

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 29
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 33
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 35
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 36

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

ADDITIONAL TARGET SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (CSI)
<p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <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

Through the pursuit of collective excellence, Stenstrom Elementary emphasizes student-centered, collaborative, process-driven learning, ensuring that our students have the knowledge and critical thinking skills required for success in an increasingly STEM-focused global community. Our MicroSociety program ensures student voice and student choice throughout all academic and social areas of their education.

Provide the school's vision statement

Stenstrom Elementary will set the standard for real life learning opportunities by preparing and inspiring generations of learners to meet the challenges of a competitive, increasingly connected global community. Students will be challenged to learn through innovation, collaboration, and project-based learning within the MicroSociety environment.

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

Robert Vanderloop

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Sets the vision, implements the School Improvement Plan, cultivates a mindset of focus for the leadership team – prioritizes what is most important and aligns actions accordingly. Provides leadership for setting school targets and presents evidence to district leadership of the plan for school improvement each year. Makes sure goals set in the School Improvement Plan are strategically aligned with district priorities. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Amanda Specht

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about curriculum, assessment, instruction, and professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Takes responsibility for activating the school improvement plan through school-based professional learning and monitors progress. Knows the school goals and selects strategies to achieve them, understands school data and uses data to set school goals. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Kristen Hodges

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about professional learning in order to improve student behavior and learning outcomes, helps create a safe and nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals, helps keep the focus on the targets and works to assure that the structures in place support the instructional program, helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Tiffany Roberson

Position Title

Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about ELA curriculum, ELA assessment, ELA instruction, and ELA professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data

and uses data to set school goals. Helps set school reading goals, design strategies and monitor progress in reading. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Christina Culvar

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions using data on how to close academic and social-emotional gaps by connecting students with the services they need in order to improve student learning outcomes, and helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals with respect to social and emotional needs of students and the training needed by staff. Helps set school goals, design strategies and monitor progress in social-emotional learning. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

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.

The School Advisory Committee, which includes parents, teachers, non-instructional personnel, and community members participated in the development of the School Improvement Plan. During a meeting in August, ideas for student improvement were discussed by the committee and added to the plan. The plan is being shared in both English and Spanish and other languages by request. Comments and survey results from our Snapshot Survey were also reviewed and taken into consideration when developing goals and action steps. The plan includes strategies that will improve student achievement.

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 will be regularly monitored by the leadership team and the faculty and staff following each progress monitoring testing window. Implementation checks will take place at SAC meetings following each progress monitoring testing window. Revisions will be made as needed.

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	54.4%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	44.8%
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		21	16	20	6	7				70
One or more suspensions			5	1	1	1				8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		7	13	6	2	7				35
Course failure in Math		7	9	4	8	1				29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					7	16				23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					9	21				30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)			4	8						12
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

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		6	9	7	10	15				47

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				6						6
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	5	12	20	15	10	10				72
One or more suspensions		5	4	3	1	9				22
Course failure in ELA	1		11		1	1				14
Course failure in Math	1	1	7		3	2				14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					9	20				29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					11	27				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)	1	7	23	6						57

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	5	14	5	11	24				60

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		1							2
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 *	74	66	57	68	61	53	72	65	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	77	69	58	74	62	53			
ELA Learning Gains	65	62	60				69		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	52	55	57				61		
Math Achievement *	69	67	62	68	64	59	68	46	50
Math Learning Gains	66	64	62				60		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	32	43	52				31		
Science Achievement *	72	68	57	81	65	54	64	65	59
Social Studies Achievement *								62	64
Graduation Rate								62	50
Middle School Acceleration								45	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	80	75	61	55	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	65%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	587
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
65%	78%	62%	63%		72%	65%

* 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	45%	No		
English Language Learners	59%	No		
Asian Students	85%	No		
Black/African American Students	42%	No		
Hispanic Students	57%	No		
Multiracial Students	74%	No		
White Students	69%	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	56%	No		
English Language Learners	55%	No		
Asian Students	87%	No		
Black/African American Students	37%	Yes	1	
Hispanic Students	77%	No		
Multiracial Students	78%	No		
White Students	78%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	69%	No		

