

Seminole County Public Schools

LAKE MARY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 3
 - A. School Mission and Vision 3
 - B. School Leadership Team 3
 - C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 6
 - D. Demographic Data 7
 - E. Early Warning Systems 8
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 17
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 20
- III. Planning for Improvement 21
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 27
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 33
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 35
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 36

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/8/24.

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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Lake Mary Elementary is to promote self-esteem, strong academic achievement, creativity and acceptance of responsibility through building relationships and establishing high academic expectations in a safe, positive environment that unifies staff, parents and community to prepare all students for success in real-life experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Lake Mary Elementary is to ensure every students will have one year's academic growth in one year's time. Lake Mary Elementary will continue to increase overall academic achievement for all students in preparation for college and career readiness.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Charlotte Little

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Lynette Bornemann

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal with school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Angela Shapiro

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal and assistant principal with school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Rebecca Pitzen

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Instructional support for teachers; MTSS lead facilitator; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Stephanie Manor

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Instructional support for teachers; MTSS facilitator; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Lisa Citrano

Position Title

Guidance Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Management of student study, exceptional student education, students with 504 plans, and social-emotional instruction in the classroom as needed

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Lake Mary Elementary actively engages parents and our community through various collaborative methods. This involvement includes holding school advisory council meetings where parents and community members share their input and ideas. To ensure that the plan is communicated effectively to all stakeholders, including parents, it will be presented in clear and simple language, avoiding jargon.

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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

Regular updates will be shared with parents and our community through newsletters, school websites, social media, and in-person meetings. This transparent communication allows parents to stay informed about the ongoing initiatives and provides opportunities for feedback and suggestions. Student achievement data after each FAST assessment cycle is shared with stakeholders.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	50.5%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	53.6%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: B 2022-23: B* 2021-22: B 2020-21: 2019-20:

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days	0	38	18	22	13	24				115
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	0				4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	7	4	0	2	0				13
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	1	1	0				7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	20	19				57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	23	22				66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	9	1	5						15
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	4	2	4	1					11

Current Year 2024-25

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	12	7	6	4	6				35

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	3	6	0	6	0	0				15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days	14	24	23	17	17	15				110
One or more suspensions		7	3		3	1				14
Course failure in ELA	4	12	4	2	2					24
Course failure in Math	3	7		1	1					12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				3	29	19				51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				2	33	17				52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	4	16	19	16						89

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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	4	11	8	4	27	19				73

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	5	6	7	3	3					24
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	63	66	57	61	61	53	66	65	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	64	69	58	57	62	53			
ELA Learning Gains	60	62	60				68		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	57	55	57				54		
Math Achievement *	64	67	62	59	64	59	68	46	50
Math Learning Gains	59	64	62				63		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	45	43	52				43		
Science Achievement *	69	68	57	62	65	54	64	65	59
Social Studies Achievement *								62	64
Graduation Rate								62	50
Middle School Acceleration								45	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	75	75	61	42	77	59	65		

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	62%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	556
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
62%	60%	61%	56%		69%	64%

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 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%
Students With Disabilities	38%	Yes	3	
English Language Learners	56%	No		
Asian Students	57%	No		
Black/African American Students	55%	No		
Hispanic Students	56%	No		
Multiracial Students	58%	No		
White Students	66%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	30%	Yes	2	1
English Language Learners	42%	No		
Asian Students	47%	No		
Black/African American Students	37%	Yes	1	
Hispanic Students	51%	No		
Multiracial Students	53%	No		
White Students	70%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	54%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	69%	No		
Black/African American Students	56%	No		
Hispanic Students	53%	No		
Multiracial Students	74%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	66%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	No		

