

Seminole County Public Schools

Stenstrom 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Stenstrom Elementary School

1800 ALAFAYA WOODS BLVD, Oviedo, FL 32765

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0681>

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.

Through the pursuit of collective excellence, Stenstrom Elementary emphasizes student-centered, collaborative, process-driven learning, ensuring that our students have the knowledge and critical thinking skills required for success in an increasingly STEM-focused global community. Our MicroSociety program ensures student voice and student choice throughout all academic and social areas of their education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stenstrom Elementary will set the standard for real life learning opportunities by preparing and inspiring generations of learners to meet the challenges of a competitive, increasingly connected global community. Students will be challenged to learn through innovation, collaboration, and project-based learning within the MicroSociety environment.

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
Novak, Jake	Principal	Sets the vision, implements the School Improvement Plan, cultivates a mindset of focus for the leadership team – prioritizes what is most important and aligns actions accordingly. Provides leadership for setting school targets and presents evidence to district of the plan for school improvement each year. Makes sure goals set in the School Improvement Plan are strategically aligned with district priorities. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals.
Specht, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about curriculum, assessment, instruction, and professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Takes responsibility for activating the school improvement plan through school-based professional learning and monitors progress, knows the school goals and selects strategies to achieve them, understands school data and uses data to set school goals, helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.
Hodges, Kristen	Administrative Support	Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about professional learning in order to improve student behavior and learning outcomes, helps create a safe and nurturing learning
Roberson, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about ELA curriculum, ELA assessment, ELA instruction, and ELA professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals. Helps set school reading goals, design strategies and monitor progress in reading. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

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.

The School Advisory Committee, which includes parents, teachers, non-instructional personnel, and community members participated in the development of the School Improvement Plan. During a meeting in August, ideas for student improvement were discussed by the committee and added to the plan. The plan is being shared in both English and Spanish and other languages by request. Comments and survey results from our Snapshot Survey were also reviewed and taken into consideration when developing goals and action steps. The plan includes strategies that will improve student achievement.

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))

To ensure effective implementation and monitor the impact of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) on increasing students' achievement in meeting the State's academic standards, especially for those with the greatest achievement gap, the school will follow a systematic and data-driven approach.

1. Data Collection and Analysis:

The leadership team will gather relevant data on student performance, including standardized test scores, classroom assessments, attendance records, and any other indicators of academic progress. This data will be disaggregated to identify subgroups of students, particularly those with the greatest achievement gap, such as students from low-income backgrounds, English language learners, and students with disabilities.

2. Goal Setting and Action Planning:

Based on the data analysis, the school will set specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals for improving student achievement. These goals will be aligned with the State's academic standards and will address the needs of the underperforming student subgroups, specifically our Students with Disabilities. The SIP outlines actionable steps and interventions to achieve these goals.

All goals will revolve around 4 main targets the school has set in place through shared leadership teams. (1. Improve student proficiency to 75%, 2. Increase learning gains to 100%, 3. Increase teacher influence, 4. Celebrate our story and our successes!)

3. Implementation and Monitoring:

Teachers, administrators, and other staff will implement the SIP's strategies and interventions in their classrooms and across the school. Regular monitoring will take place to assess the progress towards meeting the set goals. This monitoring will involve ongoing data collection, formative assessments, and progress checks. These items will be discussed within the collaborative PLCs, Leadership meetings, Team Leader meetings, Shared Leadership groups, and stakeholder meetings.

4. Professional Development and Support:

The school will provide targeted professional development to teachers and staff to equip them with the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively implement the strategies and interventions outlined in the SIP. This year we will be looking at Multisensory reading PD to help our readers who struggle with reading.

5. Evaluation and Adjustment:

At the end of each quarter and semester, the leadership team will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the SIP's effectiveness. This evaluation will involve a thorough review of student performance data, the success of implemented strategies, and feedback from stakeholders.

6. Revision and Continuous Improvement:

Based on the evaluation results, the school will identify areas of success and areas that need improvement. The SIP will be revised and updated accordingly, focusing on strengthening the successful strategies and making necessary adjustments to address any shortcomings. The revision process will be ongoing to ensure continuous improvement and alignment with changing student needs and academic standards.

By following this systematic approach, the school will continuously work towards narrowing the achievement gap and ensuring that all students make meaningful progress towards meeting the State's academic standards.

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	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
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	5	12	20	15	10	10	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	3	1	9	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	1	1	7	0	3	2	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	27	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	23	6	5	15	0	0	0	57	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	14	5	11	24	0	0	0	60

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	1	6	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	11	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	18	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	10	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	23	

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	4	2	3	5	1	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	8	7	5	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	1	6	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	11	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	18	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	10	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	23	

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	4	2	3	5	1	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	8	7	5	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*	68	61	53	72	65	56	77		
ELA Learning Gains				69			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			44		
Math Achievement*	68	64	59	68	46	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				60			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31			53		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	81	65	54	64	65	59	76		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	100	77	59	68			40		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	391
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	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	56			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	77			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	69			

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	64			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	46			
HSP	57			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	53			

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	68			68			81					100
SWD	36			36			58				5	100
ELL	33			43							4	100
AMI												
ASN	87			87							2	
BLK	41			33			36				3	
HSP	66			63			83				5	100
MUL	74			82							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			74			91				4	
FRL	54			54			72				5	100

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	72	69	61	68	60	31	64					68
SWD	42	47	45	40	36	20	30					57
ELL	71	73		56	55		63					68
AMI												
ASN	93	70		86	70							
BLK	54	65	67	29	27	36	44					
HSP	66	64	53	63	58	32	57					65
MUL	61			67								
PAC												
WHT	80	75	75	79	70	27	79					
FRL	60	64	52	55	52	25	49					69

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	77	69	44	75	70	53	76					40
SWD	42	35	18	44	41	36	35					
ELL	65	70		74	70		70					40

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
AMI												
ASN	86			93								
BLK	50			41								
HSP	72	78	50	71	68	50	65					33
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	86	67	50	83	77	57	86					
FRL	65	58	35	61	58	35	65					36

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	60%	61%	-1%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	66%	9%	58%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	60%	14%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	66%	11%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	68%	-5%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	55%	-1%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The greatest need for improvement is in our lowest quartile of math and reading.
Many of the students in our lowest quartile in both subject areas are part of our ESE subgroup.