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	64%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	80%	No		
Black/African American Students	46%	No		
Hispanic Students	57%	No		
Multiracial Students	64%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	69%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	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	74%	77%	65%	52%	69%	66%	32%	72%					80%
Students With Disabilities	47%	61%	54%	47%	33%	43%	34%	40%					
English Language Learners	48%		76%	80%	52%	48%	27%						80%
Asian Students	94%		91%		89%	64%							
Black/African American Students	52%		52%	50%	35%	43%	25%	40%					
Hispanic Students	65%	71%	53%	47%	62%	62%	35%	63%					
Multiracial Students	74%	70%	73%		85%	73%		70%					
White Students	80%	85%	70%	48%	74%	71%	38%	82%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	60%	62%	59%	55%	53%	52%	29%	51%					

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	68%	74%			68%			81%					55%
Students With Disabilities	36%	48%			36%			58%					100%
English Language Learners	33%	45%			43%								100%
Asian Students	87%				87%								
Black/African American Students	41%				33%			36%					
Hispanic Students	66%	71%			63%			83%					100%
Multiracial Students	74%				82%								
White Students	72%	76%			74%			91%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	64%			54%			72%					100%

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	72%		69%	61%	68%	60%	31%	64%					68%
Students With Disabilities	42%		47%	45%	40%	36%	20%	30%					57%
English Language Learners	71%		73%		56%	55%		63%					68%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	93%		70%		86%	70%							
Black/African American Students	54%		65%	67%	29%	27%	36%	44%					
Hispanic Students	66%		64%	53%	63%	58%	32%	57%					65%
Multiracial Students	61%				67%								
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	80%		75%	75%	79%	70%	27%	79%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	60%		64%	52%	55%	52%	25%	49%					69%

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	77%	67%	10%	55%	22%
Ela	4	72%	62%	10%	53%	19%
Ela	5	70%	63%	7%	55%	15%
Math	3	68%	69%	-1%	60%	8%
Math	4	66%	64%	2%	58%	8%
Math	5	54%	43%	11%	56%	-2%
Math	6	100%	67%	33%	56%	44%
Science	5	71%	65%	6%	53%	18%

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 that showed the most improvement was when students moved up a level specific to the content areas of ELA and Math. In ELA, 28% moved from level 1 to level 2, 36% moved from level 2 to level 3, 33% moved from level 3 to level 4, and 17% moved from level 4 to level 5.

In Math, 25% moved from level 1 to level 2, 23% moved from level 2 to level 3, 23% moved from level 3 to level 4, and 31% moved from level 4 to level 5.

We created environments for more focused PLCs. This allowed the teachers time as they were asked to refine their practices related to the BEST standards. This was year 2 of BEST implementation, and teachers were finding what works and what needed to be revised. Data charts and 'walk to' interventions were used more last year than the year prior.

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 lower performance areas for Stenstrom were the learning gains for the LQ (lowest quartile) groups in Math and ELA. Only 32% of students in the LQ group for math showed learning gains, while only 52% of students in the LQ group for ELA showed learning gains. While 52% may not be very low, it is still the second lowest area of need, and many of the same students exist in both subgroups.

As we continue to always improve, we recognize our data chats did not go deep enough into using formative data. We also needed to get some of the subgroup data out to our staff faster so they could recognize what students were in the LQ group and intentionally address those needs. We also could have focused our PD to ensure teachers were equip with the tools to reach those in the LQ.

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline from the year prior lies within our Hispanic subgroup population with a decline of 20 points (77% to 57%). The next subgroup showing the most decline is the free/reduced lunch

population with a decline of 16 points (69% to 53%). The third subgroup showing the most decline is the students with disabilities population with a decline of 11 points (56% to 45%).

The data chats were very overarching and they did not specifically address the needs of the subgroups. This prohibited us from recognizing the decline and targeting these subgroups.

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.

We don't have state average at the time of writing this SIP. Our focus is going to be on the SWD and black students because they may not have the greatest gap, but their data is the lowest performing of all subgroups. Many of our students in those subgroups seemed to struggle with mental health issues, attendance, and social skills that took them away from core instruction and a focus on academic success.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Areas of Concern:

1. Attendance-number of students with EWS.
2. The number of students identified Level 1 in ELA and Math in 5th grade.
3. The 47 students who have 2 or more EWS.

Highest Priorities

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year include:

1. Addressing the learning gains of the lowest quartile subgroup through core ELA instruction.
2. Addressing the learning gains of the lowest quartile subgroup through core math instruction.
3. Addressing student achievement with our SWD subgroup.
4. Addressing student achievement with our black subgroup.

