

Seminole County Public Schools

Seminole County Virtual Franchise (Scvs) School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Seminole County Virtual Franchise (Scvs)

450 TECHNOLOGY PARK, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/virtualschool>

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.

Our mission is to provide students with state-of-the-art educational opportunities to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed academically and personally using a technological environment that creates flexibility for time, space, access, and support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To expand, improve, and innovate educational pathways that lead to success for all students in a 21st century, globalized and technology rich world.

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
Camilleri, Deborah	Principal	Oversees all aspects of Seminole County Virtual School
Kavanaugh, Courtney	Assistant Principal	High School, ESE, ESOL, MTSS, Virtual Operations, FTE, Summer School, Department Chairs, Grades 8-12 A-K
Backel, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Elementary, CTE, Hospitality and Tourism Program, Summer School, Graduation, Contracts, Business Partners, Grades K-7
Horel, Patricia	Administrative Support	State Testing, CTE Testing, SAC, Surveys,
Fogel, Amanda	Dean	Campus Scheduling, Intensive Reading/Math programs/ Safety and Security, Facilities, Mental Health, Ambassadors
Sandoval, Courtney	Instructional Technology	Testing Support, Technology Support, Teacher support, SCVS Website, Skyward, Grade Guardian
Cantu, Courtney	Other	MTSS, Truancy Reports, Testing ESE/ 504, ESOL compliance and support, gifted compliance and support, Hospital Homebound

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.

As a franchise of Florida Virtual School (FLVS), SCVS works collaboratively with FLVS, the SCVS School Advisory Committee, business partners such as Orlando North Seminole County Tourism, and student organizations to ensure the school’s plan reflects the core values of the collective whole. The draft plan is shared with the School Advisory Council and posted on the school’s website upon approval.

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))

For the 2023-2024 school year, our students with disabilities will be regularly monitored by our interventionists and support facilitation team. Students who have the greatest achievement gap will complete formative assessments at the beginning of the year and will be regularly monitored by our MTSS team. Students who are meeting benchmarks during the year are reviewed and moved accordingly. Students with disabilities will receive support from a designated support facilitator in the areas of reading and math in person through a foundational reading and/or math class when support facilitation is provided per the student's IEP. During support facilitation, students are regularly monitored using classroom assessments, assessments that align with goals within their IEPs as well as state and district 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)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	3	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	3	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	75	66	53	64	69	55	79		
ELA Learning Gains				66			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			58		
Math Achievement*	65	67	55	44	48	42	60		
Math Learning Gains				50			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			38		
Science Achievement*	66	61	52	55	63	54	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	78	68	44	63	59	100		
Middle School Acceleration	41	76	70	56	49	51	24		
Graduation Rate	83	71	74	100	64	50	100		
College and Career Acceleration	36	35	53	44	83	70	57		
ELP Progress		60	55	46	79	70			

* 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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	83

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	658
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	80
Graduation Rate	100

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	61			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	63			
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			

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	60			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	42			
HSP	58			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	55			

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	75			65			66	75	41	83	36	
SWD	64			52			62				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	93			69							2	
BLK	77			55						33	4	
HSP	63			65			61	77		48	6	
MUL												

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	82			66			68	78	47	35	7	
FRL	73			45			53	67		43	6	

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	64	66	48	44	50	41	55	44	56	100	44	46
SWD	38	52	35	34	41	29	32					
ELL	47	71		53	50							46
AMI												
ASN	91	73		93	83		100					
BLK	54	52	44	31	31	30	50					
HSP	74	63	41	49	46	53	70	80	48			
MUL	75			76			80					
PAC												
WHT	70	75	57	54	54	43	70	73	63	100	42	
FRL	65	60	43	42	41	37	59	67	41	100	58	45

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	79	58	58	60	44	38	67	100	24	100	57	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	76	55		39	32		56		18			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	57		82	44		81	100	20	100	46	
FRL	66	48		50	39	45	52		20			

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
10	2023 - Spring	89%	55%	34%	50%	39%
05	2023 - Spring	85%	61%	24%	54%	31%
07	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	47%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	78%	50%	28%	47%	31%
09	2023 - Spring	65%	54%	11%	48%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	66%	13%	58%	21%
06	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	47%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	92%	60%	32%	50%	42%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	66%	-6%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	67%	6%	48%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	66%	17%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	68%	-10%	61%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	96%	31%	65%	55%	41%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	44%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	64%	15%	51%	28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	50%	7%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	48%	10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	68%	10%	63%	15%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	71%	2%	66%	7%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	63%	5%

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.

