

Seminole County Public Schools

GOLDSBORO ELEMENTARY MAGNET



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) 32
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 34
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

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 Goldsboro Elementary Magnet School is to empower students to excel in a world of math, science, engineering, and technology through local and global collaboration in a nurturing and challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement

Goldsboro Elementary School will be the premier magnet elementary school in Seminole County. It will be recognized at the district and state levels for its high standards, academic performance, and customized educational pathways in STEM.

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

Dr. Chris Mulholland

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Manage all faculty and staff at the school. Responsible for the school's academic performance and students, faculty, and staff safety. Provide strategic direction for the school and cultivate a positive school climate.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Dustin Trahan

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the principal with implementing school-wide goals. Works with the school principal as an instructional leader of the building staff to achieve and sustain high levels of student learning and growth. Assists in the day-to-day operations of the school.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Alyssa Costanza

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the principal and the assistant principal in implementing school-wide goals. Works with teachers and parents to provide a positive school climate. Assists in the day-to-day operations of the school.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jennifer Prather

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provides resources and support for teachers. Collaborates with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans and analyze data. Design and lead professional development presentations and model lessons for teachers.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Marcus Robinson

Position Title

Behavior Interventionist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the principal and the assistant principal with implementing school-wide goals. Works with teachers and parents to help students struggling to regulate their behavior.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Robert Wakelyn

Position Title

STEM Resource Teacher/Technology Facilitator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the principal with innovating our Magnet Program. Space Lab STEM Teacher provides unique learning opportunities for all students. Serves as the schoolwide technology coordinator.

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.

Goldsboro's School Advisory Council has scheduled monthly meetings to discuss successes and challenges that the school community needs to address. This input was used in the development of the SIP plan. Goldsboro's SAC comprises seven parents/community members, three teachers, and one non-instructional school employee.

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))

The SIP goals will be discussed at our Leadership Team meetings. The team will assess and adjust instructional practices based on the data indicating what is working to ensure school improvement goals are being met and revise implementation strategies if needed. Using the schoolwide data board, highlight individual ESE students who are not progressing and then meet with both the teacher and ESE teacher to develop an actionable plan to intervene.

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	84.8%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	36.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	N/A
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: A 2022-23: A* 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	1	41	22	19	22	16				121
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	6	4	0				14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	14	9	5	4	3				36
Course failure in Math	1	13	6	2	9	4				35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					14	13				27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					18	20				38
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	0	1	6						7
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	2	16	2	8	6					34

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	2	13	5	8	19	14				61

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	4	1	5	1	0				14
Students retained two or more times										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	22	43	29	27	22	29				172
One or more suspensions		2	1	5	6	4				18
Course failure in ELA		9	13	2	3					27
Course failure in Math		6	11	1	1					19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				1	15	17				33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					18	18				36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	10	15	5						54

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	1	10	15	5	15	18				64

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	1	5	2	1						9
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 *	77	66	57	67	61	53	71	65	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	75	69	58	72	62	53			
ELA Learning Gains	74	62	60				70		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	62	55	57				50		
Math Achievement *	74	67	62	66	64	59	66	46	50
Math Learning Gains	70	64	62				62		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	37	43	52				37		
Science Achievement *	82	68	57	72	65	54	69	65	59
Social Studies Achievement *								62	64
Graduation Rate								62	50
Middle School Acceleration								45	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	84	75	61	67	77	59	68		

*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 (FPI) 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)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	71%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	635
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
71%	71%	62%	59%		59%	63%

* 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	41%	No		
English Language Learners	67%	No		
Asian Students	85%	No		
Black/African American Students	47%	No		
Hispanic Students	55%	No		
Multiracial Students	68%	No		
White Students	70%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	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	27%	Yes	4	2
English Language Learners	67%	No		
Asian Students	92%	No		
Black/African American Students	33%	Yes	1	
Hispanic Students	54%	No		
Multiracial Students	60%	No		
White Students	76%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	47%	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	25%	Yes	3	1
English Language Learners	68%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	86%	No		
Black/African American Students	43%	No		
Hispanic Students	58%	No		
Multiracial Students	50%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	59%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	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	77%	75%	74%	62%	74%	70%	37%	82%					84%
Students With Disabilities	31%	37%	61%	52%	40%	50%	45%	8%					
English Language Learners	70%	67%	72%	54%	77%	72%	40%	63%					84%
Asian Students	92%	92%	85%	79%	95%	88%	60%	93%					85%
Black/African American Students	46%	38%	63%	56%	35%	41%	30%	70%					
Hispanic Students	59%	61%	56%	45%	51%	51%	32%	55%					81%
Multiracial Students	71%		73%		71%	55%							
White Students	80%	88%	67%		70%	60%	50%	78%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	56%	67%	60%	42%	42%	30%	62%					88%