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 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.

The Area of Focus were related to: ELA. This category drives everything we do with our PLCs focused on ELA. We will address the 4 key questions of a PLC (what do we want students to know, how will we know they know it, what do we do when they know it, and what do we do when they don't know it?). This category was selected because one of our lowest scoring data is specific to the learning gains within the lowest quartile in the area of ELA.

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.

The measurable outcomes will be specific to students in 4th (3rd into 4th) and 5th (4th into 5th) grade during the 2024-25 school year.

We will increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in ELA from 52% to 60% as measured by student achievement on PM3 of the FAST.

Monitoring

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

Teachers and administrators will look at the lowest 30% per grade level in ELA.

Instruction will be monitored through administrative walk throughs.

Grade level and subject level teams will have common use of unit assessments at the pre, mid, and post points and monitor student progress.

Based on the assessment in mind, teams will plan small group instruction in ELA daily.

Teachers will use the ALD when planning for core instruction in PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Specht

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:

Elementary ELA - 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).

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

Implementing of Pre/Mid/Post Unit Assessments in ELA

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Mid/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to create pre/mid unit assessments. Teachers will use the post assessments as created by SCPS. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs on Tuesday and Data Drive PLCs on Thursday. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #2

Utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD) in PLC

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Mid/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to incorporate the ALD in PLC discussions. Teachers will use a PLC planning form to address students who know and don't know the standard, and scaffold instruction with the use of the ALD. This will be monitored during

scheduled Instructional PD PLCs on Tuesday and Data Drive PLCs on Thursday. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #3

ELA Small Group Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Daily, per unit of instruction

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

Classroom teachers will use the above-mentioned data to identify the best use of small group instruction. Classroom teachers will use the SCPS framework, classroom specific data, ALD, and best practices for small group instruction to create data-driven small groups during core instruction.

Area of Focus #2

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.

The Area of Focus were related to: Math. This category drives everything we do with our PLCs focused on Math. We will address the 4 key questions of a PLC (what do we want students to know, how will we know they know it, what do we do when they know it, and what do we do when they don't know it?). This category was selected because it is our lowest scoring data specific to the learning gains within the lowest quartile in the area of Math.

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.

The measurable outcomes will be specific to students in 4th (3rd into 4th) and 5th (4th into 5th) grade during the 2024-25 school year.

We will increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in math from 32% to 40% as measured by student achievement on PM3 of the FAST.

Monitoring

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

Teachers and administrators will look at the lowest 30% per grade level in Math.

Instruction will be monitored through administrative walk throughs.

Grade level and subject level teams will have common use of unit assessments at the pre, mid, and

post points and monitor student progress.

Based on the assessment in mind, teams will plan small group instruction in Math daily.

Teachers will use the ALD when planning for core instruction in PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

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:

Elementary Math - The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

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

Implementing of Pre/Mid/Post Unit Assessments in Math

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Mid/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to create pre/mid unit assessments. Teachers will use the post assessments as created by SCPS. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs on Tuesday and Data Drive PLCs on Thursday.

Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #2

Utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD) in PLC

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Mid/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to incorporate the ALD in PLC discussions. Teachers will use a PLC planning form to address students who know and don't know the standard, and scaffold instruction with the use of the ALD. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs on Tuesday and Data Drive PLCs on Thursday. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #3

Math Small Group Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Daily, per unit of instruction

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

Classroom teachers will use the above-mentioned data to identify the best use of small group instruction. Classroom teachers will use the SCPS framework, classroom specific data, ALD, and best practices for small group instruction to create data-driven small groups during core instruction.

Action Step #4

Factatics in Grades 3-5

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

As needed based on student data

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

Classroom teachers will use the above-mentioned data to identify the best use of Factastics during their math block. This program will support student knowledge of core facts in grades 3-5.

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.

The Area of Focus were related to: Science. This category drives everything we do with our PLCs focused on Science. We will address the 4 key questions of a PLC (what do we want students to know, how will we know they know it, what do we do when they know it, and what do we do when they don't know it?). This category was selected because we have a new Science curriculum and we have room to grow with our student performance in this area.

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.

