

Monroe County School District

# Stanley Switlik Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>12</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>25</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>28</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>31</b> |

# Stanley Switlik Elementary School

3400 OVERSEAS HWY, Marathon, FL 33050

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1375>

## SIP Authority

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

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

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Stanley Switlik Elementary School will empower our diverse population of students to attain an educational foundation that enables them to be persistent learners who are prepared for success in college and careers in an ever changing global society.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Stanley Switlik school community fosters individual determination in a learning environment that emphasizes the well-being of the whole student and academic goal setting to enable student citizens to act for the betterment of themselves and their community.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Diaz, Linda        | Principal           | Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision of all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.   |
| Adams, Sarah       | Assistant Principal | To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of an elementary school program which meets the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.  |
| Hendrix, Heather   | Teacher, K-12       | The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Heather Hendrix is the kindergarten chair.  |
| Collins, Gayzel    | Teacher, K-12       | The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Gayzel Collins is the first grade chair.    |
| Strama, Nicole     | Teacher, K-12       | The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Nicole Strama is the second grade chair.    |
| Forgrave, Taylor   | Teacher, K-12       | The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Taylor Forgrave is the fourth grade chair.  |
| Dennington, Krista | Teacher, K-12       | The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Krista Dennington is the third grade chair. |
| Miller, Kaia       | Teacher, K-12       | The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role  |

| Name                      | Position Title                | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
|                           |                               | <p>of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Kaia Miller is the fifth grade chair.</p>  |
| <p>Sessler, Michael</p>   | <p>Teacher, K-12</p>          | <p>The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE &amp; special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Michael Sessler is the special areas chair.</p>     |
| <p>Roux, Zoraida</p>      | <p>Administrative Support</p> | <p>The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE &amp; special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Zoraida Roux is the Office Manager.</p>             |
| <p>Worthington, Kerri</p> | <p>Teacher, K-12</p>          | <p>The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE &amp; special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Kerri Worthington is the interventionist chair.</p> |
| <p>Willis, Chris</p>      | <p>School Counselor</p>       | <p>The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE &amp; special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Chris Willis is the School Counselor.</p>           |
| <p>Sly, Tanya</p>         | <p>Instructional Coach</p>    | <p>The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE &amp; special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Tanya Sly is the Literacy Coach.</p>                |
| <p>Meier, Christy</p>     | <p>Instructional Coach</p>    | <p>The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE &amp; special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Christy Meier is the Math Coach.</p>                |



**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

The members of the building level planning team meet with their teams to develop and create goals. The school SAC committee membership includes school leaders, teachers, staff, parents, community members, and local businesses.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The building level planning team has a standing agenda item related to school improvement and data collected. Our focus is to help every student success through intentional use of data to drive instruction. The plan will be updated as needed.

| Demographic Data   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 63%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 74%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Identification</b>   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B<br><br>2019-20: B<br><br>2018-19: B<br><br>2017-18: A  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |

|  |
|--|
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b> |
|--|

**Early Warning Systems**

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 21          | 20 | 23 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4     |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 17 | 26 | 15 | 23 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107   |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 4 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30    |

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

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|           |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 14          | 19 | 14 | 25 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0  | 3  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 8  | 15 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 8  | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**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 | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 14          | 19 | 14 | 25 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0  | 3  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 8  | 15 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 8  | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**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 | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component        | 2022   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                | 52     | 54       | 56    | 67     | 70       | 57    |
| ELA Learning Gains              | 59     | 56       | 61    | 47     | 55       | 58    |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      | 42     | 46       | 52    | 29     | 46       | 53    |
| Math Achievement*               | 57     | 57       | 60    | 73     | 71       | 63    |
| Math Learning Gains             | 66     | 61       | 64    | 66     | 64       | 62    |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     | 51     | 51       | 55    | 59     | 56       | 51    |
| Science Achievement*            | 53     | 48       | 51    | 66     | 66       | 53    |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        | 0        | 50    |        | 0        |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 58     |          |       | 76     |          |       |

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 55   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 438  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 43                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                | 42                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 30                              | Yes                | 1   | 1   |
| HSP                                | 51                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 55                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 72                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 52                              |                    |   |   |