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	67%	72%			66%			72%					67%
Students With Disabilities	19%	21%			24%			45%					
English Language Learners	58%	76%			64%			60%					79%
Asian Students	87%	91%			94%			95%					92%
Black/African American Students	33%	45%			23%			32%					
Hispanic Students	47%	59%			40%			56%					67%
Multiracial Students	53%				67%								
White Students	75%	77%			65%			85%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	39%	47%			35%			42%					73%

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	71%		70%	50%	66%	62%	37%	69%					68%
Students With Disabilities	20%		31%	32%	21%	24%	20%	27%					
English Language Learners	63%		75%		70%	63%							68%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	91%		84%		93%	84%		92%					69%
Black/African American Students	47%		60%	50%	34%	43%	32%	32%					
Hispanic Students	60%		69%	60%	52%	54%	25%	75%					71%
Multiracial Students	46%				54%								
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	72%		67%	40%	60%	55%	42%	74%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%		63%	51%	40%	44%	29%	51%					77%

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	75%	67%	8%	55%	20%
Ela	4	75%	62%	13%	53%	22%
Ela	5	79%	63%	16%	55%	24%
Math	3	77%	69%	8%	60%	17%
Math	4	73%	64%	9%	58%	15%
Math	5	32%	43%	-11%	56%	-24%
Math	6	100%	67%	33%	56%	44%
Science	5	81%	65%	16%	53%	28%

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?

The data component that showed the most improvement is learning gains from our lowest 25% ELA, which increased from 50% in 2023 to 62% in 2024. Small group targeted instruction based on data during the ELA block and intervention helped to meet the needs of these students who are one year behind grade level in reading. Our school team benefited from ongoing professional development, grade-level collaboration, and accessing/analyzing data for individual students.

Lowest Performance

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is learning gains from our lowest 25% in Mathematics, which is 36%. The problem/gap is occurring because data-driven differentiation is not purposeful enough to meet the needs of these students. Most of these students were more than one year behind grade level in mathematics. Targeted intervention and scaffolding instruction will need to be a priority, along with improving math proficiency in the primary grades.

Greatest Decline

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline was the SWD students Science proficiency which dropped from 45% proficient in 2023 to 8% proficient in 2024. Factors contributing to this decline was the need to implement tiered layers of instructional support and interventions aligned to State Science standards

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.

5th Grade Mathematics- Non RAMP students

Most of these students were more than 1 year behind grade level in Mathematics and weren't able to close the gap to show proficiency.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

1. Inclusion practices with consistency to best support students with disabilities.
2. Focus on math Interventions and small group instruction for foundational skills and scaffolding to support targeted L25 in all grades.

Highest Priorities

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

1. School Climate and Culture.
2. Providing teachers with extended school time to meet in PLCs for planning and data analysis, including the ESE support facilitators and resource teachers.
3. Continue to focus on K-5 teachers' collaborative planning sessions, which focus on target task alignment, and targeted walkthroughs with specific feedback, which focus on tight target task alignment, to increase purposeful core instruction and differentiation for all students.
4. Math small group instruction to support targeted L25 students.

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.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Students currently in standard math classes in grades 4 and 5 are not meeting proficiency for those level 2 students or showing learning gains based on the the 2023-2024 math data.

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.

Students in 4th Grade standard math classes were 40% proficient and 5th Grade standard math classes were 32% proficient based on the 2023-2024 FAST assessment data. The goal is 50% proficiency in both grade level standard math classes.

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.

Monitor the flow of the math block for pacing to include rigorous, grade level content, purposeful practice and remediation.

Math intervention duration and intensity to support targeted students.

Implement small group targeted instruction during the math block to include data-driven math groups, teacher selected small group for reteaching or reinforcing skills.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Chris Mulholland

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: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy- Project.

Rationale:

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

PLC Discussions of student performance on math formative assessments.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Chris Mulholland

By When/Frequency:

May, 2025

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

PLCs weekly that promote the collaboration and discussion on math foundations and how to manage small groups and plan for needs.

Action Step #2

Math Vocabulary purposefully taught during during core instruction and in interventions.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Chris Mulholland

By When/Frequency:

May, 2025

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

Lesson plans and student work samples will show implementation and support of mathematics vocabulary development strategies.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 percent of all students that are L25 achieving ELA Learning gains on FAST is 62% up from 50% in 2022 as evidenced in FSA ELA. Although we are trending in a positive direction, we would like to see our L25 continue to make learning gains and be closer to proficiency.

