Keeth Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Keeth Elementary School

425 TUSKAWILLA RD, Winter Springs, FL 32708

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0061

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 Allan F. Keeth Elementary School is to maximize the individual potential of each student by providing a safe, nurturing environment that facilitates love for learning and respect for self and others. Through the utilization of technology and open communication between school, family, and community, we will promote responsible decision making that will prepare students to be productive citizens in a changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Keeth Elementary School will be recognized at the district and state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students customized educational pathways. Keeth will support the SCPS vision that every student will graduate from high school prepared for the future as a lifelong learner and responsible citizen in democratic society. All of Keeth students will perform at their highest levels. 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
Tilley, Carol Lynn	Principal	Oversee the daily operation and activities at the school, including but not limited to instruction, campus safety, school improvement, school culture and climate, family and community involvement.
Brown, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in overseeing the daily operation and activities at the school, including but not limited to instruction, campus safety, school culture and climate, family and community involvement.
Klump, Rebecca	School Counselor	Works with staff, students, and families to support social-emotional well-being, identify behavior needs and develop intervention plans, participate in MTSS, guide the Student Study Team, conduct 504 meetings, coordinate with school social worker and LMHC, conduct risk assessments and communicate concerns with administration.
Halerz, Sean	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with teachers in the implementation of instructional technology and increase students' achievement. In addition, they will support the instructional coach by attending the math and science cohort meetings, and co-leading MTSS.

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.

Keeth Elementary involves parents, staff and the community in developing the plan collaboratively. Input is through the SAC committee and guests, PTA, Team Leader and staff meetings and through the 5Essential and Safety surveys. Our focus is on safety, academic proficiency and growth, as well as students emotional well being.

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))

Monitoring for effective implementation of the SIP will take place during weekly Leadership Team meetings. We will look at each action step and monitor that it is being completed and what the impact on students' academic growth has been. We will monitor proficiency and growth of all students, along with proficiency and growth of SWD and black students. The SIP will also be monitored during monthly SAC meetings. The SAC team will look at the individual components of Quality Instruction, Conditions for Learning, and Future Ready to determine needed support, next steps, and any revisions that are needed.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	12	10	9	13	16	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	8	10	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	1	2	4	10	0	0	0	21

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	0	1	2	2	6	12	0	0	0	23

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	11	13	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	13	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	11	13	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	13	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The Grade Level header spans columns K through 8.

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*	76	61	53	75	65	56	76		
ELA Learning Gains				62			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			44		
Math Achievement*	74	64	59	73	46	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				60			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			24		
Science Achievement*	78	65	54	71	65	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	82	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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	391
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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
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	30	Yes	2	2
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	75			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	80			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
FRL	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	68			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	48			

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	76			74			78					82
SWD	28			28			38				4	
ELL	54			50							3	82
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			42							2	
HSP	76			70			77				4	
MUL	63			65							2	

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	78			78			83				4	
FRL	63			61			65				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	75	62	46	73	60	41	71					
SWD	36	30	19	27	25	11	37					
ELL	67			60								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			30								
HSP	80	69		72	64	47	76					
MUL	69	60		77	50							
PAC												
WHT	76	61	47	74	59	37	70					
FRL	60	53	42	57	45	29	50					

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	76	66	44	77	63	24	70					
SWD	40	55		45	36		27					
ELL	90			70								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			38								
HSP	76	62		68	62		69					
MUL	69			62								
PAC												
WHT	78	69	55	84	67		75					
FRL	65	60	50	54	40		45					

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	78%	61%	17%	54%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	66%	12%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	60%	17%	50%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	66%	13%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	68%	7%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	44%	21%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	64%	16%	51%	29%

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.

The greatest areas of need will be increasing proficiency for black students and SWDs. Another area to pay attention to will be learning gains for all students.