D. 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)

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	63%	64%	60%	57%	64%	59%	45%	69%					75%
Students With Disabilities	28%	26%	46%	48%	37%	46%	44%	31%					
English Language Learners	48%	53%	56%	47%	53%	63%	55%						75%
Asian Students	47%		69%		59%	54%							
Black/African American Students	56%	58%	67%		53%	52%	50%	50%					
Hispanic Students	56%	45%	53%	43%	57%	60%	46%	64%					81%
Multiracial Students	56%		58%		56%	63%							
White Students	71%	75%	63%	68%	71%	58%	48%	76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	51%	50%	45%	54%	57%	41%	58%					71%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	61%	57%			59%			62%					42%
Students With Disabilities	34%	31%			33%			20%					
English Language Learners	35%	33%			35%			45%					60%
Asian Students	47%				47%								
Black/African American Students	38%	40%			35%			33%					
Hispanic Students	56%	62%			48%			39%					50%
Multiracial Students	58%	50%			50%								
White Students	70%	64%			69%			76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	46%			45%			46%					55%

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	66%		68%	54%	68%	63%	43%	64%					65%
Students With Disabilities	33%		51%	52%	33%	39%	32%	39%					
English Language Learners	45%		59%	64%	47%	55%	55%	43%					65%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	60%				77%								
Black/African American Students	48%		66%	67%	50%	55%	57%	47%					
Hispanic Students	54%		58%	55%	52%	51%	33%	54%					67%
Multiracial Students	73%		70%		73%	80%							
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	75%		75%	50%	78%	69%	40%	74%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%		62%	54%	52%	56%	45%	51%					57%

E. 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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2023-24 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	3	62%	67%	-5%	55%	7%
Ela	4	63%	62%	1%	53%	10%
Ela	5	62%	63%	-1%	55%	7%
Math	3	74%	69%	5%	60%	14%
Math	4	69%	64%	5%	58%	11%
Math	5	27%	43%	-16%	56%	-29%
Math	6	89%	67%	22%	56%	33%
Science	5	69%	65%	4%	53%	16%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Our most improved data component for the 2023-2024 school year was improving the overall subgroup proficiency rates of our black students by 17% from 37% to 54%. This was accomplished through teachers disaggregating summative data, adjusting instruction, and using effective instructional strategies. Students were appropriately placed in intervention or acceleration groups based on their academic needs.

Lowest Performance

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

Our lowest performance area is our math learning gains for our lowest quartile at 44%. We noticed students are struggling with foundational skills such as number sense and operations. Another contributing factor to this decrease is an increase of student absences in the 2023-2024 school year from 20% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2023-2024.

Greatest Decline

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

Our greatest area of decline was our overall proficiency subgroup data for white students. We saw a decline of 5% points from 72% to 67%. The contributing factor to this decrease is an increase of student absences in the 2023-2024 school year from 20% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2023-2024.

Greatest Gap

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.

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is 5th grade math. The state's proficiency for 5th grade math is 56%. Our school's proficiency is 27%. The contributing factor for this gap is our accelerated math program called RAMP. This program accelerates 5th grade

students by taking 6th grade math and therefore the 6th grade math FAST. Our school had 47% of our 5th grade students enrolled in this accelerated math program.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Our areas of concern are 57 students scoring at Level 1 for ELA and 66 students scoring at a Level 1 for Math.

Highest Priorities

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

- Increase ELA and Math Achievement for SWD to 50%
- Increase ELA Achievement from 62% to 70%.
- Increase Math Achievement from 64% to 70%
- Increase Science Achievement from 69% to 80%
- Ensure learning gains for all students reach a percentage of 70% for ELA and Math
- Improve student attendance by decreasing the percent of students absent by 10%

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need. Training sessions on evidence-based reading instruction, literacy strategies, and math instruction are beneficial. Professional development in building strong Professional Learning Communities will help strengthen core instruction.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Our SWD were underperforming with an overall proficiency rate in 2023 of 29% in ELA, Math, and Science. This is an ESSA finding.

In 2024, our SWD underperformed with an overall proficiency rate of 37% in ELA, Math, and Science. For 2025, our goal is for our SWD is to achieve an overall proficiency rate of at least 50% in ELA, Math, and Science on the final FAST assessment.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Teachers with our leadership team will work collaboratively following these strategic steps: 1. Conduct a comprehensive assessment of students' reading and math abilities to identify specific areas of improvement and analyze the data to understand individual and group reading and math strengths and weaknesses. 2. Develop individualized reading and math differentiated plans for students based on their assessment results as well as tailor interventions and instructional

approaches to address each student's unique needs and learning style. 3. Leadership team will provide professional development for teachers to enhance their knowledge and skills in teaching reading and math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence), Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools) (strong evidence), Reading Mastery (promising evidence), FastForward (promising evidence), Corrective Reading (strong evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). Elementary Math - The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

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 included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan. Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, 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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Intensive reading groups conducted with fidelity in structure and frequency required for student progress.

