

Seminole County Public Schools

Crystal 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Crystal Lake Elementary School

231 RINEHART RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0821>

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 Crystal Lake Elementary community will uphold an enthusiastic, collaborative learning environment where all teachers and students are dedicated and motivated to learn and succeed to their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Crystal Lake Elementary is to prepare our students so they will flourish as a responsible citizen in our global community.

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
Carver, Ricky	Principal	Leadership Team Agenda, Classroom Walk-Throughs w/Feedback to Faculty/Staff, Attend SST Meetings, Attend PLC & MTSS Meetings, Parent Conferences. Presenting School Updates & Student Recognitions on WCLES. Finance, Human Resources, Budget, Facilities, PTA Board & SAC Meetings, attend PTA events.
Torres, Omayra	Assistant Principal	AP Agenda, Weekly Staff Newsletter (CROC Tales), School Wide Calendar, Curriculum Updates, School-Wide Testing
Gardner, Cynthia	Administrative Support	Monthly Newsletter to Parents/Staff (CROC Talk), Non-Instructional Evaluations, Facilities Concerns
Farley, Nicole	School Counselor	MTSS Contact, SST Agendas/Parent Meetings, ESE Contact

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.

All parents were given the opportunity to complete a Snap Shot survey. The parents completed surveys through Snap Shot. This provided Crystal Lake information on what our community felt we did well and areas on which focus. The School Advisory Committee provided input at the end of the 2022-2023 school year on areas they see as important. Crystal Lake used this information when creating the School Improvement 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))

The SIP will be presented to Faculty & Staff, as well as members of the SAC Committee. They will be made aware of the accountability of the Needs Assessments & Areas of Concern.

We will need to review these Needs Assessments monthly to monitor to make sure that we are on track to meet these goals. (Analyzing Student Data)

Develop PLCs & PD to address areas of concern, as well as our ESE Subgroup.

The school-wide expectation will be that we will increase the number of students who are proficient at a level 3 or above.

Have Leadership Team members adopt a group of ESE students & monitor their ongoing progress monitoring on their assessments & conduct data chats.

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	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
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) 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	9	30	23	18	10	17	0	0	0	107	
One or more suspensions	1	6	2	3	3	5	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	17	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	14	2	9	15	0	0	0	52	

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	9	11	1	15	21	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	2	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	3	2	0	7	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	3	5	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	3	17	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	19	14	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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	6	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	9	1	6	2	2	0	0	0	23
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	3	2	0	7	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	3	5	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	3	17	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	19	14	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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	6	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	9	1	6	2	2	0	0	0	23
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*	53	61	53	68	65	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				68			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			42		
Math Achievement*	57	64	59	64	46	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				58			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			19		
Science Achievement*	62	65	54	66	65	59	59		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	93	77	59	71			89		

** 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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	15	Yes	2	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	46			
HSP	59			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	42			
HSP	58			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	53			

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	53			57			62					93
SWD	17			21			13				4	
ELL	24			40			64				4	93
AMI												
ASN	70			75							2	
BLK	48			45			54				4	
HSP	44			49			55				5	95
MUL	59			59							2	
PAC												
WHT	57			63			73				4	
FRL	41			44			46				5	90

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	68	68	47	64	58	38	66					71
SWD	25	34	27	44	42	28	35					
ELL	58	58	53	35	26	18	45					71
AMI												
ASN	64	85		81	69		70					
BLK	55	52	15	51	50	27	47					
HSP	62	71	67	52	52	35	53					68
MUL	93	80		64	60							
PAC												
WHT	73	67	44	72	62	37	78					
FRL	58	62	43	54	58	33	48					70

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	71	69	42	61	38	19	59					89
SWD	39	43	18	32	24	18	45					
ELL	35			30								89
AMI												
ASN	75			84								
BLK	50			47								
HSP	66	59	38	44	27	14	41					92
MUL	87			73								
PAC												
WHT	78	79		70	49		70					
FRL	60	61	42	44	25	10	42					88

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	48%	61%	-13%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	66%	0%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	92%	66%	26%	54%	38%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	68%	3%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	44%	-11%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	64%	-3%	51%	10%

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.

Based on our Progress Monitoring data for our 2023 state assessments, our greatest need for improvement would be 5th Grade ELA.