A contributing factor is not monitoring data specifically for these sub-groups. New actions to be taken will be to monitor data for these two sub-groups. Many Students with a Disability at Keeth participate in the Curriculum Project for intervention instruction. To support monitoring of growth, an administrator will attend weekly CP meetings. In addition, data for black students and SWD will be monitored during bi-

weekly data meetings with the leadership team. Another action to be taken is to focus on Core instruction and monitoring data during PLC meetings.

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

While the overall scores in ELA and Math saw an increase at Keeth, the ESSA finding groups of Black Students and Students with Disabilities saw a decline. Sixty-seven percent of our SWD students are not proficient in either ELA or Math. Our Black students perform slightly better with 50% proficient in ELA and 42% of black students proficient in Math. One impact on these percentages is the low numbers of black students at Keeth. Another area of impact on our SWD and Black students was in the implementation of new curriculum. Teachers were continuing to learn the BEST standards while also implementing the new Wonders and EnVision Math programs. Additionally, this was Keeth's first year in the Curriculum Project. These changes impact our SWD and Black Students and their decline.

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?

Walk-throughs were conducted regularly to monitor instruction, and feedback was provided. The focus of feedback was to identify high impact instructional strategies that were in use and to provide positive feedback.

To accelerate learning, the focus will be on monitoring Core instruction, providing feedback for areas of strength and areas of growth, monitoring data and determining needs, then providing intervention and enrichment using identify materials.

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.

• Strong Core instruction to include guided reading and small group math instruction to address appropriate needs of students.
• Interventions and enrichments will be monitored to insure all children have the skills and support needed to make growth.
• Increased focus on data both in PLCs and as a Leadership Team. -Creation of a common data spreadsheet.
• Focused monitoring of PLCs to communicate the expectation of data collection and data driven instruction.
• Partnership with SCPS ESSS and NIFDI to maximize the benefits of the Curriculum project for our SWD 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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 and Black/African American students. 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 and Black/African American students.

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:

Carol Lynn Tilley (carollynn_webb@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?
Keeth Elementary wants all students to gain an understanding of and mastery of their grade level benchmarks in Reading, Writing, Math, Science, and Social Studies. In addition, Keeth wants students to reach proficiency and make a learning gain as measured by the FAST PM 3 assessment. We will monitor subgroup data for SWDs and black students in particular through MTSS and PLCs.

How will we know if they learn it?
The goal is for all students to reach a minimum of 70% mastery of all grade level benchmarks. Progress monitoring will include classroom assessments, DRA, fluency, iReady, and FAST PM. For the FAST PM3 assessment, the goal is for 80% of students to score at level 3 or higher and for at least 62% of students to show a learning gain. We plan to give the assessments, meet to discuss the date, and plan next steps.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
During PLC, mastery of benchmarks will be monitored, the barrier(s) to learning will be identified, and support will be provided through intervention and/or enrichment instruction. This support might include small group instruction during Core instruction, through Curriculum Project and/or intervention instruction, or after school tutorial instruction.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
Data spreadsheet
PLC notes
Classroom assessments
iReady data
FAST PM

Person Responsible: Carol Lynn Tilley (carollynn_webb@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:

Carol Lynn Tilley (carollynn_webb@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.

The goal is for students to feel safer by identifying a trusted adult on campus.
We are implementing weekly SEL time on Wednesday of each week to teach students how to build positive relationships with peers and others. We will also be delivering PD on SEL and PBIS to support teachers in building a positive classroom culture.

All school staff will take responsibility for improving the school to increase learning gains for all students. During pre-plan a need for a different coaching structure was identified and staff, schedules, and

responsibilities were reworked to be able to support two instructional coaches, one in ELA/SS and one in Math/Science. Time was built into their schedules to not only work with students, but to be able to have time to support teachers with improving their craft. Administration and instructional coaches will work with teams in PLCs to build understanding of collective responsibility.

Person Responsible: Carol Lynn Tilley (carollynn_webb@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing throughout 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).