Carillon Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Carillon Elementary School

3200 LOCKWOOD BLVD, Oviedo, FL 32765

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0441

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.

The mission of Carillon Elementary School is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and mindsets to be Capable, Connected, Contributing, and Collaborative citizens in our ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Carillon Elementary strives to support our students in becoming Capable, Connected, Contributing, and Collaborative members of the community. Our vision is for Carillon Elementary School to be identified as a premier elementary school in Seminole County and recognized for innovating learning environments, engaging instruction, strong relationships, and individualized student success.

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
Darcy, Elizabeth	Principal	Mrs. Darcy is the instructional leader of the school and is ultimately responsible for completing both the mission of the school and the district. The principal is responsible for the safety, relationships, and achievement of students and faculty/staff.
Adames, Teddy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Adames' responsibilities are to assist the principal in being the instructional leader for the school. Her responsibilities include, but are not limited to custodial and facility supervision, literacy instruction and planning, evaluations, testing, dual language, schedule creation and data analysis.
Boza, Maegan	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Boza responsibilities are to assist the principal in being the instructional leader. for the school. Her responsibilities include, but are not limited to discipline, math instruction, evaluations, MTSS, PBIS, and data analysis.
Flora, Jennifer	School Counselor	Mrs. Flora serves the schools and student needs by fulfilling the responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, assisting students in crisis, supervising, and coordinating the SST schedule, and helping teachers who serve students with exceptionalities.
Osbun-Rapp, Amy	School Counselor	Ms. Osbun-Rapp serves the schools and student needs by fulfilling the responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, assisting with students in crisis, supervising and coordinating the MTSS process, and helping teachers who serve students struggling to make progress.
Robinson, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Robinson's primary responsibilities include but are not limited to supporting grades 3-5 in ELA. As a coach she is responsible for completing the coaching cycles with 3-5 teachers. Carillon. Mrs. Robinson supports grades 3-5 in ELA. As a coach is responsible for completing the coaching cycles with 3-5 teachers and assisting with the integration of instructional technology.
Hill, Cyndy	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Hill's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, supporting instructional needs in Math, and coordinating the Expanding Academic Readiness and Targeted Help (EARTH) blocks at Carillon. As a coach is responsible for completing the coaching cycles with K-5 teachers and assisting with the integration of instructional technology.
Walker, Lynne	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Walker's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, supporting. instructional needs and coordinating the Expanding Academic Readiness and Targeted Help (EARTH) blocks at Carillon. As a coach is responsible for completing the coaching cycles with K-2 teachers and assisting with the integration of instructional technology.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Youmans, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Youmans responsibilities include, but are not limited to, enhancing, and coordinating the education of the gifted and creating and supporting enrichment activities for all students as wells as assisting with integration of technology into instruction at Carillon and assisting with the integration of instructional technology.

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.

Parent and community feedback was utilized in developing this plan. Feedback was solicited both formally through the use of district (Snapshot) and School (Google Forms) developed surveys. Feedback was also solicited informally through PTA Meetings, SAC Meetings, and school events. The principal will provide a state of the school presentation for all stakeholders that summarizes the key points of the school improvement plan. The presentation will be recorded and shared through our school website to make it accessible to all. The presentation will include contact information in case stakeholders have additional questions.

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 CNES SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation three times per year by examining the data analysis processes and results through PLC, MTSS, SST, and Leadership Data Meetings. These implementation expectations include: 1. Stakeholders consultation regarding goals and expectations; 2. Implementation of action steps developed based on student individual results and needs; 3. Identifying and ensuring the utilization of specific individual student intervention and/or services; 4. Analysis of impact and evaluation of effectiveness; and 5. Revision of the plan based on findings. In addition, the Leadership Team will disaggregate all assessment data for students with disabilities at quarterly data meetings by whole school, grade level, teacher, and by specific students.

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	49%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	32%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: 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	13	27	23	11	18	25	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	1	4	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	16	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	18	16	8	9	18	0	0	0	70

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	1	6	6	3	17	25	0	0	0	58

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	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	16	17	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	18	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	2	9	4	7	0	0	0	28
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	16	17	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	18	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	2	9	4	7	0	0	0	28
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*	68	61	53	72	65	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				66			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			27		
Math Achievement*	74	64	59	71	46	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				65			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			24		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	75	65	54	72	65	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	77	59	57			63		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	56			
HSP	62			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	64			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	61			
HSP	57			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	50			

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	68			74			75					74
SWD	30			46			39				4	
ELL	45			70							4	74
AMI												
ASN	86			91			79				4	
BLK	47			65							2	
HSP	57			64			61				5	60
MUL	63			87							3	
PAC												
WHT	71			74			79				4	
FRL	54			62			65				5	82

