Layer Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Layer Elementary School

4201 SR 419, Winter Springs, FL 32708

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0121

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 Layer Elementary School is To Build a Community of Confident Problem Solvers and Productive Citizens of Tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

One Year's Growth in One Year's Time: Accelerate Beyond Proficiency to Mastery

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
Todd, Lindsay	Principal	Instructional Leader, SAC/PTA Administrator, MTSS/SST Facilitator, Facilities, School Budget, HR Components, and Monitor SIP
Wright, Artranise	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Test Coordinator, Professional Development Coordinator, Discipline, Business Partner/Dividend Coordinator, and Monitor SIP
Borrazzo, Kristi	Instructional Technology	Computer Technology Facilitator, PBIS Facilitator, Media Specialist, and School Communication
Holcomb, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, Monitors Reading data, Facilitates Reading/Writing/Social Studies PLCs, iReady Champion, PD Facilitator, Reading Intervention/MTSS Facilitator
Mahon, Heather	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, Monitors Math Data, Facilitates Math/Science PLCs, iReady Champion, PD Facilitator, Monitors Math Intervention, MTSS Facilitator
Akins, Neva	School Counselor	Attendance, Behavior Support, Student Study Meetings, 504 Meetings, SEL Support to teachers, Counseling Support
Botens, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Instruction and Support, Spanish Liaison, Wellness Champion, Intervention Support

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.

Layer Elementary included the data collected from the 5 Essentials Survey completed in the spring to focus on all areas that were areas of growth. At the first SAC meeting of the 2023-2024 school year, achievement data from 2022-2023 will be shared (iReady and FAST). The SIP will also be shared at this meeting so the stakeholders can be part of the intentional planning.

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 Leadership team meets weekly and we link all student focused support to our School Improvement Plan. We review the document monthly to ensure that we have aligned our PLCs/PDs to the overall missions. As we adjust the instructional needs based on data, we will adjust teacher and student supports.

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	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
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: C

	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	10	21	16	14	13	12	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	22	9	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	18	8	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	8	12	13	13	5	0	0	0	52

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	6	7	6	21	7	0	0	0	47

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	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	2	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	15	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	2	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	15	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

(Grade Level spans columns K–8 in header)

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*	64	61	53	63	65	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				57			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			26		
Math Achievement*	67	64	59	55	46	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				45			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26			5		
Science Achievement*	58	65	54	60	65	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	94	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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	36	Yes	4	
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	68			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	69			

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	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%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	1	1
HSP	46			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	64			67			58					94
SWD	32			40			32				4	
ELL	73			55							3	94
AMI												
ASN	75			83							2	
BLK	44			37			29				3	
HSP	60			68			60				5	93
MUL	54			54							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	72			74			66				4	
FRL	52			55			42				5	92

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	63	57	30	55	45	26	60					
SWD	40	46	25	22	38	24	30					
ELL	46	50		62	50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	39		28	24	18	15					
HSP	57	49		43	50	36	39					
MUL	46			38								
PAC												
WHT	74	66	57	67	45	20	80					
FRL	50	44	29	41	35	20	43					

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	61	45	26	54	30	5	47					
SWD	31	25	20	27	5		24					
ELL	47			53								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	31		21	0		17					
HSP	58	40		42	40		58					
MUL	18			18								
PAC												
WHT	74	54		69	35	10	53					
FRL	47	37	27	38	19	0	39					

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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide</u>
<u>assessments</u>.

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	57%	61%	-4%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	66%	10%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	60%	-2%	50%	8%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	66%	-7%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	68%	18%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	44%	-12%	55%	-23%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	64%	-7%	51%	6%

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.

Reading - Informational Text
Math - Geometric Reasoning, Measurement, Data Analysis and Probability
Science - Nature of Science, Earth Space Science

Factors that contributed to this need for improvement include lack of student prerequisites, vertical understanding with teachers of standard expectations, and initial ability to analyze data trends to know next steps for instruction.

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

While learning gains were evident and proficiency overall proficiency increased in ELA, third and fifth grade reflected decreases in students' overall performance. All students participated in our differentiated walk-to for reading four days a week and guided reading groups were happening in each classroom daily. We will continue to remain focused on Core Instruction with increased rigor in instruction and monitor the extent to which teachers utilize instructional strategies that most strongly increase students' mastery of the grade level standards.

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?

Overall for Grades 3-5 according to the Math FAST Assessment, we went from 55% proficiency to 65% proficiency. We were able to maintain our 63% proficiency in ELA on PM3.

Contributing factors to this improvement include intentional planning linked to progress monitoring data, task alignment with practice during small group instruction, differentiated teacher small group instruction, and walk to intervention for all students.

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- ELA Learning Gains
2- Math Learning Gains
3- Science Proficiency
4- Consistent Conditions for Learning Practices
5- Intentional Monitoring of daily practice and analysis of data trends

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, Black/African American and free/reduced lunch 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, Black/African American students and FRL 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:

Lindsay Todd (lindsay_todd@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 will be able to take ownership of their learning through goal setting and consistent feedback through teacher-student data chats. Students will be able to reflect on their learning and connect their practices to their achievement goals.

How will we know if they learn it?
Students will share their thinking and learning through exit tickets or simple reflections after each lessons. We will utilize that formative data pieces to drive our instruction and small group planning. Through the PLC process teachers will work to develop task aligned practices based on the formative data and overall summative data results.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
We will provide walk-to support and differentiated small group instruction for all students in the areas of Reading and Math.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
Analyzing formative assessments and Unit/Topic assessments and District assessments will help all instructional staff to monitor the extend of growth and needs of improvement. Through the use of mentoring, interventionist support within classroom rotations, and student data-chats there will be an increase in student achievement of our lowest 30 subgroup.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Todd (lindsay_todd@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:

Lindsay Todd (lindsay_todd@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 link all behaviors to PRIDE PBIS expectations. We will use weekly MVP awards, positive notes, and Lucky Bucks to reward student performance in all areas on campus. In addition ,we will celebrate student academic growth after each progress monitoring assessment.
We will review discipline data at each monthly PBIS meeting and analyze trends to determine areas of focus. The leadership team will analyze progress monitoring data to determine growth and appropriate rewards.

Relationship building and clear communication with all stakeholders.
We will provide ongoing review of Layer PRIDE expectations, daily SEL morning meetings, and provide weekly updates to our families through our school wide newsletter.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Todd (lindsay_todd@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).