

Seminole County Public Schools

Red Bug 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

Red Bug Elementary School

4000 RED BUG LAKE RD, Casselberry, FL 32707

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0511>

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.

Red Bug Elementary is dedicated to providing the highest level of education to all students while increasing achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe all students can succeed with BUGS behavior; Be Responsible, Use Respect, Grow Every Day, and Stay Safe.

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
Thacker, Teresa	Principal	Oversees all operations of the school, budget, observations, curriculum, data, goals, Elementary Commitments, PLCs, ESE, 504, MTSS, retentions, staffing, Community Involvements, 5 Essentials and SnapShot Surveys, SIP, PTA, SAC, emergency drills, professional development, facilities, interns, retention of staff,
Sweeney, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Support in overseeing all operations of the school, observations, curriculum, data, Elementary Commitments, SIP, ESE, MTSS, Gifted, PLCs, WIN time, professional development, transportation, testing, substitutes, fundraisers, Teach In, discipline, bullying, duty schedules, field trips, health screenings, website
Burkett, Richard	Administrative Support	Responsibilities: Work orders, facilities, pictures/yearbook schedules, Community Involvement Events, 5 Essentials, SnapShot Survey, emergency drills, field trips, school calendar, Custodial/Clerical Staff, transportation, Teach In, truancy, website
Everson, Tiffany	School Counselor	Coordinate ESE and MTSS responsibilities, provide SEL resources/training to staff and students.
Heins, Tami	Instructional Coach	Support teachers/students with reading resources/strategies. Oversee Tier 2 and Interventions, PD, book studies, Early Warning, support with BEST Standards, Instructional Leaders, Leadership
Redding, Victoria	Other	Supports Teachers/students with interventions, Instructional Leaders, Leadership

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.

Data from the 5 Essentials and the Snapshot Survey were utilized to determine areas we need to improve upon as a school. Additionally, feedback from the School Advisory Council (SAC) was utilized to finalize the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP will be posted on Red Bug's website for all stakeholders to access.

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))

Red Bug Elementary will monitor our SIP every quarter as progress monitoring data is available. Additionally, we will monitor those students with the greatest achievement gap through the Multi-Tiered System of Support process and our PLC questions. This will provide a natural way to focus on our students identified through the ESSA findings (black students).

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	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	5	29	26	18	25	14	0	0	0	117	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	2	4	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	14	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	28	0	0	0	50	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	15	7	15	11	0	0	0	53	

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	4	9	1	19	19	0	0	0	52

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	1	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	1	4	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	15	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	18	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	27	

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	9	8	5	1	3	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	5	7	4	1	0	0	0	27
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	1	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	1	4	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	15	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	18	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	27	

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	9	8	5	1	3	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	5	7	4	1	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	61	53	73	65	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				69			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			30		
Math Achievement*	60	64	59	65	46	50	67		
Math Learning Gains				59			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			22		
Science Achievement*	73	65	54	65	65	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	77	77	59	79			85		

* 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	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
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	44			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	45			
HSP	63			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	74			

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	59			

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	47			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	65			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			60			73					77
SWD	43			36			47				4	
ELL	43			57			40				4	77
AMI												
ASN	86			86							2	
BLK	43			33			60				3	
HSP	66			48			67				5	74
MUL	65			65							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			71			80				4	
FRL	55			46			63				5	81

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	73	69	52	65	59	35	65					79
SWD	41	61	58	45	51	35	38					
ELL	66	67		59	67		58					79
AMI												
ASN	88	92		76	75							
BLK	48	50	36	42	41	27	38					
HSP	72	70	55	66	61	42	62					90
MUL	65			53								
PAC												
WHT	78	69	54	69	60	30	72					
FRL	66	63	47	55	59	36	63					88

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	69	65	30	67	45	22	66					85
SWD	33	37	21	43	16	18	24					
ELL	48	70		52	55		45					85
AMI												
ASN	85			77								
BLK	45			29								
HSP	68	62	36	60	33		65					80
MUL	73			87								
PAC												
WHT	70	64	25	72	47	13	65					
FRL	54	48	26	53	31	17	49					82

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	67%	61%	6%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	58%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	50%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	66%	-4%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	68%	-1%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	55%	-19%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The greatest need for improvement is our growth in proficiency for students in ELA in third through fifth grade. Additionally the need for growth in proficiency in math from third to fourth grade.

One contributing factor was the new curriculum for Math and ELA. We will continue to improve by providing opportunities for our teachers to participate in professional learning focused on the curriculum. We focus on collective responsibility in our PLCs. Another contributing factor is the need to continue to increase our mini-lessons and small group instruction. The small group instruction will be differentiated and data driven.

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

When comparing grade levels, proficiency declined as the students moved from third through fifth grade in ELA. When comparing grade levels, proficiency declined in math scores from third to fourth grade. One contributing factor was the new curriculum for Math and ELA. We will continue to improve by providing opportunities for our teachers to participate in professional learning focused on the curriculum. We focus on collective responsibility in our PLCs. Another contributing factor is the need to continue to increase our mini-lessons and small group instruction. The small group instruction will be differentiated, and data driven.

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?

The areas that showed the most growth were in 5th grade Math and Science.

We sat aside time for Math Intervention in the Master Schedule. We also participate in a Cluster Wide Science Initiative. Our teachers dug deep into the Science progress monitoring

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 proficiency levels in ELA in grades 3-5.
- Increase proficiency levels in Math in grades 3 and 4.
- Increase proficiency levels of black students in all subject areas.
- Increase collective responsibility of all teachers grades K-5.

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 Black/African-American**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 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 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:

Teresa Thacker (teresa_thacker@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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

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

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

What do we want all students to do?

We want all students to grow according to their needs in order to accelerate beyond proficiency.

How will we know if they learn it?

We will know if students learned the curriculum and benchmarks through STAR and FAST progress monitoring. Teachers will also monitor student progress through iReady and classroom assessments and data.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

If the students do not learn, we will differentiate their instruction to meet their specific and individual needs, provide small group instruction, and focus our interventions on specific skills and learning gaps.

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

This data will be monitored through progress monitoring and through student led data conferences.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

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:

Teresa Thacker (teresa_thacker@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.

To address this action plan we will implement the following throughout the school year: PBIS, Conditions for Learning, counseling, class meetings, social skills groups led by our Guidance Counselor and our Social Worker, and begin to implement Restorative Practices. We will conduct professional learning for all faculty and staff.

Red Bug will have a decrease of referrals from the classroom and from the Campus Restaurant. More faculty and staff will participate in the PBIS initiatives by issuing more Red Bug Tickets (RBTS) and through PBIS fidelity checks.

Collective Responsibility will be addressed through grade level PLCs and Articulation meetings. Red Bug will monitor this action plan through PLCs which are teacher led and the team members take ownership of their roles in the PLC.

Person Responsible: Teresa Thacker (teresa_thacker@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

To address this action plan we will implement the following throughout the school year: PBIS, Conditions for Learning, counseling, class meetings, social skills groups led by our Guidance Counselor and our Social Worker, and begin to implement Restorative Practices. We will conduct professional learning for all faculty and staff.

Red Bug will have a decrease of referrals from the classroom and from the Campus Restaurant. More faculty and staff will participate in the PBIS initiatives by issuing more Red Bug Tickets (RBTS) and through PBIS fidelity checks.

Collective Responsibility will be addressed through grade level PLCs and Articulation meetings. Red Bug will monitor this action plan through PLCs which are teacher led and the team members take ownership of their roles in the PLC.

Person Responsible: Teresa Thacker (teresa_thacker@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).