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

ESE teachers will conduct intensive reading groups with fidelity using researched-based reading

program(s) that meets each student's needs. Administration will monitor student data collected with each program as well as conduct walkthroughs to ensure the program is being implemented with fidelity. Teachers will receive actionable feedback to rectify any issues.

Action Step #2

Strengthen Support Facilitation

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

ESE Support Facilitators will work with small groups of students on an upcoming, present, or trailing benchmark during their Support Facilitation time. ESE teachers will present information using evidenced-based ESE strategies to help students process information. Administration will monitor instruction by conducting walkthroughs and monitoring students' summative grade level data. Teachers will receive actionable feedback to rectify any issues.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA, Math, Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our area of focus is to improve instructional practice in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. Through improving instructional practice, our student achievement in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science will improve and we will close achievement gaps between subgroups.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Through strengthening our instructional practice, we will increase achievement in ELA from 62% to 70%; in Math from 64% to 70%; and in Science from 69% to 80%.

Strengthening our instructional practice will also ensure learning gains are achieved in ELA and Math for all students by reaching a percentage of 70%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

To ensure instructional practice is strengthening, instructional coaches and administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs providing actionable feedback to teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Rebecca Pitzen, Stephanie Manor, Lynette Bornemann, Charlotte Little

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence), Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools) (strong evidence), Reading Mastery (promising evidence), FastForward (promising evidence), Corrective Reading (strong evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). Elementary Math - The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

ELA - 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 included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan. Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, 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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Strengthen ELA Instructional Practice

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann, Rebecca Pitzen

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

To strengthen our instructional practice and meet our student achievement outcomes, instructional coaches and administration will attend weekly PLCs to ensure grade levels are disaggregating formative data and making instructional adjustments. Grade level PLCs will be monitored to ensure teams are discussing Achievement Level Descriptors for each benchmark and answering the four pivotal PLC questions: What do we want all students to know and be able to do? How will we know if

they learn it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient? Grade levels will use Standards Mastery with students in two phases: Phase 1: From October through January in a whole group setting with the teacher modeling metacognition and student collaboration. Phase 2: From January through May in small teacher-led groups based on students' needs. Instructional Coaches and Administration will conduct walkthroughs during the implementation of each phase of Standards Mastery to provide actionable feedback to teachers as needed.

Action Step #2

Strengthen Math Instructional Practice

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann, Stephanie Manor

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

To strengthen our instructional practice and meet our student achievement outcomes, instructional coaches and administration will attend weekly PLCs to ensure grade levels are disaggregating formative data and making instructional adjustments. Grade level PLCs will be monitored to ensure teams are discussing Achievement Level Descriptors for each benchmark and answering the four pivotal PLC questions: What do we want all students to know and be able to do? How will we know if they learn it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient? Grade levels will use Standards Mastery with students in two phases: Phase 1: From October through January in a whole group setting with the teacher modeling metacognition and student collaboration. Phase 2: From January through May in small teacher-led groups based on students' needs. Instructional Coaches and Administration will conduct walkthroughs during the implementation of each phase of Standards Mastery to provide actionable feedback to teachers as needed.

