Starke Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Starke Elementary School

1000 W WELDON ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/starke

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.

Starke Elementary is committed to providing a safe and healthy environment so each student can grow academically and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Equipping students to excel in the 21st century.

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
Schaefer, Raymond	Principal	Creation, implementation and monitoring of the SIP.
Rodriguez, Shannon	Assistant Principal	Creation, monitoring and implementation of the SIP.
Hines, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Data analysis, intervention and assessment support.
Eison, Heather	Math Coach	Data analysis, intervention and assessment support.

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.

Starting with the comprehensive needs assessment, we sent out title I SAC surveys to all parents. Teachers were sent a school climate and professional development survey. A community survey is also sent out to gather information from the community and business partners. The SAC committee reviews the information from the surveys along with the end of year assessment data to establish needs and create goals for the school improvement plan.

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))

Monitoring is done through monthly data meetings with teachers, admin. and CRT. We use spring assessment data and beginning of year data to identify student's needing intervention. Intervention activities are reviewed and updated at monthly data meetings and SAC meetings. At the mid-year point, data is monitored through growth and intervention plans are adjusted accordingly.

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)* 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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	22	23	18	13	17	14	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	2	2	6	5	9	14	0	0	0	38
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	19	16	11	7	7	10	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	13	13	11	16	12	14	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	20	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	25	20	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	10	13	8	10	7	0	0	0	65

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	19	15	16	13	21	24	0	0	0	108

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	8	11	7	8	9	1	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	26	24	17	24	22	18	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	9	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	6	8	5	6	4	5	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	3	5	3	12	14	13	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	21	15	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	21	18	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	40	46	37	33	48	33	0	0	0	237

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	26	24	17	30	25	18	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	14	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3

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	26	24	17	24	22	18	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	9	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	6	8	5	6	4	5	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	3	5	3	12	14	13	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	21	15	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	21	18	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	40	46	37	33	48	33	0	0	0	237

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	26	24	17	30	25	18	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	14	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3

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*	42	46	53	51	45	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				56			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			69		
Math Achievement*	56	56	59	53	49	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				63			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			57		
Science Achievement*	28	34	54	58	46	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					38	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress			59						

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	177
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	53			

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%
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	59			

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	42			56			28					
SWD	29			41			31				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			36			17				4	
HSP	33			44							2	
MUL	50			58							2	
PAC												
WHT	49			66			40				4	
FRL	36			49			20				4	

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	51	56	59	53	63	67	58					
SWD	26	44	45	31	57	57	22					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	36	57	60	30	62	81	41					
HSP	44	64		39	64							
MUL	53	50		60	50							
PAC												
WHT	56	55	67	62	66	53	65					
FRL	46	57	62	51	65	72	59					

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	55	52	69	59	70	57	48					
SWD	30	50		33	42		43					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	43		50	64		33					
HSP	64			45								
MUL	50			30								
PAC												
WHT	62	50		67	76		60					
FRL	52	53		55	70		45					

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	35%	45%	-10%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	58%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	51%	4%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	62%	11%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	63%	-11%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	25%	34%	-9%	51%	-26%

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.

5th grade science was our lowest performance component at 25% proficient. This cohort has a ESE student population of 33%. This grade group has also historically been a low preforming group. This grade group also had the lowest proficiency in reading and math.

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

Our greatest decline was in science proficiency from 58% to 25%

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.

Science proficiency had the greatest gap compared to the state. This 5th grade group historically has been low preforming. This cohort is made up of 33% SWD.

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

Math achievement increased to 63% overall. Experienced and certified math teachers had a tremendous impact. Math achievement was a focus last school year, implementing IXL for math as well as Rocket Math for fluency practice.

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

SWD were 40% proficient in ELA.

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

1. Improving SWD proficiency
2. Improving Science achievement
3. Improving school culture by decreasing referrals.

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.

If we increase the proficiency in ELA for SWD we will see an improvement in school grade and learning gains.

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

Proficiency for SWD will increase 3% in ELA.

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

Monitoring during monthly data meetings will have a focus on SWD providing monthly monitoring of the progress of these students in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raymond Schaefer (schaefer.raymond@mybradford.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.)

SIPPS will be used to meet the foundational reading needs of students. IXL will also be used for student reading independent practice and monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPS is an ESSA approved evidenced-based reading program. It will accelerate progress to help students close the gap.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

ESE teachers will plan small group intervention times. Students identified organized into similar needs groups. ESE teacher meets with students in small group using the SIPPS program to improve reading proficiency. Training and materials will be provided to as needed.

