closely with county level support personnel in both subject areas.

Retained third grade students were clustered together and placed with highly effective teachers. ESE and ESOL push-in support was increased in these designated classrooms.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

PRIORITY 1 – Conditions for Learning – Bear Lake Elementary will participate in the Behavior Coaching Academy which will provide resources and tools for classroom teachers and school leaders in creating learning environments where ALL students can be successful.

PRIORITY 2 – Students with Disabilities – Bear Lake Elementary will participate in the Curriculum Project program with the county to help address the needs of our students with disabilities in a more systematic and structured way. In addition, the leadership team will focus on supporting classroom teachers in understanding their students with disabilities and using strategies during instruction to make the content accessible.

PRIORITY 3 – Learning Gains – Bear Lake Elementary will focus on increasing the productivity of teacher PLCs to better guide instruction and help move students forward towards proficiency.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Barone (amy_barone@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Students will identify at least one trusted adult on campus to whom they can turn for support.

The school will develop opportunities for students to connect with staff members outside of the general education classrooms through the development of extracurricular activities (before, during, and after school hours).

Collective Responsibility - Staff members will have a better understanding of their role in supporting positive student behavior and positive culture.

The school will begin year one of a three year Behavior Coaching Academy. This program will train leadership team members to support staff in ensuring classroom and common area environments are designed to support successful and positive student behavior.

Leadership team will receive intensive training on Conditions for Learning and how to coach and support classroom teachers in their development.

All staff will receive an hour long PD at the start of the school year and ongoing training as needed.

Select staff will receive one-on-one coaching from a BCA school-based team member. BCA school-based team will receive weekly support from the county-based BCA team.

Person Responsible: Amy Barone (amy_barone@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities, English language learners and Black/African American students. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities, English language learners, and Black/African American students.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Barone (amy_barone@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

ELA- All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

What do we want all students to do?

The goal is for at least 62% of students to show proficient on the FAST ELA and Math assessments by the end of the 23-24 school year. In addition, at least 62% of these same students will show a learning gain from the 22-23 school year.

How will we know if they learn it?

Students will be monitored throughout the school year using FAST progress monitoring assessments, iReady diagnostics, RAMP Benchmark assessments, and classroom performance. Teachers will develop SMART goals for their students based on each student's growth needs to meet the above expectation and will meet weekly in PLC to review data and make instructional decisions.

Teachers will identify students in the lowest quartile and those in vulnerable groups at the start of the year and will monitor the growth of these students.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

The classroom teachers, instructional coach, and intervention teacher will work together to identify students who would benefit from tutorial and/or intervention groups. These programs will allow students to work in a small group targeting specific math deficits to help students make their growth goals.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

PLC minutes & notes

Student data notebooks

School-wide data spreadsheet

iReady reports & other data tracking sheets

Person Responsible: Amy Barone (amy_barone@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout 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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then

operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

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

For grade K, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments

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

For grade 5, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

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

The number of students in grades K that are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The number of students in grades 5 that score below a Level 3 on the end of the year statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA, FAST and district progress monitoring assessment outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Barone, Amy, amy_barone@scps.k12.fl.us

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?

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning

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?

By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data.

Utilizing results of FAST PM1 and PM2, DRA and district progress monitoring to design reading acceleration support for students.

Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.

Barone, Amy,
amy_barone@scps.k12.fl.us

Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.

Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.

Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.