WEKIVA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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:

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

Wekiva works as a team to promote a safe and positive learning environment for all.

Provide the school's vision statement

Wekiva is a special place where teachers, staff, and students can laugh, grow, and learn together.

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

Keaton Schreiner

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Lead the team by creating agendas and facilitate dialogue focused on student achievement and safety through scheduled and consistent weekly meetings. Conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs, providing feedback on teacher instruction.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Mallory Garrett

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Compile, analyze and disaggregate student data and update through Google Document. Conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs, providing feedback on teacher instruction.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Alex Shannon

Position Title
Instructional/Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Facilitate and manage MTSS meetings. Organize and facilitate PLC/PD meetings for READING related content/updates. Facilitate and teach LQ groups.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Julie Gabrovic

Position Title
Science Teacher/Math Coach/NEST Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Organize and facilitate PLC/PD meetings for MATH and SCIENCE related content/updates. Serve as NEST lead teacher.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Tara Williams

Position Title
School Administration Manager (SAM)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Manage facilities and non-instructional staff. Serve as primary discipline designee. Handle all school management unrelated to instructional practice.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name
Melanie Bingham

Position Title
Guidance Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist with MTSS meetings by monitoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Schedule facilitate, lead and organize Student Study Team (SST) meetings weekly.

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.

Parents and the community are key stakeholders in the review of our annual plan to improve. Our PTA and SAC are involved in the process of parent and community input in the way of monthly meetings year round. As we develop our School Improvement Plan annually, I make it a point to address the SIP and seek their input and validate our current focus on goals and the direction our school desires to improve upon. Our 5 Essentials and Panorama survey results are also reflected on as we use the feedback to shape the supportive environment.

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))*

Our leadership team meets weekly on Monday mornings to examine SIP goals and measure real-time data and the trends with overall grade level/subject areas. We determine action steps that are proven to be successful and what action steps need to be adjusted or replaced in an effort to meet our goals.

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	**43.6%**
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**38.1%**
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 *2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2023-24: A** **2022-23: A*** **2021-22: A** **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	12	19	23	13	19				87
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	1	2	3				10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	6	9	4	0	1				22
Course failure in Math	2	5	5	4	1	5				22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					11	28				39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					14	21				35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	2	15	11	25						53
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1	11	11	13	10					46

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	16	9	15	17	24				83

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	1	2	1	0	0				7
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	10	17	16	16	20	11				90
One or more suspensions			2	4						6
Course failure in ELA		4	12	1						17
Course failure in Math		6	12							18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					26	10				36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					22	12				34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		8	16	6						52

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		7	12	3	20	11				53

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		4	1							5
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 CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	69	66	57	66	61	53	78	65	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	73	69	58	67	62	53	65		
ELA Learning Gains	59	62	60				66		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	47	55	57				51		
Math Achievement *	72	67	62	73	64	59	75	46	50
Math Learning Gains	68	64	62	68			68		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	41	43	52				54		
Science Achievement *	73	68	57	80	65	54	80	65	59
Social Studies Achievement *								62	64
Graduation Rate								62	50
Middle School Acceleration								45	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	77	75	61	61	77	59	80		

*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	64%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	579
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
64%	72%	69%	68%		75%	66%

* 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	74%	No		
Asian Students	84%	No		
Black/African American Students	49%	No		
Hispanic Students	59%	No		
Multiracial Students	75%	No		
White Students	64%	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	24%	Yes	2	1
English Language Learners	61%	No		
Asian Students	74%	No		
Black/African American Students	39%	Yes	2	
Hispanic Students	73%	No		
Multiracial Students	76%	No		
White Students	72%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	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	39%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	60%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	76%	No		
Black/African American Students	31%	Yes	1	1
Hispanic Students	66%	No		
Multiracial Students	89%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	72%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	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	69%	73%	59%	47%	72%	68%	41%	73%					77%
Students With Disabilities	31%	44%	39%	36%	41%	54%	30%	27%					
English Language Learners	64%				82%								77%
Asian Students	77%	91%	91%	77%	77%	91%							
Black/African American Students	36%		28%		33%	76%	83%	40%					
Hispanic Students	63%	67%	56%	45%	71%	57%	26%	74%					73%
Multiracial Students	80%		62%		80%	77%							
White Students	73%	76%	61%	51%	76%	70%	29%	76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	53%	51%	41%	59%	59%	38%	52%					80%

