

Seminole County Public Schools

# Geneva Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

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

## 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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

|                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                                                                                                                     | Active                                                                                                                            |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)                                                                                                      | Elementary School<br>PK-5                                                                                                         |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)                                                                                                               | K-12 General Education                                                                                                            |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>                                                                                                                         | No                                                                                                                                |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>                                                                                                                                 | 24%                                                                                                                               |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>                                                                                                         | 46%                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Charter School</b>                                                                                                                                        | No                                                                                                                                |
| <b>RAISE School</b>                                                                                                                                          | No                                                                                                                                |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024                                                                                                       | ATSI                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>                                                                                                | No                                                                                                                                |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b>                                                                                                                                 | 2021-22: B                                                                                                                        |

|                                                                 |                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: B |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>                        |                                        |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>                        |                                        |

### 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**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| FRL                  | 44                                     |                           |                                                              |                                                              |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| 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).