Action Step #3

Strengthen Science Instructional Practice

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann, Stephanie Manor

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

To strengthen our instructional practice and meet our student achievement outcomes, instructional coaches and administration will attend quarterly Science PLCs to ensure grade levels are disaggregating district benchmark assessment data and making instructional adjustments. Based on district benchmark data, Instructional Coaches and Administration will conduct science intervention groups in the spring.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Based on our 2024 5 Essentials results, "Collaborative Teachers" is our greatest area in need of improvement scoring at the "neutral" range. If we collectively believe we can positively affect student achievement through a strong sense of responsibility for student development, school improvement, and professional growth then we will build teacher to teacher trust while closing student achievement gaps. This will build a sense of community and belonging for students and staff resulting a total team effort which enables us to earn and sustain LME as an "A" rated school with a positive culture and climate.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Based on 5 Essentials results, "Collaborative Teachers" is our greatest area in need of improvement scoring at the "neutral" range. By focusing on teacher efficacy, our goal for our 2025 5 Essentials results will be for "Collaborative Teachers" to move from a "neutral" rating to a "strong" rating.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will evaluate the results from the Panorama surveys in the 1st and 2nd semester to determine our progress. Our final results will be determined by our 2025 5 Essentials survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Develop Teacher Cohort for Specific Instructional Purposes

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann, Rebecca Pitzen, Stephanie Manor

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Our Instructional Leadership Team meets monthly. Our team is composed of UF coaching graduates, representatives from each grade level and is open to all instructional personnel interested. Discussions will center around productive PLCs with a solution/support mindset. Our Math Articulation Cohort meets quarterly. This cohort is open to instructional personnel who would like to analyze instructional gaps between math grade level benchmarks. The cohort will develop lesson plans and/or learning stations to share with each grade level to help close instructional gaps.

Area of Focus #2

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Based on the 23-24 discipline data, our area of focus is to decrease the number of referrals for the 24-25 school year. Our focus will be on improving the conditions for learning in classrooms which supports students' well-being and improves positive classroom interactions. This will foster a culture focused on student learning and academic achievement.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

During the 23-24 school year, our school had 73 referrals. This was a decrease from the 22-23 school year by 50%. By focusing on building relationships and ensuring the social-emotional needs of students are being met through our positive behavior support plan, our goal is to continue to decrease the number of referrals by 10%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will disaggregate discipline data at monthly PBIS team meetings to develop strategies to support and build a positive school culture and environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Charlotte Little and Lynette Bornemann

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

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. Schools should have evidence of a strong Tier 1 framework of support in all of these areas.

Rationale:

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance. Interventions should be targeted to meet a specific need of students at the school based on data and should involve explicit teaching and monitoring.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:**Action Step #1**

Reinforce schoolwide procedures and expectations for staff and students.

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little and Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Through the Behavior Coaching Academy and "House" systems, we will promote teamwork and collaboration in order to foster a sense of community. House points will be collected to encourage positive behaviors from all students and monthly incentives will be given to students from the winning House.

Area of Focus #3

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Student attendance can negatively affect their academic performance due to missing core instruction. During the 2023-2024 school year, our school had 22% of our student miss 10+ days.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for

each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Based on 23-24 attendance data of 22% of students missing 10+ days, we will decrease absenteeism by 10%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Attendance reports will be reviewed weekly through our attendance incentive program. Our attendance incentive program rewards classrooms with perfect attendance on the morning news.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Lynette Bornemann

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

State statute requires that school teams shall be diligent in facilitating intervention services and make all reasonable efforts to resolve nonattendance behavior. Using the MTSS problem-solving model, teams are responsible for providing and monitoring appropriate interventions for individual students. To ensure students are provided with the necessary resources and interventions, schools should form comprehensive teams with clear roles and responsibilities.

Rationale:

levels-Through the use of evidence-based intervention supports, schools invest in fostering a culture that promotes engagement and attendance. However, some students struggle to attend school regularly. Unchecked absences can lead to lower achievement levels and gaps in knowledge that may prove challenging to overcome. It is critical for students and families to understand that absence due to arriving late, or missing full days, whether excused or unexcused can negatively affect learning. Efforts to curb tardiness, chronic absenteeism, and truancy can address the needs of students and families, mitigating student failure.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Attendance Initiative

Person Monitoring:

Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly attendance reports will be monitored for all students and classes with perfect attendance will be given certificates. Classes receiving certificates will be announced on the morning news. Our goal is to increase daily attendance based on creating a positive culture in the classroom and promoting team work.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii)

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00