

Seminole County Public Schools

# Goldsboro Elementary Magnet 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>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</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>

## Goldsboro Elementary Magnet

1300 W 20TH ST, Sanford, FL 32771

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0271>

### 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 Goldsboro Elementary Magnet School is to empower students to excel in a world of math, science, and technology through local and global collaboration in a nurturing and challenging environment.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Goldsboro Elementary School will be the premier magnet elementary school in Seminole County.

Goldsboro will be recognized in the district and the state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students customized educational pathways in the areas of science.

\*Goldsboro will support the SCPS vision that all Early Childhood Program and Pre-K through Grade 5 students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. \*All students will make a year's growth in a year's time. \*There will be equitable facilities and opportunities for all students. \*The school's personnel will be highly qualified, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated to the mission.

### 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
Mulholland, Chris	Principal	Manage all faculty and staff at the school. Responsible for the school's academic performance and for the safety of students, faculty, and staff. Provide strategic direction for the school and cultivate a positive school climate.
Froess, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with implementing school-wide goals. Works with the school principal in serving as an instructional leader of the building staff to achieve and sustain high levels of student learning and growth. Assists in the day to day operations of the school
Costanza, Alyssa	Administrative Support	Assists the principal and the assistant principal with implementing school-wide goals. Works with teachers and parents to help students who are struggling with their behavior. Assists in the day to day operations of the school.
Nolting, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Provides resources and support for teachers. Collaborates with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans and analyze data. Design and lead professional development presentations and model lessons for teachers.
Hess, Mary Lynn	Teacher, K-12	Assists with innovating our Magnet Program. Bio-Science STEM Lab Teacher.
Wakelyn, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Assists with innovating our Magnet Program. Space Lab STEM Teacher. Schoolwide technology coordinator.
Finkle, Adam	Teacher, K-12	Assists with innovating our Magnet Program. Robotics and Computer Sciences STEM Lab Teacher.

### 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.

Goldsboro's School Advisory Council has scheduled monthly meetings to discuss successes and challenges that need to be addressed as a school community. This input was used in the development of the SIP plan.

### SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP goals will be discussed at our Leadership Team meetings. The team will assess and adjust instructional practices based on the data indicating what is working to ensure school improvement goals are being met and revising implementation strategies if needed. Using the schoolwide data board, highlight individual students who are ESE students and are not progressing and then meet with both the teacher and ESE teacher to develop an actionable plan to intervene.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	83%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	38%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	22	43	29	27	22	29	0	0	0	172	
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	5	6	4	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	9	13	2	3	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	6	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	18	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	10	15	5	11	12	0	0	0	54	

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	10	15	5	15	18	0	0	0	64

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	6	7	3	0	3	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	1	5	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	6	27	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	27	0	0	0	48	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	17	

**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	4	7	5	1	7	0	0	0	25

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	5	8	6	12	0	0	0	36
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	6	7	3	0	3	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	1	5	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	6	27	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	27	0	0	0	48	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	17	

**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	4	7	5	1	7	0	0	0	25

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	5	8	6	12	0	0	0	36
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*	67	61	53	71	65	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				70			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			38		
Math Achievement*	66	64	59	66	46	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				62			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			27		
Science Achievement*	72	65	54	69	65	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	79	77	59	68			88		

\* 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	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****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>
SWD	27	Yes	4	2
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	54			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	47			

**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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	43			
HSP	58			

**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%
MUL	50			
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	67			66			72					79
SWD	19			24			45				4	
ELL	58			64			60				5	79
AMI												
ASN	87			94			95				5	92
BLK	33			23			32				4	
HSP	47			40			56				5	67
MUL	53			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	75			65			85				4	
FRL	39			35			42				5	73

**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	71	70	50	66	62	37	69					68
SWD	20	31	32	21	24	20	27					
ELL	63	75		70	63							68
AMI												
ASN	91	84		93	84		92					69

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
BLK	47	60	50	34	43	32	32					
HSP	60	69	60	52	54	25	75					71
MUL	46			54								
PAC												
WHT	72	67	40	60	55	42	74					
FRL	52	63	51	40	44	29	51					77

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	63	67	38	59	57	27	74					88
SWD	25	28	18	26	37	23	25					
ELL	55	58		50	42		55					88
AMI												
ASN	91	83		91	80		90					93
BLK	36	65	45	27	48		70					
HSP	51	50		38	35	25	46					82
MUL	69			69								
PAC												
WHT	63	60		65	43		75					
FRL	43	54	39	34	43	29	55					84

### 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	65%	61%	4%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	66%	8%	58%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	60%	12%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	66%	5%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	68%	8%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	44%	-11%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	64%	8%	51%	21%

### 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.**

5th Grade Mathematics of non RAMP students

Monitor the flow of the math block for pacing to include rigorous, grade level content, purposeful practice, and remediation.

Math intervention duration and intensity to support targeted students.

Implement a differentiated plan to improve mathematics teacher quality. Incorporate school-wide and individualized training and support. Empower mathematics teacher leaders and model classrooms.

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

5th Grade Mathematics – Non RAMP students

Most of these students were more than 1 year behind grade level mathematics.

Targeted intervention and support in the classroom was sporadic this school year due to teacher changes.

**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.**

There are no gaps when compared to the state average.

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

Mathematics in Grade 4- 76% of students were proficient which was up 7 points from 2022 data.

Utilize data to organize students to interact with content. Differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student. Use initial assessments before any unit to figure out what students have already learned and then focus on the skills and concepts students haven't mastered.

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

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

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

1. Providing teachers extended school time to meet in PLCs for planning and data analysis to include the ESE support facilitators.
2. Continue to focus on K-5 teachers collaborative planning sessions focused on target task alignment and targeted walkthroughs with specific feedback focused on a tight target task alignment to increase purposeful core instruction and differentiation for all students
3. Math intervention duration and intensity to support targeted L25 students

**Area of Focus**

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



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

**Monitoring:**

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Chris Mulholland (chris\_mulholland@scps.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

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

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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

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

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

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

What do we want all students to do?

We want students to be able to show proficiency on grade level standards as tested on the FAST.

How will we know if they learn it?

Formative Assessments, Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostics, DRA Scores

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

By using formative assessments consistently teachers can use the data to determine the level of mediation needed for each student based on grade level content standards.

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

Continue to focus on K-5 teachers collaborative planning sessions focused on target task alignment and targeted walkthroughs with specific feedback focused on target task alignment to increase purposeful core instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Chris Mulholland (chris\_mulholland@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:**

Chris Mulholland (chris\_mulholland@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.

Strengthen school safety by establishing and conducting Campus Safety Committee reviews throughout the school year.

Schoolwide walk throughs will be conducted by the safety team. Monthly meeting discussions on student discipline. Emphasizing the importance of constant supervision and buddy system.

Make relationship-building a priority by identifying the specific causes of mistrust in the school and making a sincere commitment to address them while working collaboratively on school goals.

**Person Responsible:** Chris Mulholland (chris\_mulholland@scps.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).