The measurable outcomes will be specific to students in 5th grade during the 2024-25 school year. We will increase student performance in Science from 71% to 75% as measured by 5th grade student achievement on PM3 of the FAST.

Monitoring

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

Teachers will implement the new Science curriculum as outlined in the framework.

Teachers will conduct experiments within the Science framework.

Instruction will be monitored through administrative walk throughs.

Teachers will have access to district TOA support in the area of Science during PLCs.

Teachers will use the ALD when planning for core instruction and data chats in PLCs.

Teachers and administration will review the October, February, and April Science benchmark data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

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:

Teachers will utilize the tier 1 Science framework during their core instructional periods.

Rationale:

This is a year of growth for our students and their teachers as this curriculum is new to all stakeholders.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken 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

Implement the new SCPS Science curriculum

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level.

Roberson

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

Teachers will implement the new SCPS Science curriculum and embed conversations related to Science instruction within their PLCs.

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.

As displayed in EdInsight, our data showed roughly 10% of our school population were in school less than 90% of the time. Specifically, for the 2024-25 school year, 21 students will be in 1st grade, 16 students in 2nd grade, 20 students in 3rd grade, 6 students in 4th, and 7 students in 5th grade. This means these students missed at least 10% or more of instruction last school year. Research shows that attendance has an impact on student performance. This percentage is not a high number compared to other schools across the county, but this is our data and each student on this list is unique and is afforded equal opportunities to learn alongside their peers.

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.

We will decrease the percent of students with 15 or more absences 25% from 18% to 13% as measured by end of year district district attendance data.

Monitoring

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

We will identify the students who are on the attendance list and share those names with grade level teachers, school counselor, social worker, all administration, and other building level staff. We will pull attendance data monthly and share this information with all necessary staff connected to these students.

This ongoing monitoring will draw attention to these students and the teachers who have these students in their classrooms. We will provide support for those students and those teachers to help engage parents and increase attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop

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**

Preventative Communication Yielding a Focus on Positive School Attendance

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop

By When/Frequency:During Leadership/Grade Level PLCs/MTSS:
Monthly**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

1. Attendance data will be pulled monthly for students who are 90% or below. 2. Data will be shared with relevant stakeholders (grade level teachers, school counselor, social worker, all administration, and other building level staff) 3. Parent meetings will be set up as needed 4. Ongoing communication and attendance tips will be shared with all stakeholders (including all families) will be done regularly

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.

Through the use of Panorama data from the 23-24 school year, we identified the area of "School Climate" and "Belonging" to have the largest impact on our school climate, teacher retention, recruitment, performance, and student learning. The question: How connected do you feel to other adults at your school? resulted in a favorable score of 63%. This was tied for the lowest score. 'When new initiatives are presented at your school, how positive are your colleagues?' This was also favorable at 63%. This is the first time the Panorama data was provided to school sites so it is our baseline 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.

We will increase our favorable scores in 'School Climate' and 'Belonging' from 63% to 80% as measured by the end of the year Panorama survey.

Monitoring

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

We will utilize the fall, winter, and spring Panorama results as our ongoing progress monitoring of this data.

We will informally communicate with all staff through google forms, team lead meetings, and individual check ins.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop

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 interventions to achieve are: 1. Team building activities during pre-plan 2. Google form check ins 3. Shout outs at team lead and staff meetings 4. Brick calls during morning announcements 5. Planned events by our shared leadership team specific to hospitality 6. Connections and belonging through NEST meetings 7. Front-loading staff with the 'why' when introducing new initiatives and

creating feedback loops

Rationale:

There is not just one way to build a positive staff climate, so we are looking at multiple ways to engage with our staff. Engaging staff in decision making will help us lead through change and we aim to adjust specific things to increase student achievement. People feel invested when they have a voice and are part of a positive movement.

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

Building our Future, Brick by Brick

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing/Daily

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

The actions steps include: 1. Team building activities during pre-plan 2. Google form check ins 3. Shout outs at team lead and staff meetings 4. "Brick" calls during morning announcements 5. Planned events by our shared leadership team specific to hospitality 6. Connections and belonging through NEST meetings 7. Front-loading staff with the 'why' when introducing new initiatives and creating feedback loops 8. Panorama data will be shared with staff as it is implemented across the county. This data will allow us to gain feedback and make adjustments to the plan All of this information will be openly shared with staff as it comes to provide transparency between all and towards our common goal.

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