Sterling Park Elementary School

analysis

leadership

Florida

college and career

students

ambitious

mission

school improvement

family and community involvement

striving

achievement

teaching

relationships

needs assessment

success

resources

areas of focus

instruction

strategic planning

collaboration

vision

learning

supportive environment

growth

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sterling Park Elementary School

905 EAGLE CIR S, Casselberry, FL 32707

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0611

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.

We the students, parents and staff of Sterling Park Elementary commit ourselves to the dream of excellence. We strive to provide a positive learning environment by establishing opportunities for all students to engage in rigorous learning and become lifelong learners in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sterling Park Elementary will support the SCPS mission and vision. MISSION: The mission of the Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. VISION: Seminole County Public Schools (SCPS) will be the premier school district in the State of Florida. The district will be recognized nationally for high standards, academic performance and offering students customized educational pathways 24/7/365 in a safe and caring environment. *Every student will graduate from high school prepared for their future as a lifelong learner and a responsible citizen. * All staff members will demonstrate high expectations for student's learning and achievement. *Highly qualified, diverse, innovative, and enthusiastic, teachers, administrators, and support personnel will embody a growth mindset and be dedicated to the mission.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Langdon, Tina	Principal	School Operations, Budget, Observations, Curriculum, Support Instruction, Data, Goals, Elementary Commitments, PLCs, ESE, Gifted, A+ Monies, Promotions, Assignments, Retentions, Staffing, Class Lists, 5 Essentials, PTA, SAC, Faculty Meetings, Instructional Leader Meetings, Technology, and Code Red
Borrero, Jaimee	Assistant Principal	Observations, Curriculum, Support Instruction, School Improvement Plan, MTSS, Acceleration (Talent Development, Advanced Opportunities, Tutorial), Professional Development, Transportation (Bus Ramps, Daycare), Testing, Substitutes, Fundraisers, Instructional Plans, 504, Intern Coordinator/College Student Observations, Community Involvement/Events (Dividends/Mentors, Business Partners), Print Solutions Approvals, Discipline (Suspensions & Bullying), Recognitions (Teacher of the Year, Employee of the Year), and Marquee
Blondin, Scott	Administrative Support	Master Schedule, School/Shared Calendar, Facilities, Handbooks, Custodians, Clerical & Support Staff Evaluations, Duty Schedules, Discipline, Aggregating Data, Testing, Truancy, Food Service, Field Trips, Attendance/Truancy, Fire Drills, Health Screenings, School Maps, Pictures/Yearbooks Schedules, and Website
Ojeda-Blommel, Kerry	School Counselor	Student Study/ESE Guidance (Individual Counseling, Group Counseling, Baker Acts, Bullying), Referrals for Outside Services, FIN, Social Worker Liaison, Mental Health Liaison, 504, and MTSS
Clarke-Daniels, Bianca	Instructional Coach	Acceleration, MTSS, iReady, PLC Support, Data, Best-Practice (Kagan, HYS, Differentiation), Instructional Rounds, Side-by-Side Coaching, NEST Lead Teacher
Terrell, Patricia	Instructional Coach	i-Ready Champion, Acceleration, MTSS, Computer Club, PLC Support Data, BestPractice (Kagan, HYS, Differentiation), Instructional Rounds, Side-by-Side Coaching, Think-Map Thursdays, and Book Studies
Alcorn, Jennifer	Behavior Specialist	Positive Behavior Support, Tracking Discipline of ESE Students, Ensure Fairness and Equity with all Discipline, Supporting Relationships between ESE and General Education Teachers, MTSS, and Early Warning

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 was utilized to finalize the School Improvement Plan. The SIP will be made available on the Sterling Park Elementary Website.

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))

The Sterling Park leadership team will meet monthly to review the SIP, outlined goals, needs assessment and progress in each area. We will use data from FAST and i-ready to monitor student progress toward goals on the SIP. In particular, we will monitor learning outcomes for African American and ESE students. The SIP will be revised as needed according to student data obtained through FAST and i-ready assessments.

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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	9	23	21	16	18	20	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	5	8	3	0	0	0	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	5	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	27	27	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	28	29	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	13	15	15	16	22	0	0	0	82

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	7	8	7	25	25	0	0	0	73

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	0	5	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	6	29	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	31	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	2	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	10

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	2	13	8	8	0	0	0	35
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	0	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA		1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math		0	0	1	2	0	5	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		0	0	0	12	6	29	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		0	0	0	3	12	31	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	2	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	10

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	2	13	8	8	0	0	0	35
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*	55	61	53	58	65	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				53			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			39		
Math Achievement*	56	64	59	57	46	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				52			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			32		
Science Achievement*	53	65	54	52	65	59	57		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	77	59	59			77		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	2	2
HSP	55			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	51			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	1	1
HSP	53			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	55			56			53					74
SWD	28			29			13				5	57
ELL	36			44			40				5	74
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			19			22				3	
HSP	49			52			43				5	73
MUL	63			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			68			71				4	
FRL	44			45			38				5	74

