

Seminole County Public Schools

Geneva Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Geneva Elementary School

275 1ST ST, Geneva, FL 32732

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0051>

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 Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. Also, we aim to achieve all of five of the Elementary level commitments: 1. Build Positive Relationships and Culture 2. Ensure rigorous instruction 3. Demonstrating a Growth Mindset 4. Cultivate purposeful PLCs 5. Monitor with Feedback.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Geneva Elementary will provide an enriched environment to all students so they could acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to achieve their personal best and become life-long learners in this global economy. Our goal is to meet the district-wide initiative/goal and strive for achieving: One year's growth in one year's time for all Geneva students.

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
Padilla, Aimee	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the school's operation and instruction.
Phillips, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in meeting all school goals.
Burke, Alison	School Counselor	To assist school personnel, parents, and students with relevant educational and personal/social goals and develop and implement effective programs for all students while functioning as a member of a school's Leadership Team.
Davidson, Lisa	Instructional Coach	To generate improved student achievement in relevant content areas by providing 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
Bough-VonHagel, Olivia	Instructional Technology	To coach and support teachers while coordinating, organizing, and facilitating administrative and instructional technology and applications.

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.

Geneva employs parent and community involvement through various survey collections and local School Advisory Meetings. Stakeholders provide input to establish common goals and ideals aligned to our Seminole County mission and school wide vision. Input is utilized to collaborate and develop plans such as family events to impact the welfare and success of the school.

Our PTA supports our school's goals and improvement efforts by providing human and financial resources. Input and feedback from our SAC is used in developing this plan as well as SAC gives the final approval of 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))

Our school team will take a collaborative approach to reviewing school and student data. We have clear teams that look either at whole school, grade level, or individual student data. Each team will create checkpoints, monitor fidelity of the action plans, create tasks related to the action plans, and meet regularly to adjust action plans to support the overall goals.

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	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	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	6	21	10	10	9	8	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	6	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	14	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	6	4	11	9	10	0	0	0	42	

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	6	1	2	11	14	0	0	0	36

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	14	0	0	0	30	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	15	13	0	0	0	32	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	

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	2	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	11

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	6	3	4	0	0	0	19
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	1	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	14	0	0	0	30	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	15	13	0	0	0	32	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	

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	2	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	11

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	6	3	4	0	0	0	19
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*	57	61	53	63	65	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				64			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			29		
Math Achievement*	58	64	59	70	46	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				64			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			41		
Science Achievement*	69	65	54	70	65	59	61		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		77	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
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	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			

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	44			

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	33	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	73			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	51			

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	57			58			69					
SWD	29			24			14				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	68			71			73				4	
MUL												

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	55			56			71				4	
FRL	38			41			53				4	

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	63	64	54	70	64	35	70					
SWD	20	38	43	28	34	21	50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70	83		72	59		82					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62	61	48	69	65	42	69					
FRL	46	66	55	54	54	26	53					

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	68	56	29	74	60	41	61					
SWD	29	25	17	40	41	50	13					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	85			81								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	56	26	73	58	33	62					
FRL	48	41	31	60	54	43	43					

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	61%	61%	0%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	50%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	96%	66%	30%	54%	42%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	66%	-4%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	68%	-12%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	64%	3%	51%	16%

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.

Our area of focus is Math. Although PM1 to PM3 showed great gains for core content, we remained weak in overall proficiency.

In our intermediate grade levels, we had 2 new content area teachers and one second year teacher who were all working diligently on understanding the BEST standards and best practices to correlate. We are aiming to host a T&L Math PLC coordinated monthly for deepening support in planning and assessments.

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

Overall, Math Proficiency showed the greatest decline from 70% to 59%. In our intermediate grade levels, we had 2 new content area teachers and one second year teacher who were all working diligently on understanding the BEST standards and best practices to correlate. With the new course code for grade 6 math, our grade 5 math students came in at a lower proficiency. We are aiming to host a T&L Math PLC coordinated monthly for deepening support in planning and assessments.

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.

4th grade math 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?

With the changes upon us, ELA sustained data. In addition to core data, attendance data increased for student present on campus with the reduction of 5 day letters.

For the next steps, I have planned to maintain the vision of a true INSTRUCTIONAL leadership team. My "coaches" for all things instruction. This has helped support ownership, accountability, and foster a culture of we are in it together, for the students. In addition, I broke down 3 areas for our focus. 1- PD (book study for SIP teams) 2- Classrooms (Behavior Coaching Academy Support) 3- Students (Building on ownership and student led initiatives) Keeping a clear focus will help my team reflect and growth together.

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.

We will have 3 data priorities established. Focus on Math low quartile gains, ELA proficiency, and ESE low quartile based on historical data.

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:

Aimee Padilla (aimee_padilla@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?

All students should apply knowledge acquisition to authentic tasks and utilize self monitoring strategies. 100% of all students will work on mastery of grade level content to show standard proficiency. 100% of students will demonstrate learning gains in both ELA and Math as they work on the standard mastery.

How will we know if they learn it?

In our structured, weekly PLC's teachers will analyze benchmark data, formative assessments, and criterion referenced data to identify learning outcomes. Teachers meet every Monday K - 5 to plan ELA instruction, 3 - 5 Departmentalized Math Instruction and every Wednesday K - 2 to plan Math Instruction and 3 - 5 to review data and make instructional decisions that impact teaching and learning. In addition, students will self monitor on their weekly and quarterly student accountability charts. The Geneva Leadership team meets each Friday to review school-wide data. Using the data collection process, planning, and student monitoring our team will monitor the impact on student learning.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

In PLC's teachers will proactively analyze data, plan for instruction and differentiation for core content support. Further, teachers will use the MTSS problem solving process to monitor students data and create intervention plans to increase student learning outcomes. Geneva rotates on a 6 week monitoring cycle beginning in September. Student benchmark data is collected such as foundational phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension data to determine the best intervention approach to intervene student learning. Students are grouped based on the foundational need, time, and intensity of the intervention. Teachers will use the plans to intervene and provide individualized support for student concept attainment specific to the concept.

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

Weekly data PLC's will monitor and track student goals and standard progression. Data will be broken down into LQ and SWD to reflect on instructional needs and practices for student outcomes. Data collected: Grade Level Assessments, I-Ready, FAST

Person Responsible: Aimee Padilla (aimee_padilla@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:

Aimee Padilla (aimee_padilla@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 Reported Trusted Adults on Campus

In collaboration with our District Support Team, our staff will conduct PD sessions focusing on SEL and building relationships. Staff will enhance and refine best practices for rigorous instruction, which includes analyzing data, and making data-based decisions for our bottom quartile and enriching students.

Increase Collective Responsibility

Staff will enhance and refine best practices for rigorous instruction, which includes analyzing data, and

making data-based decisions for our bottom quartile and enriching students for advanced opportunities to ensure future ready success using a book study. SIP Committees: ELA, Math, Science, PBS

Person Responsible: Aimee Padilla (aimee_padilla@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: On going through out 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).