**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)

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 52       | 59     | 42          | 57        | 66      | 51           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     | 58           |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| SWD  | 32       | 41     | 31          | 33        | 50      | 55           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     | 64           |
| ELL  | 24       | 48     | 40          | 34        | 53      | 57           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     | 58           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 33       |        |             | 27        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 41       | 54     | 41          | 46        | 61      | 53           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     | 62           |
| MUL  | 40       |        |             | 70        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 70       | 68     |             | 74        | 78      |              | 72       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 44       | 60     | 38          | 49        | 67      | 53           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     | 61           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 58       | 48     | 36          | 58        | 57      | 64           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| SWD  | 40       | 23     |             | 37        | 31      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 32       | 70     |             | 30        | 90      |              | 30       |         |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 53       | 52     |             | 49        | 65      |              | 61       |         |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| MUL  | 55       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 68       | 42     |             | 68        | 52      |              | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 38     |             | 50        | 62      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     | 54           |

| 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 67       | 47     | 29          | 73        | 66      | 59           | 66       |         |           |                   |                     | 76           |
| SWD  | 36       | 29     | 21          | 47        | 64      | 65           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 44       | 46     | 45          | 69        | 62      |              | 60       |         |           |                   |                     | 76           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 61       | 47     | 31          | 70        | 66      | 58           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     | 76           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 75       | 47     | 27          | 77        | 69      | 64           | 81       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 61       | 47     | 35          | 69        | 68      | 67           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     | 76           |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 42%    | 49%      | -7%                        | 54%   | -12%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 40%    | 51%      | -11%                       | 58%   | -18%                    |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 42%    | 49%      | -7%                        | 50%   | -8%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 50%    | 56%      | -6%                        | 59%   | -9%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 40%    | 51%      | -11%                       | 61%   | -21%                    |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 48%    | 45%      | 3%                         | 55%   | -7%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 43%    | 44%      | -1%                        | 51%   | -8%                     |

**III. Planning for Improvement**

## Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

In the area of reading, the school performed below the district average with an average proficiency in STAR of 43%. On the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking the average proficiency was 42%.

Student Factors include

Attendance 102/568 – 18% chronically absent

Influx of 54 immigrant students throughout the school year- 39 in January.

Teacher Factors include:

Attendance- Teacher only absence count- 542

Implementation of new curriculum and BEST standards-based instruction; slow deployment\ of small group instruction.

Systemic Problem:

Lack of engagement and individualized instruction with differentiated support.

Limited awareness and knowledge among educators: Some teachers may lack sufficient training and awareness to recognize the signs of language disorders or learning disabilities that can impact reading. As a result, appropriate interventions may not be implemented in a timely manner.

Stigma and misconceptions surrounding learning disabilities: Negative attitudes or misconceptions about learning disabilities can create barriers to effective support. Students may have low expectations, leading to decreased self-esteem and disengagement from reading activities. It is crucial to foster a supportive and inclusive environment that promotes understanding and provides the necessary accommodations for students with learning challenges.

Large group sizes: Large group sizes make it challenging for teachers to provide individualized attention and support to each student. Intervention group sizes should be no larger than 3 for Tier 3 supports and no larger than 6 for Tier 2 supports.

Intentional assessment and progress monitoring: Without regular and comprehensive assessments, it is difficult to identify students' specific strengths and weaknesses in reading.

Materials are needed that cater to students' varied interests and reading levels to increase engagement and growth in reading skills.

Administrative Factors

Inconsistent communication

Limited ability to participate in grade level meetings

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

The prior year mathematics proficiency was 57% and this year mathematics proficiency was 46%. The materials for the new curriculum arrived well into the school year. The change in standards paired with a new scope and sequence contributed to the difficulty students demonstrated with certain concepts. Additionally, the number of students designated as homeless numbered over 80.



**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.**

Students With Disabilities Subgroup: Achievement gap widened. Third Grade: 42% of students met third grade promotion criterion via state assessment. Literacy: Reading performance remains a lagging school grade indicator

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

STAR, Istation, FAST all indicate an average near 50% in proficiency for reading and math. Third grade EOY Istation results indicate 72% proficiency for reading. Science Progress Monitoring shows 40% of students “at mastery” for Spring of 2023.

Strategies included providing opportunities for teachers to observe and learn from colleagues, completing coaching cycles from interventionists in reading and mathematics, and utilizing data from classroom walkthroughs to inform instruction.

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

The early warning system data indicates the chronic absenteeism did not decrease as projected. Though there was a small improvement compared to the previous year, this is still an area of critical concern.

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

1. Improve attendance
2. Third grade proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA)
3. ELA performance on STAR for second grade
4. Overall reading/ELA proficiency
5. Overall mathematics proficiency

**Area of Focus**

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

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Absenteeism directly impacts student learning and overall well-being.

Parent phone calls when three or more days are missed.

Parent letters sent home.