Person Responsible: Raymond Schaefer (schaefer.raymond@mybradford.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Improving Science proficiency will improve our overall school grade as well as positively impact science proficiency.

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

Science proficiency will increase from 25% to 30%, 5% increase.

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

Monitoring will occur through monthly data meetings with grade level teachers. Identifying student progress and student needs. Most recent progress monitoring data will be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raymond Schaefer (schaefer.raymond@mybradford.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.)

Penda science will be used as a digital learning intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Penda is a game-based standards-aligned digital curriculum fosters and accelerates mastery of science concepts for students grades 3 -10.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

EWS and teacher/staff climate survey indicates a need to deal specifically with disrespectful behavior and peer conflict among students.

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

The number of referrals in this area will decrease by 10%.

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

EWS reports will be pulled on a monthly basis to review the types and number of referrals. Administration would also observe the implementation of program content throughout the school and reflect on it during staff and SAC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Raymond Schaefer (schaefer.raymond@mybradford.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 7 mindsets social emotional curriculum teaches students seven character traits that develop them into a responsible and good citizen.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Social emotional learning curriculum teaches our students how to interact with peers and adults. They will learn how to self regulate their emotions based on characteristics that are most aligned with being successful. (Optimism, creativity, passion, purpose, open-mindness, gratitude etc.)

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 3 - Promising 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.

7 mindsets curriculum and resources will provided to teachers. A PBIS/7 mindsets team will be created to support the implementation.

Person Responsible: Shannon Rodriguez (rodriguez.shannon@mybradford.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

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).

Although no additional specific funds are provided through UNISIG, penda science will be funded with ESSER3 grant funding, 7 mindsets will be funded with title V or ESSER3.

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

The following curriculum and supports are in place at Starke Elementary:
HMH, UFLI, LLI (SRA, SIPPS, FCRR for interventions)
2022-2023 End of Year STAR Data:
Kindergarten showed 29% of our students below the benchmark of 40PR.
1st grade showed 26% of our students below the benchmark of an 839 scale score (level 3 or above).
2nd grade showed 30% of our students below the benchmark of a 930 scale score (level 3 or above).

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

HMH, LLI, Top Score, Star Progress Monitoring and Star Reading
2022-2023 End of Year STAR Data:
3rd grade showed 37% of our students scored below a level 3.
4th grade showed 38% of our students scored below a level 3.
5th grade showed 60% of our students scored below a level 3.

This school year 2023/2024 we will receive targeted support from Chris Chaplin, state regional literacy director for Just Read Florida. Targeted support will include: BEST ELA standards professional learning and implementation support, school improvement planning support to develop literacy goals, literacy leadership team professional learning and implementation planning, literacy coach professional learning

and ongoing support, train-the-trainer opportunities for district and school staff to build capacity and differentiated support based on data.

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

Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency in grades K-2 by 5% comparing STAR EOY data 22/23 to STAR EOY data 23/24.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 by 5% comparing STAR EOY data 22/23 to STAR EOY data 23/24.

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.

STAR progress monitoring will be our progress monitoring tool. Tier 3 students are tested monthly. Monthly data meeting with teachers, coaches and CRT will ensure that students are receiving targeted differentiated instruction based on their specific needs.

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

Schaefer, Raymond, schaefer.raymond@mybradford.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?

Chris Chaplin will provide professional learning to our teachers on the science of reading. UFLI will continue to be used for K-2 phonics instruction and used as a small group support as needed. SIPPS will be used for Tier 3 reading interventions.

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?

UFLI is a research based phonics program used in K-2 last year that has proven to positively impact our students reading proficiency.
SIPPS is an ESSA approved systematic phonics/reading instruction that will support student reading proficiency.

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
Targeted support will be provided by Chris Chaplin, the state regional literacy director. This support will include BEST ELA standards professional learning and implementation support, school improvement planning to develop literacy goals, literacy leadership team professional learning and implementation planning, literacy coach professional learning and ongoing support, train-the-trainer opportunities for district and school staff to build capacity and differentiated support.	Schaefer, Raymond, schaefer.raymond@mybradford.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Title I Open House, Facebook post, copy at front desk, copy of the webpage where the SIP will be available: www.bradfordschools.org.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Title I Open House, SAC meetings, Monthly Parent Newsletters, Parent/teacher conferences www.bradfordschools.org.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We are going to strengthen our academics in areas of ELA and Science as well as improving our school culture by decreasing referrals. We will use SIPPS (ELA-aof 1), Penda Science (Science-aof 2), 7 mindsets (school culture- aof3) to support increased student achievement.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a