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	72	66	46	71	65	43	72					57
SWD	36	44	30	39	46	36	38					
ELL	53	64	50	53	52	36	64					57
AMI												
ASN	90	72		92	84		94					
BLK	58	54		56	75							
HSP	65	73	50	59	54	33	62					60
MUL	65	73		73	64							
PAC												
WHT	72	62	44	72	65	51	76					
FRL	59	62	46	55	47	31	57					45

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	75	55	27	70	57	24	66					63
SWD	37	19	9	35	24	14	36					
ELL	55	40		58	67		53					63

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
AMI												
ASN	87	82		89	73		77					
BLK	65			57								
HSP	60	28	0	55	40	10	37					72
MUL	72			56								
PAC												
WHT	78	63	56	73	61	38	75					
FRL	63	37	10	56	44	19	51					65

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	73%	61%	12%	54%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	60%	5%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	66%	1%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	68%	13%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	44%	24%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	64%	10%	51%	23%

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.

1. Increasing ELA Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile

2. Increasing Math Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile

3. Closing the Gap in ELA Proficiency for SWD (39 point gap)

4. Closing the Gap in Math Proficiency for SWD (33 point gap)

The greatest decline was in ESE ELA for grades 3 through 5. In 2022 and 2021, 36% of SWD were proficient in ELA. The factors that contributed to this decline include students' struggles with fluency and comprehension; attendance; lingering effects from the pandemic; lack of specific systematic intervention; lack of specific PD for teachers and staff; and lack of inclusion with proficient peers.

Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with targeted support and acceleration in identified areas of need. In addition, teacher leaders will establish and promote a school-wide literacy focus to include one English Language Arts Expectation (EEs) and Mathematics Thinking and Reasoning Standard (MTRs) and coordinate Family Literacy Nights that will include student -led conferences and "Take Home Activities." Teachers will participate in professional developed focused on FIN Collaborative Teaching Models to support inclusion and Restorative Practice focused on building relationships and promoting a positive culture and climate.

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

The greatest decline was in ESE ELA for grades 3 through 5. In 2022 and 2021, 36% of SWD were proficient in ELA. The factors that contributed to this decline include students' struggles with fluency and comprehension; attendance; lingering effects from the pandemic; lack of specific systematic intervention; lack of specific PD for teachers and staff; and lack of inclusion with proficient peers.

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.

All data components are above the state average.

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

Carillon Elementary shows a trend of increased proficiency in ELA 5th grade (up 3), Math 4th (up 8) and 5th (up 11) grades and Science 5th (up 6) grade. The factors that contributed to this improvement include high performing PLCs, increased focus, time, and coaching with Science instruction, and strong and effective Tier 2 interventions in 4th and 5th Math and 5th ELA, and increased differentiation through RAMP

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.

1. Increasing ELA Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile
2. Increasing Math Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile
3. Closing the Gap in ELA Proficiency for SDW (39 points)
4. Closing the Gap in Math Proficiency for SDW (33 points)

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. 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.

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:

Elizabeth Darcy (elizabeth_darcy@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?
Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of grade level benchmarks in all content areas. Students with disabilities will have IEP goals aligned to skills related directly to benchmarks and demonstrate understanding of grade level benchmarks in all content areas.

How will we know if they learn it?
Teachers will work in PLCs to examine formative and summative assessments and student work products to determine if the benchmarks were met. PLCs will plan for high level core instruction based on student data and continually measure student progress. Case managers will work in PLCs to examine the progress of students with IEPs.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
Teachers will work in PLCs to analyze student data, determine areas of specific needs, and design instruction to address these needs. During core instruction, teachers will deliver differentiated instruction that includes engagement strategies, re-teaching, grouping, guided reading, and tiered interventions. In addition, Carillon uses Earth Time, a block of time in the morning and in the afternoon, to provide targeted and tiered ELA and Math intervention focusing on areas where students show a need. Students scoring in the lowest 30% will be invited to participate in tutoring during and beyond the school day.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
This strategy will be monitored through PLC and teacher data chats, PLC notes, lesson plans, and classroom observations.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Darcy (elizabeth_darcy@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year

#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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, 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:

Elizabeth Darcy (elizabeth_darcy@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.

Carillon Elementary will build a culture where students trust the adults who work with them by adopting and implementing Restorative Practices school-wide.
Upon review of the Restorative Practice Relationship Plan, the faculty will provide feedback and the final Relationship Plan will be implemented. Carillon will adopt 2 practices selected by the faculty; one practice will include Proactive Circles. Each class will participate in weekly proactive circles to build positive and trusting relationships among students and between teachers and students.

Carillon Elementary will cultivate Collective Responsibility by revamping Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports (PBiS).

Carillon Elementary will recruit leaders and committee members to revamp PBiS with fidelity, aiming for implementing all elements of a PBiS Gold School restarting with Tier 1, https://flpbis.cbcs.usf.edu/tiers/tier1.html.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Darcy (elizabeth_darcy@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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).