

Seminole County Public Schools

Lake Mary Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Lake Mary Elementary School

132 S COUNTRY CLUB RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0081>

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 Lake Mary Elementary is to promote self-esteem, strong academic achievement, creativity and acceptance of responsibility through building relationships and establishing high academic expectations in a safe, positive environment that unifies staff, parents and community to prepare all students for success in real-life experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lake Mary Elementary is to ensure every students will have one year's academic growth in one year's time. Lake Mary Elementary will continue to increase overall academic achievement for all students in preparation for college and career readiness.

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
Little, Charlotte	Principal	Oversee school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students.
Bornemann, Lynette	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in the overall operation; safety of the school and ensure the academic success of all students.
Shapiro, Angela	Administrative Support	Instructional coach for teachers; assist the principal and AP in the overall operation; safety of the school; and ensure the academic success of all students.
Pitzen, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach for teachers, MTSS and curriculum support
Citrano, Lisa	School Counselor	Management of student study, exceptional student education, students with 504 plans and social-emotional instruction in classrooms.

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.

Lake Mary will actively engaged parents and the community through various collaborative methods. This involvement may include holding school advisory council meetings where parents and community members could share their input and ideas. To ensure that the plan is communicated effectively to all stakeholders, including parents, it will be presented in clear and simple language, avoiding technical jargon. Regular updates will be shared with parents and the community through newsletters, school websites, social media, and in-person meetings. This transparent communication allowed parents to stay informed about the ongoing initiatives and provided opportunities for feedback and suggestions.

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 instructional leadership team will review SIP goals at weekly meetings and discuss our current progress monitoring data to ensure our SWD are making the academic gains to close achievement gaps. We will address any needed revisions to the plan with staff and our SAC.

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	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: 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	14	24	23	17	17	15	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	7	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	12	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	3	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	29	19	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	33	17	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	16	19	16	21	13	0	0	0	89

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	4	11	8	4	27	19	0	0	0	73

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	5	6	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	24
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	0
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	6	5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	4	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	8	21	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	23	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	9	13	36	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	3	12	4	7	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	6	5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	4	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	8	21	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	23	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	9	13	36	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	3	12	4	7	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*	61	61	53	66	65	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				68			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			41		
Math Achievement*	59	64	59	68	46	50	67		
Math Learning Gains				63			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			32		
Science Achievement*	62	65	54	64	65	59	63		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	77	59	65			63		

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	47			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	51			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	70			

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	48			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	56			
HSP	53			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	54			

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	61			59			62					60
SWD	34			33			20				4	
ELL	35			35			45				5	60
AMI												
ASN	47			47							2	
BLK	38			35			33				4	
HSP	56			48			39				5	50
MUL	58			50							3	

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	70			69			76				4	
FRL	49			45			46				5	55

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	66	68	54	68	63	43	64					65
SWD	33	51	52	33	39	32	39					
ELL	45	59	64	47	55	55	43					65
AMI												
ASN	60			77								
BLK	48	66	67	50	55	57	47					
HSP	54	58	55	52	51	33	54					67
MUL	73	70		73	80							
PAC												
WHT	75	75	50	78	69	40	74					
FRL	52	62	54	52	56	45	51					57

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	66	62	41	67	57	32	63					63
SWD	37	41	41	37	38	39	38					
ELL	57			57								63
AMI												
ASN	80			80								
BLK	46			38								
HSP	59	67		54	53	20	52					70
MUL	70			90								
PAC												
WHT	73	68	40	77	64	50	75					
FRL	56	57	44	58	60	42	58					58

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	66%	61%	5%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	66%	3%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	97%	66%	31%	54%	43%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	66%	-4%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	68%	5%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	44%	-7%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	64%	-4%	51%	9%

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 SWD demonstrate the greatest need for improvement in math and ELA.

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills.

Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

Training sessions on evidence-based reading instruction and literacy strategies are beneficial.

Professional development in building strong Professional Learning Communities will help strengthen core instruction.

Teachers and leadership team will work collaboratively in the following strategic steps: 1. Conduct a comprehensive assessment of students' reading abilities to identify specific areas of improvement and analyze the data to understand individual and group reading strengths and weaknesses. 2. Develop individualized reading differentiated plans for students based on their assessment results as well as tailor interventions and instructional approaches to address each student's unique needs and learning style. 3. Leadership team will provide professional development for teachers to enhance their knowledge and skills in teaching reading.

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

Our SWD showed the greatest decline. Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills.

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?

Our 4th grade math proficiency rate showed the most improvement.

The 4th grade team disaggregated data weekly to determine how to differentiate instruction students needed to close achievement gaps.

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.

- Increase the percentage of proficiency in ELA and math for SWD.
- Increase the percentage of proficiency for all students to 70% for ELA, Math, and Science.
- Ensure learning gains for all students reach a percentage of 70% for ELA and Math

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:

Charlotte Little (charlotte_little@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 possess a strong foundation in core reading & writing with the help of explicit and systematic foundational skill instruction. . They should be able to comprehend and critically analyze information, solve problems, and express themselves effectively.

How will we know if they learn it?

Students' progress through formative and summative assessments including, but not limited to unit tests, iReady diagnostic, and FAST assessments.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Teachers will disaggregate assessment data to determine deficiencies and make instructional adjustments including differentiating instruction to meet students' needs as well as implementing effective instructional strategies.

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

Administration and the instructional coach will conduct walkthroughs to monitor our action plan. Informal and formal observational feedback will be provided to teachers. Coaching cycles based on feedback will be conducted to ensure students are making adequate progress.

Person Responsible: Charlotte Little (charlotte_little@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:

Charlotte Little (charlotte_little@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.

We will continue to implement the Ron Clark Academy House System school-wide to join students and staff together. This character-building program helps students and staff form strong relationships ensuring students will indicate they have a trusted adult on campus.

Teachers will be active partners in school improvement through committing to a focus on professional development.

Person Responsible: Charlotte Little (charlotte_little@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).