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	66%	67%			73%			80%					61%
Students With Disabilities	22%	21%			37%			15%					
English Language Learners	44%				63%								75%
Asian Students	65%				82%								
Black/African American Students	53%				24%								
Hispanic Students	67%	64%			71%			83%				82%	
Multiracial Students	68%				84%								
White Students	66%	69%			75%			78%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	42%			57%			74%					

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	78%	66%	51%	75%	68%	54%	80%					80%
Students With Disabilities	35%		41%	39%	31%	45%	48%	31%				
English Language Learners	58%		67%		63%	53%		40%				80%
Native American Students												
Asian Students	75%		50%	85%	92%							
Black/African American Students	48%		20%	24%								
Hispanic Students	77%		70%	65%	67%	62%	50%	69%				
Multiracial Students	93%			85%								
Pacific Islander Students												
White Students	80%		69%	51%	82%	71%	63%	89%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students	68%		58%	48%	61%	65%	50%	66%				

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.

			2023-24 SPRING			
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	3	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%
Ela	4	63%	62%	1%	53%	10%
Ela	5	72%	63%	9%	55%	17%
Math	3	71%	69%	2%	60%	11%
Math	4	71%	64%	7%	58%	13%
Math	5	49%	43%	6%	56%	-7%
Math	6	100%	67%	33%	56%	44%
Science	5	72%	65%	7%	53%	19%

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?

5th Grade ELA increased 12% points this school year (60% to 72%). New actions included strategic intervention and focus on standards mastery.

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 components that showed the lowest performance was our Lower Quartile learning gains for both ELA (45%) and Math (43%). Our intervention block designed to meet the academic needs of all learners, but specifically our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students needs to be more strategic in planning, lesson plan implementation, and most importantly, monitored by administration and coaches.

Greatest Decline

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

Science proficiency decreased from 81% to 73% (-8). Contributing factors were the lack of re-teaching and focus on standards mastery.

5th Grade math proficiency for standard math students decreased from 56% to 49%. Contributing factors were the lack of re-teaching and focus on standards mastery.

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 ELA proficiency is at 72% which is 17% points above the state average (55%). New actions included strategic intervention and focus on standards mastery.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

A level of concern for the 2024-2025 school year is that of student attendance. This includes tardies.

Highest Priorities

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

1. ELA LQ Learning Gains and Math LQ Learning Gains.

2. Science Proficiency.

3. Grade 5 Math proficiency.

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.

SWD ELA Achievement (proficiency) is 30%. By addressing the needs of our Students with Disabilities (SWDs) will also impact our Lower Quartile Learning Gains.

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.

According to 22-23 data on SWD ELA Achievement, only 22% scored proficient. Although there is an 8% increase, more focus and attention needs to implemented with all SWDs at each grade level. Our goal is to achieve above 40% proficiency with our SWDs.

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.

As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of unit and mid-unit assessments in ELA and topic assessments in ELA. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or acceleration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Keaton Schreiner

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

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.

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
ESSA Subgroup SWD Proficiency Increase in ELA

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Keaton Schreiner	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
As our grade level PLC and leadership teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress of SWDs by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in ELA and topic assessments in ELA. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or intervention. Our school-wide intervention time will occur first thing during the school day, allowing for all instructional staff to be available for small group skill based instruction for all grade level learners.

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.

ELA LQ Learning Gains (45%) is an area of focus for 24-25 school year. By addressing students that in this category, we will also impact the learning of SWDs as the majority of these students also fall into this category. Over recent years, our LQ learning gains have not improved steadily enough to be acceptable.

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.

According to 23-24 data, only 45% of our students in the ELA LQ Learning Gains category made measurable improvement. The outcome we as a school plan to achieve for all 3rd-5th grade students is 60% proficiency for the 24-25 school year.

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.

As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in ELA and topic assessments in ELA. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or acceleration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Keaton Schreiner

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

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.