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	58	53	48	57	52	33	52					59
SWD	25	34	31	29	37	24	15					47
ELL	55	72		53	50		38					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	25		12	24	21						
HSP	54	59	68	51	50	43	44					52
MUL	57	36		64	55							
PAC												
WHT	68	55	41	71	60	32	60					
FRL	51	55	60	46	42	33	46					52

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	60	57	39	59	52	32	57					77
SWD	29	38	23	31	39	14	35					63
ELL	42	47		42	29		27					77
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			26								
HSP	54	44	37	53	37	26	41					71
MUL	62			77								
PAC												
WHT	67	71		66	67	45	69					
FRL	50	51	42	49	43	30	46					74

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	47%	61%	-14%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	66%	-6%	58%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	60%	-2%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	66%	23%	54%	35%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	66%	2%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	68%	-6%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	19%	44%	-25%	55%	-36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	64%	-13%	51%	0%

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 in fifth grade math. Additionally, proficiency in math and reading for ESE and African American students needs to increase.

One contributing factor to this need for improvement is teacher turnover. Our plan for the upcoming school year is to maintain a positive school culture and climate. We will also ensure our new teachers are trained and retained. Another contributing factor was new curriculum for Math and ELA. To continue to improve in this area, our teachers will attend curriculum trainings and our PLC's will be built on collective responsibility. The last contributing factor is lack of small group instruction. To address this area of need our teachers will participate in data driven PLC's and learn how to drive instruction based on student need.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the prior year was proficiency in 5th grade math. The greatest factor that contributed to this outcome was that two of three 5th grade math teachers

were first year teachers who struggled with classroom management and curriculum. This issue has been resolved by removing those teachers and hiring highly effective 5th grade math teachers.

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.

5th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students in multiple subgroups.

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

The area that showed the most improvement is our growth in proficiency scores from progress monitor #1 to progress monitor #3 in Math for grades Kindergarten, 3rd grade, 4th grade and RAMP 5.

The contributing factors to these results were small group intervention instruction and the use of the B1G-M document that helped drive Math PLC's.

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.

a. Improving rigorous tier 1 core instruction.
b. Improving the implementation of intervention with fidelity.
c. Teachers participating in data driven PLC's.
d. Continued training and implementation of Restorative Practices.
e. Continued training and implementation of Conditions for Learning.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and Black/African American students. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and Black/African American students.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Tina Langdon (tina_langdon@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 make growth according to their individualized needs in order to obtain proficiency in core content including ELA, math, and science. If students are not proficient, we want them to move toward proficiency. All teachers will engage students in rigorous tier 1 instruction in order to obtain this goal.

How will we know if they learn it?
We will know if students learned it through the use of STAR and FAST progress monitoring. Teachers will also track student progress on iReady, classroom assessments and formative assessments. Student performance on assessments will be monitored by teachers and administrators. Teachers will work in PLC's to plan standards based rigorous lesson.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
If students do not learn we will differentiate instruction to meet their needs, provide small group instruction based on these needs, and focus our intervention groups on specific learning gaps. If students do not learn, PLC's will plan for differentiated small group instruction during core instruction. Teachers will plan in PLC's for standards based instruction, core instruction, use of formative assessments, and differentiated small group instruction during core instruction. Teachers will review all student data in PLC's with a focus on collective responsibility.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
This data will be monitored through progress monitoring and student led data binders where students take ownership of their own learning. We willmonitor student created data binders where students take ownership of their learning, and also through the use of frequent and scheduled data chats. Data chats will occur between teachers and students as well as between teachers and administration

Person Responsible: Tina Langdon (tina_langdon@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:

Tina Langdon (tina_langdon@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 decrease the number of discipline referrals as well as students needing to receive tiered interventions to support behavior.
To address this action plan the following will be implemented throughout the school year: restorative practices, PBIS, counseling, social emotional lessons (Mindful Mondays), behavior interventions (social emotional groups), and providing teachers with resources for students in need or crisis.

To increase collective responsibility among teachers with more teachers saying they feel collective

responsibility.

We will build collective responsibility from the inside rather than the process of the work being done. We will use surveys with teachers to improve strategies for increasing collective responsibility. Collective Responsibility will be addressed through data driven PLCs in which all teachers are collectively responsible for grade level student data, collaborative planning for differentiated instruction and small groups, and use of a school-wide data wall where all teachers monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Tina Langdon (tina_langdon@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).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

For grade 5, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will

use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The number of students in grade 5 that score below a Level 3 on the end of the year statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA, FAST and district progress monitoring assessment outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Langdon, Tina, tina_langdon@scps.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data. Utilizing results of FAST PM1 and PM2, DRA and district progress monitoring to design reading acceleration support for students. Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions. Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction. Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block. Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.	Langdon, Tina, tina_langdon@scps.k12.fl.us