SCVS needs to improve AP Calculus, AP Psychology, and elementary and middle school math scores.

Teachers will meet in their PLCs to review the data and conduct a cross walk of FLVS curriculum and BEST standards to see where the content needs to be supplemented. Resources will be created and shared within PLCs.

Targeted professional development that focuses on BEST standards and FAST test specs will be provided.

AP Teachers who struggled to meet or exceed the district averages will use their Instructional Reports provided by College Board to assess where they need to supplement instruction and resources.

AP Teachers who have not attended an AP Summer Institute with in the last three years will be required to attend next summer.

All AP teachers, regardless of success rate, will be required to conduct AP Review sessions prior to the tests in May.

Students will be carefully screened and monitored for placement in intensive ELA and/or math courses

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

SCVS showed the greatest decline in 8th grade science from 60% passing rate to 38% passing rate this year. That is a 22% decline in passing scores. The 8th grade science test draws upon concepts and lessons from three consecutive years to include 6th, 7th and 8th grade science classes. The most notable factor that contributed to this decline is the pandemic and the effects on education over the past 3 years.

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?

ELA showed the most improvement overall. All grades scored above district and state scores.

Our teachers use effective teaching strategies which greatly enhance student learning. The curriculum aligns with the educational standards and objectives of the test. There are resources and technology including digital tools, interactive textbook and videos to assist students with learning. Teachers give students feedback and discuss the most important topics for each section during the DBAs (discussion based assessments) Students demonstrating need for enhanced support in reading were identified and provided additional support based on individual needs.

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

N/A

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

1. Improving 8th grade science scores which had a 38% passing rate. This is 6 percentage points below the state average.
2. Improving middle school Algebra 1 End of Course test scores. This year was 73% passing which is 7 percentage points below the district average.
3. Improving 4th grade Math scores. This year the score was 58% which is 11 percentage points below the district average.
4. Improving 5th grade science scores which were 9 points below the district average.
5. Improving 6th grade math scores which was at 59% passing this year which is 3 percentage points below the district average.

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 achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Camilleri (deborah_camilleri@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.

For the 2023-2024 school year, our students with disabilities will be regularly monitored by our interventionists and support facilitation team. Students who have the greatest achievement gap will complete formative assessments at the beginning of the year and will be regularly monitored by our MTSS team. Students who are meeting benchmarks during the year are reviewed and moved accordingly. Students with disabilities will receive support from a designated support facilitator in the areas of reading and math in person through a foundational reading and/or math class when support facilitation is provided per the student's IEP. During support facilitation, students are regularly monitored using classroom assessments, assessments that align with goals within their IEPs as well as state and district assessments.

Person Responsible: Deborah Camilleri (deborah_camilleri@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 PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Camilleri (deborah_camilleri@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 academic 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.

Teachers will work on instructional strategies to improve the area of collaborative practices. On the 5 Essentials Survey, teachers scored a 35 which is a weak area and needs improvement. Teachers will communicate with students through a welcome call, discussion based assessments, positive feed back on assignments and celebrate student successes.

Person Responsible: Deborah Camilleri (deborah_camilleri@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

Teachers will work on instructional strategies to improve the area of collaborative practices. On the 5 Essentials Survey, teachers scored a 35 which is a weak area and needs improvement. Teachers will communicate with students through a welcome call, discussion based assessments, positive feedback on assignments and celebrate student successes.

Person Responsible: Deborah Camilleri (deborah_camilleri@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).