Wilson Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wilson Elementary School

985 S ORANGE BLVD, Sanford, FL 32771

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0231

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wilson Elementary is dedicated to providing a safe, professional and enriching learning environment for students. Our educators believe that all children can be successful with rigorous academic standards and achievement goals. Staff members model the learning process through collaborative professional learning communities for continuous school improvement. Our students are creative problem-solvers, growth-minded critical thinkers and caring contributors. Highly engaging differentiated instruction, research-based teaching and learning strategies and an emphasis on STEM fields develop future ready students. We value and embrace the diversity and rich history of our outstanding community. We welcome families to become engaged partners in their child's learning experience. Positive relationships among stakeholders are at the core of our values and success.

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
Dunaye, Rod	Principal	School Principal; Instructional Leader; analyzes & interprets school data and determines overall school improvement goals; sets school vision; oversees school Leadership Team; supervises teachers, clerical, non-instructional employees, custodians, etc. Works with PTA and SAC, along with dividend volunteers on campus. Monitors/updates school website and electronic marquee. Facilitates PLCs with grade level teachers and departments.
Wells, Karen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal; Testing coordinator for i-Ready and F.A.S.T. assessments; coordinator for school pictures, college volunteers; school master calendar; supervision of teachers and non-instructional employees; discipline.
Riedel, Kelly	Administrative Support	PBS, Discipline, MTSS, Facilities; campus work orders; fundraisers, coordinating campus events for PTA. Supervisor of custodial and clerical employees; Assists administration with daily tasks. LEA.
Herrin, Elaina	Instructional Coach	MTSS; Lead of Literacy committee & PLCs; i-Ready champion. Facilitates PLC meetings with grade level teachers; participates in monthly cluster meetings with TOAs and peer reading coaches from the district. N.E.S.T (new teacher) mentor
Mireles, Amy	Instructional Coach	MTSS; Lead of Mathematics committee & PLCs; facilitates grade level PLCs with teachers; Dreambox champion; Physics Bus coordinator.
Cameron, Eric	School Counselor	Student Study, ESE, Mental Health; PCM certified; works closely with Staffing Resource Specialist, School Psychologist; district Mental Health counselor, and Social worker.

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.

Wilson Elementary works closely with all stakeholders to ensure voices are heard and opinions are considered in the decision making process. The Wilson community including but not limited to SAC, PTA, and parent groups play a large role in the collaborative model which make the school a success for all students.

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))

At Wilson Elementary, our Leadership Team will review the SIP goals in our weekly leadership meetings. Also, we plan to involve our grade level team leaders in these discussions during our bi-weekly team sessions. This will then spill over into our weekly PLCs with teachers and data reviews.

Official Professional Development opportunities, titled PLCs/SIP, will occur quarterly to review the School Improvement Plan goals and action steps. All stakeholders responsible will be involved & held accountable.

The district has created Semester 1 and Semester 2 Professional Development for the teachers. The teachers will be tasked with reviewing the SIP plan and demonstrating evidence to administration of their efforts to meet the goals.

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	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
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: A 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	9	22	30	12	9	17	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	7	2	7	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	4	13	1	0	2	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	1	2	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	16	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	20	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	9	16	10	9	13	0	0	0	59

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	2	4	11	4	11	19	0	0	0	51

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	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
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	0	4	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	15	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	15	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	3	2	4	6	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	3	9	4	3	0	0	0	23
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	0	4	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	15	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	15	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	3	2	4	6	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	3	9	4	3	0	0	0	23
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*	70	61	53	79	65	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				73			73		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			58		
Math Achievement*	76	64	59	79	46	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				77			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			38		
Science Achievement*	79	65	54	77	65	59	81		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	77	77	59	91			69		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	595
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	48			
HSP	67			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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	52			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	86			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	48			
HSP	73			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	72			
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	70			76			79					77
SWD	30			42			31				4	
ELL	46			77			80				4	77
AMI												
ASN	83			89			92				4	
BLK	50			47			47				3	
HSP	63			69			69				5	64
MUL	60			75							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	74			79			85				4	
FRL	49			57			54				5	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	79	73	60	79	77	59	77					91
SWD	32	37	26	43	56	45	25					
ELL	63	85		84	90	100						91
AMI												
ASN	86	87		95	85		83					
BLK	61	48	42	44	55	40	46					
HSP	74	78	69	67	78	72	73					
MUL	71			93								
PAC												
WHT	82	71	61	81	77	53	82					
FRL	62	61	54	64	70	55	57					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	83	73	58	80	59	38	81					69
SWD	49	44	27	59	33		57					
ELL	63	18		70	55		60					69
AMI												
ASN	89	70		93	73		95					
BLK	66			44								
HSP	79	61		72	43		68					
MUL	79			93								
PAC												
WHT	85	77	71	84	58	44	83					
FRL	66	52	42	62	45	33	67					58

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide
assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or
all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	58%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	97%	66%	31%	54%	43%
03	2023 - Spring	82%	66%	16%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	68%	12%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	64%	15%	51%	28%

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.**

Focusing on our Students with Disabilities subgroup, we show eight Level 1 students, one Level 2
student, and two Level 3 students for the F.A.S.T. ELA (grade 3). Then eight Level 1 students, six Level
2 students, and two Level 3 students for the F.A.S.T. ELA (grade 4). Finally, we have nine Level 1
students, six Level 2 students, and two level 3 students for the F.A.S.T. ELA (grade 5).