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 percent of all students that are L25 achieving ELA Learning gains on FAST is 62%, but only 10% of these students were proficient . Our goal is to focus on the high level 2's who need to be proficient in order to have a learning gain.

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.

Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards and continue to focus on K-5 teachers collaborative planning sessions focused on target task alignment.

Targeted walkthroughs with specific feedback focused on a tight target task alignment to increase purposeful core instruction

Differentiation needs to remain data driven, focused on student reading needs utilizing evidence-based interventions and implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Chris Mulholland

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), Corrective Reading (strong evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence).

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.

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

Comprehension

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Chris Mulholland

By When/Frequency:

May, 2025

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

In the area of literacy, performance data from FAST and iReady in elementary schools are used to monitor progress and determine whether core instruction meets students' needs. A benchmark of 80% of students at or above the 26th percentile is used to monitor whether further support is needed. Provide cross-content reading opportunities with an intentional focus on vocabulary acquisition and comprehension strategy instruction during small groups. Weekly PLCs with grade level teams will be used to monitor and make instructional decisions.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

In 2024, 82% of our Grade 5 students scored level 3 or above on the State Science Assessment, an increase from 69% in 2023.

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.

As evidenced by the Grade 5 State Science assessment, the percentage of SWD students who are proficient on the State Science assessment will increase from 10% in 2024 to 50% in 2025.

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.

Facilitate science professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs to focus on collaborative planning.

Focus on fair game content from 3rd and 4th grade to ensure knowledge applies to learning.

Emphasize Science Vocabulary.

Utilize hands-on lessons aligned with essential standards for science in 5th grade.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Chris Mulholland

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 in science, based on the individual student's area of need, utilizing McGraw Hill science series and interactive science investigations.

Rationale:

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

Science PLCs with purposefully planned lessons for science.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Chris Mulholland

By When/Frequency:

May, 2025

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

Interactive notebooks with a focus on vocabulary. Hands-on, inquiry-based learning as a way to teach concepts. Vocabulary development for scientific terms/integration of science in math and reading Utilize data to organize students' interactions with science content based on state science standards and content limits for each area of focus. This systematic instruction approach uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students' needs.

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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized and teachers feel confident and have a sense of belonging in their current school. Focusing on campus safety, developing a culture where teacher voice and belonging are valued, and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student 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.

School Climate, Leadership Relationships, and Sense of belonging were all assessed through the Panorama Survey completed in April, 2024. The results showed 77% of teachers who completed the survey saw a favorable school climate, 83% of teachers who completed the survey saw positive leader relationships and 71% of teachers felt a sense of belonging.

The goal for 2024-25 will be to raise each area on the Panorama survey by 5% with a focus on belonging which was the lowest scored area.

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.

Make building connections a priority for teachers and students by identifying the specific causes of individual challenges in the classroom or other areas within the school and sincerely commit to address such challenges proactively as a school community.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Chris Mulholland, Principal

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 solid collaboration between families and professionals from various disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance, and behavior.

Rationale:

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to impact school climate and increase academic

positively performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Building Connections

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Chris Mulholland/Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

May, 2025

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk-throughs, PLC meetings, attendance, and discipline data reviews. School Climate Committee meets every 6 weeks to gauge the climate and culture of the school and help to implement strategies for making connections within our school community.

Area of Focus #2

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.

Chronic Absenteeism is when a student is absent 10% or more full days of school. During the 2023-2024 school year, our school had 14% of students in the chronic absenteeism category.

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 goal is to decrease the overall total chronic absenteeism by at least 2% by the end of 2024-2025 school year. We will continue to identify students who are chronically absent and provide support where appropriate.

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.

The leadership team will monitor and review the percentage of Chronic absent students twice each month as a collaborative team. This data will help the team determine communication needs to students and parents on the importance of being in school. The team will regularly share information

about the current state of attendance at staff meetings, SAC meetings, school newsletters and communications.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Chris Mulholland

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:

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:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Schoolwide Attendance Campaign

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Chris Mulholland

By When/Frequency:

May, 2025

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

Use parent engagement events and conferences to ensure parents are informed of the consequences of chronic absenteeism in their child's learning progression. Recognize entire grade

levels that have the highest percentage of students in regular attendance on the morning news. Greeting students consistently with positive praise that will establish relationships and a positive school culture associated with improved attendance.

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