This year our lowest performance had a few factors that proved especially challenging. Teachers were tasked with teaching a new set of standards, a new curriculum, and preparing students for a new assessment. Without adequate time to prepare, teachers were teaching curriculum as they were working with the new resources simultaneously. There was also an overemphasis on testing this year, leading to less time to prepare students to demonstrate their understanding of content knowledge.

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

5th Grade ELA was our sharpest decline during the 2022-2023 school year with a drop of 13 points to 62% proficient. There were several factors that contributed to this decrease, however, the one that continuously caused concern was the introduction of our RAMP program. The scheduling of just four classrooms with 30% of students in advanced placement math created homogeneous groupings across the grade level which created challenges for instructional groupings. Couple this with new standards, new curriculum, and new standards, and our teachers had a lot working against them from the beginning of the year.

This year we have implemented a different plan for scheduling RAMP, have a better understanding of the materials in the curriculum, have worked with the standards, and have multiple development opportunities to help grow our students throughout the year.

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.

All data components are above the state average.

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

Science scores showed significant gains.
Our 5th grade RAMP program was 100% proficient.
3rd grade reading and math demonstrated large growth throughout the year.

Science was a main focus this year for our school. We implemented science taught through special area classes, an after school science club for targeted students, and aligned our STEM class to the critical standards needed for 5th grade science assessment.

5th grade RAMP demonstrated a high level of success due to our enrollment criteria and data monitoring.

3rd grade ELA and math showed higher levels of proficiency in part due to their cohesive PLC, data monitoring, and implementation of BEST standards across all classrooms.

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 standard math course scores in 4th & 5th grade.
- Increase learning gains for our lowest quartile across all subject areas.
- Maintain and increase science scores in 5th grade.
- Reduce the number of disruptive incidents in general education classrooms.
- Continue implementation of MicroSociety program.

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 average grade level performance for students with disabilities in core subjects by to 70%. This will involve improving the quality of individualized education plans (IEPs), providing tailored small group teaching methods, offering additional learning opportunities, such as tutorial, and ensuring that support services are effectively meeting the needs of these students.

Teachers will collect baseline data using FAST and iReady at the beginning of the year. Throughout lessons, teachers will implement formative assessments and provide ongoing feedback on each student's current knowledge and skills related to the established objectives. Teacher PLCs will analyze assessment data and adjust instruction based on needs of students.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring teacher intervention plans is a crucial part of ensuring that struggling students are receiving the support they need. This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities. Administration will schedule regular meetings with teachers to discuss their student's intervention plans. During these check-ins, teachers can provide updates on their progress, challenges they're facing, and adjustments they've made to the plans. Stenstrom teachers will maintain detailed records of intervention sessions, including what was covered, progress observed, and any adjustments made. This documentation provides a clear picture of the interventions' impact. We will keep parents informed about the interventions their child is receiving. Regularly update parents on the progress being made and involve them in discussions about adjusting intervention strategies if necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jake Novak (jake_novak@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?

Define specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) learning objectives for all elementary school students. These objectives should align with academic standards and cover key subject areas such as reading, writing, math, science, and social studies. For lower quartile learners, we will consider additional objectives that address their specific needs and challenges.

Overall, our goal is that 100% of students are proficient in Math, Science, ELA, and Writing on state assessments.

How will we know if they learn it?

Implement a variety of formative and summative assessment strategies to gauge students' progress and understanding. These can include regular quizzes, tests, classroom observations, project assessments, and standardized tests. For lower quartile learners, we will consider using differentiated assessments that cater to their learning styles and abilities through our PLC conversations.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

When some students do not meet the expected learning outcomes, it's crucial to identify the root causes of their difficulties. Possible response strategies include:

- a. Targeted Interventions: Offer small-group or one-on-one support to address specific learning gaps.
- b. Differentiated Instruction: Modify teaching methods and materials to accommodate diverse learning needs.
- c. Individualized Learning Plans: Create personalized learning plans for struggling students to address their unique challenges.
- d. Parental Involvement: Collaborate with parents or guardians to reinforce learning at home.

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

Stakeholders will monitor student assessment on both FAST and district-wide RAMP assessments.

Person Responsible: Jake Novak (jake_novak@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:

Jake Novak (jake_novak@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.

Increasing Trusted Adults on Campus

Implement a mentoring/Advisory program, revamp our PBIS system with a new PBIS team, implement Social-Emotional Learning through Sanford Harmony within classrooms, provide character education , and present the question to our student leadership team.

Shared Leadership Teams

All staff will participate in shared leadership teams which include; PBIS, Resources & Budget,

Communication, Climate & Hospitality, Parents & Partners, and Microviedo. These teams will provide feedback and collective responsibility for the Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: Jake Novak (jake_novak@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).