Parent meetings to reinforce importance of attendance.

Attendance team weekly meeting.

Refer to district when necessary.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Average daily attendance will increase to 95%.

### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored according to Tiers

Tier 1

-Weekly attendance reports for all students

-Weekly attendance team meetings

Tier 2 & Tier 1

-Teacher contact

-Parent letters

Tier 3 & Tier 2 & 1

-Parent letters

-Parent meeting

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Willis (chris.willis@keysschools.com)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Weekly reward opportunity for students who are present, arrive on time, and remain all day.

Parent call when three days are missed.

Parent letter home.

Parent meeting.

Weekly attendance team meeting.

Refer to district when needed.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence-based strategies and resources from Attendance Works will be used to develop interventions and supports.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 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 as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Data will be collected weekly to determine average daily attendance and reviewed by the school attendance team.

**Person Responsible:** Chris Willis (chris.willis@keysschools.com)

**By When:** continuous

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Results from the 2022-2023 school year indicates a strong need for improvement.

FAST PM3 Mathematics Performance

- Third 50%
- Fourth 41%
- Fifth 48%

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall math performance will increase to 62% on the FAST mathematics assessment

### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored according to Tiers

Tier 1

- IXL and FAST progress monitoring
- Standards-based formative assessments
- Student data notebooks

Tier 2 & Tier 1

- Monthly data chats

Tier 3 & Tier 2 & Tier 1

- Weekly monitoring
- Panorama groups (EL, SWD, RTI, & ESSA subgroups)

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Meier (christy.meier@keysschools.com)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Use a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures from Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grade.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All students, especially our language learners, benefit from use of objects to represent mathematical concepts.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 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 as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Align mathematical strategies with classroom practice through a coaching and modeling model.

**Person Responsible:** Christy Meier (christy.meier@keysschools.com)

**By When:** continuous

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Growth is needed in the area of reading and English/Language Arts as evidenced in these results: Reading and ELA is an area of focus based on the following proficiency data:

Kindergarten 42%  
 First 54%/75%  
 Second 41%  
 Third 43%  
 Fourth 46%  
 Fifth 32%

FAST ELA Performance:

Third 42%,  
 Fourth 41%  
 Fifth 43%

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall ELA F.A.S.T. performance will increase to 62% for grades three, four, and five.  
 Overall ELA STAR performance will increase to 62% for grades kindergarten, one, two, and three.

#### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored according to Tiers

Tier 1

- STAR Reading & FAST progress monitoring
- Monthly ISIP Reading Assessments
- Student data notebooks

Tier 2 & Tier 1

- Monthly data chats

Tier 3 & Tier 2 & 1

- Weekly monitoring
- Panorama groups (EL, SWD, RTI, & ESSA subgroups)
- Interventionist data notebooks
- Monitoring of IEP, RTI, & EL plans

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tanya Sly (tanya.sly@keysschools.com)

#### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- Providing sufficient scaffolding for all learners.
- Explicit instruction utilizing modeling with clear explanations, verbalizing the thinking process, and providing opportunities to practice and receive feedback.
- Monitoring progress to impact instructional practices to meet the changing needs of the learners.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scaffolding is providing just enough support for a students to be successful. Scaffolding fades as the learners become more independent.

Explicit instruction has been shown to be highly effective in increasing student achievement.

Utilizing progress monitoring data to inform instruction.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 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 as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Strategies will be modeled and demonstrated through a classroom coaching model.

**Person Responsible:** Tanya Sly (tanya.sly@keysschools.com)

**By When:** continuous

#### #4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students in the black/African American subgroup need to show proficiency in ELA.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in the black/African American subgroup will demonstrate 63% on the ELA PM3.

##### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored according to Tiers

Tier 1

-STAR Reading & FAST progress monitoring

-Monthly ISIP Reading Assessments

-Student data notebooks

Tier 2 & Tier 1

-Monthly data chats

Tier 3 & Tier 2 & 1

-Weekly monitoring

-Panorama groups (EL, SWD, RTI, & ESSA subgroups)

-Interventionist data notebooks

-Monitoring of IEP, RTI, & EL plans

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

##### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through small group instruction, teachers will routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text

Part 3A. Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text

This strategy is found in the IES Guide Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many of our students are in need of understanding not just the pronunciation of the word, but the world knowledge needed to place it in appropriate context. This strategy directly affects this need.

##### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 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 as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Data chats will include a focus on this subgroup.