For F.A.S.T. Math, grade 3, we have three Level 1 students, four Level 2 students, and three Level 3
students. Grade 4 shows we have nine Level 1 students, five Level 2 students, and two Level 3 students.
Finally, grade 5 showed twelve Level 1 students, two Level 2 students, and two Level 3 students.

Areas to focus on:
4th grade ELA (big drop of 9 points);
5th grade ELA (big drop of 10 points);

4th grade Math (big drop of 3 points)
5th grade Math (focus on Non-RAMP students).

Factors included: all new instructional materials, curriculum, standards, and F.A.S.T. testing. RAMP programs for grades 4 and 5 were launched as well. Administrators, teachers, and non-instructional staff were trained in all of these areas. Plus, we added 3 administrations of F.A.S.T. versus the prior of 1 administration of FSA testing.

Our Students with Disabilities continued to be an ESSA finding for Wilson. We were fortunate to gain a 3rd allocation for an ESE Support Facilitator this coming school year. This additional teacher will add further support and work with our teachers and ESE students in a more consistent manner. The district will provide additional B.E.S.T. training this summer and we will refocus PLCs.

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

In reviewing our school-wide data, our biggest deficit is in 5th grade ELA. Our data decreased by 10 points (85% to 75% - students scoring Level 3+). Factors might include the transition to new standards, new textbook series (Wonders), new state assessment (F.A.S.T.), and finally new testing format (i.e. now a computer-based test and also with 3 administrations/progress monitoring throughout the school year).

We are still filling achievement and learning gaps from the pandemic years and loss of learning. Academic Recovery will continue to be a key focus for the next few years until all students meet mastery of skills and standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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?

An i-Ready data comparison from Diagnostic 1 to final diagnostic in grades K-5 for Math shows a decrease in students 3 or more grade levels below from 2% to 1%, a decrease of students two grade levels below from 6% to 2%, and a decrease from 54% to 17% one grade level below. There was an increase from 19% to 26% of our students who were Early on grade level and an increase from 19% to 54% of students mid or above grade level on their last math diagnostic.

Our F.A.S.T. data shows the following in grades 3-5 from PM1 to PM3:

Grade 3 Math - decrease from 42% at Level 1 to 6%
Grade 3 Reading - decrease from 35% Level 1 to 13%

Grade 4 Math - decrease from 45% Level 1 to 13%
Grade 4 Reading - decrease from 25% Level 1 to 11%

Grade 5 Math - decrease from 66% Level 1 to 29%

Grade 5 Reading - decrease from 23% level 1 to 12%

For Statewide Science Assessment, Wilson students went from a 77% to 79% achievement level (level 3+). This ranked us in the top 5 of all elementary schools in Seminole County.

A big factor would be ensuring that our teachers provided stronger differentiation during instruction, especially Math.

Also, our intervention teacher along with being in Year 2 of the Curriculum Project. This program really pushed our ESE students to enhance their reading skills, allowing for them to better understand and process Math word problems and comprehension.

Finally, our morning Tutorial program serviced approximately 60 students, four days a week. Our teachers utilized i-Ready toolkit resources along with supplemental resources from the textbook series.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1.Our 4th & 5th grade ELA instruction and progress monitoring
2 -Writing instruction (all grades K-5)
3 -Mental Health training for teachers & Social Emotional Learning education for students
4 -Fidelity with Curriculum Project daily lessons (Year 3 of the program)
5 - Administration's participation in weekly PLCs and classroom walk through visits (to provide feedback to our teachers).

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:
Rod Dunaye (rod_dunaye@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 strive for our Low 30 students to make at least one year's growth in one year's time. Also, to be proficient in their grade level in all subjects, as well as gaining confidence in their abilities to perform well on assessments (unit, benchmark, i-Ready, and F.A.S.T.), increase study skills, and lower test anxiety.

How will we know if they learn it?
Know the achievement target that students are aspiring to reach, know where the students are now in relation to that expectation, and know how to close the gap between the two.

Student reflections, exit tickets, assessments, and classroom discussions.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
Frequent monitoring of each student's learning. Raise all students' achievement, close achievement gaps between subgroups, and ensure a safe learning environment. Provide these students with additional time and support for learning in a timely, directive, and systematic way. Continue to build a collaborative culture.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
Curriculum Project lessons and assessment data; Formative and Summative assessments; Classroom walk-through observation by administrators; i-Ready Diagnostic results; RAMP Math Benchmark assessments results. Review of student-led conferences with math and reading individual data journals

Person Responsible: Rod Dunaye (rod_dunaye@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:

Rod Dunaye (rod_dunaye@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.

Creating a vision and environment of School Connection & Security for ALL Wilson Elementary Students. Based on safety surveys completed during the 2022-2023 school year, the students scored a 7.9 on a scale of 1-10, rating how safe they feel at school. We observed two areas which students were not as comfortable, which include the lunchroom/cafeteria and while riding on the bus. These two areas will be a target focus at weekly Leadership meetings, PLCs with teachers, monthly PBS meetings, & grade level assemblies. Administrators will continue to work with the SRD and other stakeholders to monitor & improve.

Focus on Collective Responsibility

Teachers noted they would like to better: help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom. Take responsibility for improving the school, feel responsible that all students learn, share what they are doing in the classroom with colleagues, and for helping students develop self-control.

Person Responsible: Rod Dunaye (rod_dunaye@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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).