There were several teachers that took personal leave of absences & there were Long-Term Subs taking over the classroom instruction. There was brand new curriculum to learn & follow with fidelity. There was more focus on whole group compared to small groups.

New Actions for 23-24:

*School-Wide Expectation to use the CORE Curriculum based on year 2 of textbook adoption.

*More DATA focused weekly PLC Sessions.

*More PLCs provided with reference to Instructional Framework.

*Use of daily small group instruction focused on student/class need.

*Looking at District Data from ongoing Progress Monitoring (STAR/FAST/iReady/Quarterly Assessments)

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

Based on our Progress Monitoring data for our 2023 state assessments, our greatest need for improvement would be 5th Grade ELA. There were several teachers that took personal leave of absences & there were Long-Term Subs taking over the classroom instruction. There was brand new curriculum to learn & follow with fidelity. There was more focus on whole group compared to small groups

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.

5th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

Based on our Progress Monitoring data for our 2023 state assessments, the grade that showed the most improvement would be 4th Grade ELA.

There was more team collaboration with regards to learning how to use & teach the standards based on the Frameworks. District Teachers on Assignment provided detailed training during PLC sessions. The team itself was a team of seasoned teachers, who have worked in collaboration before this year.

New Actions for 23-24:

*Build a Community of Trust & Transparency, so that teachers feel supported, are provided all the materials & professional development needed to have a better understanding of the BEST Standards & analyze their student data to drive their daily instruction.

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.

- * Parent Assessment Informational Night (August/September) to provide information to parents about STAR / FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments.
- * Lessons aligned to state academic BEST standards with the goal of mastery by the end of the school year.
- * Ongoing feedback loops between leadership, teachers, students, and families.
- * Offer After-School Tutorial for students
- *We will offer Professional Development opportunities based on Instructional Strategies for all CORE Subjects (ELA/Math/Science).
- *We will offer Professional Development opportunities for ESE teachers, especially self-contained ones, with focus on grade level Curriculum Frameworks.
- * We will offer Professional Development opportunities to analyze their data to differentiate their instruction in the classroom.
- *Continue weekly PLCs, closely monitor their data to differentiate their classroom instruction to determine what is working & what is not.
- *Provide a classroom of trust by building connections & relationships with their students.

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:

Ricky Carver (ricky_carver@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.

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?

We want them to know where they stand academically (Know their DATA) at this time & where they need to be at the end of the year.

The expectation is to make ONE years growth in ONE years time.

How will we know if they learn it?

We will utilize the DATA collected from their ongoing Progress Monitoring Assessments (STAR, FAST, iReady). We will meet weekly through our PLC Sessions and answer the 4 PLC questions collaboratively with teachers, as well as our MTSS Meetings to discuss ongoing progress. Teachers will use formative assessments provided by the Wonders/Saavas Core Curriculum. Teachers and students will be held accountable to KNOW their DATA & have clear understanding about making adequate learning gains.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

*Teachers & students would have DATA chats amongst each other.

*Teachers will have conferences with parents to discuss academic concerns.

*Bring student DATA to MTSS for possible Tiering Interventions & inform parents of possible upcoming tiering.

*Offer After School Tutorial &/or additional Intervention during school day.

*Find out if there are outside factors affecting their learning abilities in the classroom.

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

*Each teacher will provide each student with a DATA Notebook to "KNOW their DATA" throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Ricky Carver (ricky_carver@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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:

Ricky Carver (ricky_carver@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.

Increase by two (2) the percent of students who identify a Trusted Adult on Campus on the Annual Safety Survey.

School-wide expectation of letting students know (through Ms. Tillman's Morning Message on WCLES) that we are building trust between teachers & students. Students will be able to identify their "Trusted Adult" on campus. There will always be someone on campus that you can trust.

Ms. Tillman, our Behavior Support, will create a survey (quarterly) based on how many students can

identify a trusted adult on our campus.

Decrease by 10% per year the discipline disproportionality for students across each subgroup to a factor of 2.99 or below. Effective use of School-Wide Expectations & Consequences, *Teachers taking ownership of their classroom behavior by building positive relationships with students.

Every grading period, we will pull Discipline Data & compare it to last school year's Discipline Data.

Person Responsible: Ricky Carver (ricky_carver@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).

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The number of students in grade 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.

Carver, Ricky, ricky_carver@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.	Carver, Ricky,
Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.	ricky_carver@scps.k12.fl.us
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.	