**Person Responsible:** Tanya Sly (tanya.sly@keysschools.com)

**By When:** each scheduled data chat and continuous throughout the year

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process of reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on needs typically involves several steps to ensure fairness, transparency, and effectiveness. At Stanley Switlik Elementary School the Building Leadership Planning Team identifies and gathers data on the specific needs and challenges of the school. Once identified, BLPT will meet with their teams to discuss the priorities of the school. Stakeholders work together to discuss what resources are needed to support the needs of the school. School administration develops a clear and transparent framework for allocating resources, taking into consideration student population, academic performance trends, and specific improvement goals. Feedback and revisions are made to the budget proposal. The budget proposal is then presented to the district administration team and the school board for approval. Once approved, the budget allocation on plan is implemented, making sure that the allocated resources are used effectively and as intended. School administration continuously monitors the progress of the allocated resources in addressing the identified needs, regularly assesses the impact of the investments on student outcomes and school improvement, and makes adjustments to the allocation plan if necessary. We continue to keep all stakeholders informed about the allocation process, progress, and outcomes. School administration regularly communicates updates and successes to maintain transparency and build trust within the school community.

### Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

#### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

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

The percentage of students at a level 3 on the FAST ELA Performance will increase across the tested grades:

Third 42% to 62%, Fourth 41% to 62%, Fifth 43% to 62%

When scaffolding is provided to students, students can experience success in reading development. Teachers will fade out scaffolding as the learners become more independent.

Explicit instruction has been shown to be highly effective in increasing student achievement. Utilizing progress monitoring data to inform instruction.

### **Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### **Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**

N/A

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

Classroom walkthroughs will reflect small group instruction.

FAST ELA Performance will increase across the tested grades:

Third 42% to 62%, Fourth 41% to 62%, Fifth 43% to 62%

### **Monitoring**

#### **Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Tier 1

-STAR Reading & FAST progress monitoring

-Monthly ISIP Reading Assessments

-Student data notebooks

Tier 2 & Tier 1

-Monthly data chats

-Tier 3 & Tier 2 & 1

-Weekly monitoring

-Panorama groups (EL, SWD, RTI, & ESSA subgroups)

-Interventionist data notebooks

-Monitoring of IEP, RTI, & EL plans

- Providing sufficient scaffolding for all learners.
- Explicit instruction utilizing modeling with clear explanations, verbalizing the thinking process, and providing opportunities to practice and receive feedback.
- Monitoring progress to impact instructional practices to meet the changing needs of the learners.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sly, Tanya, tanya.sly@keysschools.com

## **Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

### **Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We intend to implement the PreK-5 practice profile for literacy instruction. The components of the profile include explicit instruction, systematic instruction, scaffolded instruction, differentiated instruction, and corrective feedback. Situational awareness during instruction, combined with intentional instructional planning is at the core of improving instructional practice. The practice will be used to deliver high-quality curriculum that is aligned with the Florida BEST ELA standards and Moderate to Promising ESSA Evidence (Benchmark Advance K-5). This practice profile has been a critical part of the district's lesson structure to support reading and align with the BEST ELA standards.

### **Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Just Read Florida recommends this process and provides resources to support this practice. The Practice Profiles provide a framework of evidence-based practices that address our needs with this target population.

The Florida Department of Education’s Literacy Instruction Practice Profiles for Grades PreK-5 and 6-12 clearly define evidence-based instructional practices of core reading instruction in a way that is teachable, learnable, doable and assessable in practice. The practice profiles feature five core components: explicit instruction, systematic instruction, scaffolded instruction, corrective feedback and differentiated instruction. The goals of the Grades PreK-5 and 6-12 Literacy Instruction Practice Profiles are to increase the understanding of evidence-based practices in delivering literacy instruction. The practice profiles are grounded in research, aligned to Florida’s Formula for Success, and correspond to

Florida’s Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking Standards (K-12) and the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards for Language and Literacy (PreK).

This strategy is located in the IES Guide: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade.

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring                |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Literacy leadership will meet weekly to review walkthrough and students performance data in order to determine progress towards the goals above.</li> <li>2. The literacy coach will provide job embedded professional learning on explicit reading instruction aligned with BEST standards for classrooms demonstrating a high level of need as evidenced by student performance and walkthrough data.</li> <li>3. Model classrooms will be established showcasing exemplars in explicit instruction.</li> <li>4. District support will be enlisted to provide professional learning related to core program implementation and impactful strategy training.</li> </ol> | <p>Sly, Tanya,<br/>tanya.sly@keysschools.com</p> |

## Title I Requirements

### Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

School Improvement Plans (SIP) are created each school year by the leadership team. Once the plan is completed, the plan was distributed to parents. The SIP is advertised on social media and available online on the school's website. Printed copies to post in the Parent Resource Center.