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
Instructional Practice - ELA

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Keaton Schreiner	Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in ELA and topic assessments in ELA. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or intervention. Expectations of small group instruction to include standards mastery. Our school-wide ELA intervention time will occur first thing during the school day, allowing for all instructional staff to be available for small group skill based instruction for all grade level learners.

Area of Focus #3

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.

Math LQ Learning Gains (43%) is an area of focus for 24-25 school year. By addressing students that in this category, we will also impact the learning of SWDs as the majority of these students also fall into this category. Over recent years, our LQ learning gains have not improved steadily enough to be acceptable.

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.

According to 23-24 data, only 43% of our students in the MATH LQ Learning Gains category made measurable improvement. The outcome we as a school plan to achieve for all 3rd-5th grade students is 60% proficiency for the 24-25 school year.

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.

As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in MATH and

topic assessments in MATH. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or acceleration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Keaton Schreiner

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:
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
Instructional Practice - Math

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Keaton Schreiner	Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in MATH and topic assessments in MATH. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or intervention. Our school-wide MATH intervention time will occur for grades 3-5, allowing for all intermediate instructional staff to be available for small group skill based instruction for 3rd-5th grade students. Fact-Tactics will be implemented as well which will increase students' ability to retain math facts.

Area of Focus #4

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.

Science proficiency (5th Grade) is an area of focus for 24-25 school year. By addressing students that in this category, we will also impact the learning of SWDs as the majority of these students also fall into this 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.

According to 23-24 data, 73% of our students scored proficient (Level 3+) in science. Historically, Wekiva has achieved higher results (81% in 22-23). Our goal for the 24-25 school year is to be back above 80% of our students scoring at or above proficiency level.

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.

As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of Science Benchmark Tests, unit and mid-unit assessments in SCIENCE and topic assessments in SCIENCE. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or acceleration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Julie Gabrovic

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:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 Proficiency

Person Monitoring: **By When/Frequency:**
Julie Gabrovic   Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
As our grade level PLC teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure progress by analyzing the results of Science Benchmark Tests, unit and mid-unit assessments in SCIENCE and topic assessments in SCIENCE. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or intervention. There will be a focus on fidelity with the use of student science journals. Teachers and instructional leadership teams will navigate new adopted science curriculum, and implement hands-on, engaging science lessons.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

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.

A large number of our students (165) recorded 15 or more absences (excused or unexcused) during the 2023- 2024 school year. This undoubtedly affects the amount of quality instruction students receive.

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.

In the 2023-2024 school year, 165 students had 15 or more absences. This includes both excused and unexcused. Our goal for the 2024-2025 school year is to reduce this by 20% and have no more than 132 students with 15 or more absences.

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 School Administration Manager will run a report weekly that determines which students have met specific thresholds from the beginning of the school year to the date of the report. She will then generate truancy letters and follow up via phone call and/or email if attendance continues to decline.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Keaton Schreiner

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, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1
Attendance

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Tara Williams	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
The School Administration Manager will run a report weekly that determines which students have met specific thresholds from the beginning of the school year to the date of the report. She will then generate truancy letters and follow up via phone call and/or email if attendance continues to decline.

Area of Focus #2

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.

Our focus will be fostering a positive working environment specifically when working as professional learning communities at each grade level. Teachers, Instructional Coaches and Administration will work closely and collaboratively when analyzing data, planning for instruction and making other instructional decisions. The PLC teams will value the team norms and positively collaborate on team decisions.

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.

According to the Panorama survey from the Spring of 2024, 77% of our teachers believed Wekiva Elementary had a positive environment in which to work. Our goal for the spring of 2025 is to raise the 77% score to that of 85% of teachers that feel we have a positive work environment.

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.

Post Panorama Surveys throughout the school year, the leadership team will analyze the results as a topic of discussion and strive to make improvements based on feedback provided by staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Keaton Schreiner

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:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1
Teacher Retention and Recruitment - Positive Climate/Culture

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Keaton Schreiner	Bi-Monthly

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

Post Panorama Surveys throughout the school year, the leadership team will analyze the results as a topic of discussion and strive to make improvements based on feedback provided by staff. Birthday cards, lunches/treats provided during meetings/gatherings, "Teacher of the Month", etc...will enhance teacher recognition and appreciation from administration.

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