School Improvement Plans (SIP) and Parent and Family Engagement Plans (PFEP) are created throughout the school year by the leadership team. The plans are completed and released to the public and a discussion about the plans is required to occur at the September's and March's SAC meetings.

SAC Meeting Agendas are collected as documentation to support the dissemination of the with the SIP and PFEP with our 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 Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

School Improvement Plans (SIP) and Parent and Family Engagement Plans (PFEP) are created throughout the school year by the leadership team. The plans are completed and released to the public and a discussion about the plans is required to occur at the September's and March's SAC meetings. SAC Meeting Agendas are collected as documentation to support the dissemination of the with the SIP and PFEP with our stakeholders.

School Level PFEPs are written by School Principals and are approved by Federal Programs in August. Completed plans are translated and then sent to schools before the start of the school year. Title I Contacts are responsible for distributing the plan via the school website, Wednesday Folders, and any online correspondence with parents and family.

Compacts are the agreement between Teachers, Parents, and Students regarding the expectations for all parties throughout the school year.

The Title I Contact is responsible for distributing Compacts to teachers and informing them that all must be signed and returned. As new students enroll throughout the year, Compacts should be distributed, signed, and returned.

Returned Compacts need to be organized by grade level and scanned. Any guidance or information regarding the Compacts distributed to both teachers and parents should be saved to CRATE.

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

A Title I Survey, also known as the Parent and Family Engagement Survey, is distributed and collected twice a year per Federal Grant requirements. The survey is advertised through school communication channels. Beginning of Year and End of Year survey links are displayed on the main page of the school website.

Parent Conferences are offered twice a year. It is recommended that Parent Conferences be held at the beginning of the year and midway through the year.

At Title I Night, activities linked to learning proof must be completed by teachers. Hands-on learning activities for all grade levels present at the event are planned and advertised through social media and school fliers. The Parent Resource Center at each school contains multiple activities, and school-allocated Parent and Family Engagement Funds can be used to purchase new activities.

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

N/A

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

Services related to mental health, counseling and the like are provided to students on a referral system. When a need arises, parents, teachers and administration make referrals for counseling and mental health services through the school counselor and the school social worker. The Guidance Care Center is a partnering agency that provides mental health counseling and therapy when the need for services goes beyond the scope of the school.

**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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

N/A

**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 ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) is fully implemented at Stanley Switlik Elementary. Switlik is a PBIS Platinum Level school, meaning three tiers of behavioral interventions are in place.

Every student receives Tier 1 level supports. Tier 1 includes school-wide expectations (The BEs), a token economy (Dolphin Stamps or Dollars that can be used in the classroom), monthly rewards that classes earn as a group contingency, and Dolphin PRIDE Awards for students going above and beyond with The BEs. Along with these interventions is our Health Living Initiative which teaches strategies for healthy living through a Studies Weekly Curriculum.

Tier 2 behavioral supports services students who are not responding to Tier 1. Students are identified either through the Universal Screeners for fifth grade, or through a parent or teacher referral for Tier 2 services. Tier 2 services include small groups focused on a variety of skills and run by either the school counselor or school social worker, or a behavior contract suited to the student's individual needs, like check in/check out. Tier 2 behavioral supports should effect around ten percent of the school population.

Tier 3 behavioral supports service students who are not responding to Tier 1 or Tier 2. Student identification for Tier 3 behavioral interventions is based on data collected during the Tier 2 behavioral intervention process. Tier 3 behavioral interventions involve the development of Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans. The school social worker works individually with students in Tier 3 and implements more targeted and data producing interventions to determine the function of the problem behavior.

Students are moving fluidly between the Tiers based on their individual needs. Student behavioral progress is monitored monthly through Problem Solving Team meetings. During these meetings there is discussion of student data and movement between the tiers. If a student continues to need further support beyond Tier 3, a referral for testing by the school psychologist is submitted.

**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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

Building-level PLC will be implemented to support evidenced-based, best practices in ELA and Math. These practices will then be used to deliver high-quality curriculum that is aligned with the Florida BEST ELA and Math standards and Moderate to Promising ESSA Evidence (Benchmark Advance K-5). This practice profile has been a critical part of the district's lesson structure to support reading and align with the BEST ELA standards.

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

Voluntary PreK and Headstart classrooms are available for students who qualify.

**Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

|               |        |   |               |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                           | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                            | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American                  | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No