

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 9
 - D. Demographic Data 10
 - E. Early Warning Systems 11
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 14
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 15
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 16
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 17
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 20
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 23
- III. Planning for Improvement 24
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 33
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 36
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 40
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 41

School Board Approval

This plan has not yet been approved by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

ADDITIONAL TARGET SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://cims2.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department’s SIP template may address the requirements for:

1. Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and
2. Charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP SECTIONS	TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM	CHARTER SCHOOLS
I.A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I.B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Working together to inspire and bring excellence to every student every day.

Provide the school's vision statement

We strive passionately to create healthy, happy, and engaged students who are successful and productive.

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

Linda Diaz

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision of all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Tanya Sly

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Kerri Worthington

Position Title

Academic Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Kerri Worthington is the Literacy Coach.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Stacie Gonzalez

Position Title

Academic Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Stacie Gonzalez is the Math Coach.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Heather Hendrix

Position Title

Kindergarten Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Heather Hendrix is the kindergarten chair.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Gayzel Collins

Position Title

First Grade Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Gayzel Collins is the first grade chair.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Nicole Strama

Position Title

Second Grade Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Nicole Strama is the second grade chair.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Krista Dennington

Position Title

Third Grade Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Krista Dennington is the third grade chair.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Jesika Dorestant

Position Title

Fourth Grade Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Jesika Dorestant is the fourth grade chair.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Kaia Miller

Position Title

Fifth Grade Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Kaia Miller is the fifth grade chair.

Leadership Team Member #11

Employee's Name

Chris Willis

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Chris Willis is the School Counselor.

Leadership Team Member #12

Employee's Name

Michael Sessler

Position Title

Special Areas Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Michael Sessler is the special areas chair.

Leadership Team Member #13

Employee's Name

Zoraida Roux

Position Title

Office Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Zoraida Roux is the Office Manager.

Leadership Team Member #14

Employee's Name

Kerry Senecke

Position Title

Exceptional Student Education Team Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 decisionmaking processes. Kerry Senecke is the interventionist chair.

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.

Involving stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process at Stanley Switlik Elementary involves identifying key groups such as school leadership, teachers, parents, students, and community members. The building-level planning team meets with their respective teams to develop and create goals, while the School Advisory Council (SAC) provides input and vets these goals. The plan is developed with detailed action steps and resource allocation, reviewed by stakeholders for feedback, and revised accordingly. Implementation includes regular monitoring and adjustments, with continuous feedback loops and annual reviews to ensure ongoing improvement.

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))

We have developed a walkthrough document that will allow us to track the use of our SIP goals and strategies. Through the collection of the walkthrough data in conjunction with regular data reviews, we will be able to monitor for effective implementation of the SIP goals and their impact on increasing student achievement. Based on the collected data we can review how our strategies are impacting our goals to continue to work towards increasing achievement, especially focused on our SWD students.

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	YES
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	64.4%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	73.6%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: B 2022-23: B* 2021-22: B 2020-21: 2019-20: B

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	22	13	18	11	16	20				100
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	1				5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	14	30	26	18	37	26				151
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	17	12	20	18	29	21				117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	11	18	14	15						58
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	6	6	10	9	10					41

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	21	27	25	24	25	20				142

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	0	1	0	0	0	0				1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	21	20	23	13	14	17				108
One or more suspensions				1		3				4
Course failure in ELA										0
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					30	35				65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					2	14				16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		17	26	15						107

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

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		4	9	4	4	9				30

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										0
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 *	50	52	57	45	48	53	52	54	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	52	56	58	48	51	53			
ELA Learning Gains	65	62	60				59		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	54	55	57				42		
Math Achievement *	57	55	62	52	53	59	57	46	50
Math Learning Gains	68	64	62				66		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	65	57	52				51		
Science Achievement *	49	55	57	54	49	54	53	57	59
Social Studies Achievement *								61	64
Graduation Rate								48	50
Middle School Acceleration								54	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	44	61	61	32	59	59	58		

*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)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	56%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	504
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
56%	52%	55%	54%		60%	63%

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

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	39%	Yes	2	
English Language Learners	47%	No		
Black/African American Students	55%	No		
Hispanic Students	53%	No		
White Students	68%	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	23%	Yes	1	1

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%
English Language Learners	32%	Yes	1	
Black/African American Students	40%	Yes	2	
Hispanic Students	40%	Yes	1	
White Students	65%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	46%	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	43%	No		
English Language Learners	42%	No		
Native American Students				

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%
Asian Students				
Black/African American Students	30%	Yes	1	1
Hispanic Students	51%	No		
Multiracial Students	55%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	72%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	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	50%	52%	65%	54%	57%	68%	65%	49%					44%
Students With Disabilities	26%		62%	80%	26%	33%	30%						14%
English Language Learners	26%		52%	42%	42%	76%	75%	18%					44%
Black/African American Students	43%		67%		50%	58%							
Hispanic Students	39%	42%	63%	54%	49%	74%	75%	35%					44%
White Students	66%	69%	70%		71%	63%		66%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	43%	43%	63%	53%	53%	67%	68%	41%					42%

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	45%	48%			52%			54%					32%
Students With Disabilities	16%	0%			19%			25%					57%
English Language Learners	22%	24%			31%			21%					60%
Black/African American Students	47%				33%								
Hispanic Students	33%	29%			43%			36%					57%
White Students	59%	67%			63%			69%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	39%	38%			45%			46%					61%

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	52%		59%	42%	57%	66%	51%	53%					58%
Students With Disabilities	32%		41%	31%	33%	50%	55%	36%					64%
English Language Learners	24%		48%	40%	34%	53%	57%	25%					58%
Native American Students													
Asian Students													
Black/African American Students	33%				27%								
Hispanic Students	41%		54%	41%	46%	61%	53%	46%					62%
Multiracial Students	40%				70%								
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	70%		68%		74%	78%		72%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	44%		60%	38%	49%	67%	53%	42%					61%

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	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%
Ela	4	45%	50%	-5%	53%	-8%
Ela	5	40%	48%	-8%	55%	-15%
Math	3	52%	58%	-6%	60%	-8%
Math	4	54%	51%	3%	58%	-4%
Math	5	51%	52%	-1%	56%	-5%
Science	5	45%	50%	-5%	53%	-8%

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?

Proficiency in ELA and mathematics both increased by 5%. Gains in ELA and mathematics were 65% and 68% respectively. Our focus for student support centered on utilizing progress monitoring data combined with lagging data to focus on students performing at Level 2.

Lowest Performance

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

Science was our area for lowest performance at 49%. Contributing factors include teachers in the grade level new to the content and the shift from paper-based testing to computer-based testing.

Greatest Decline

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

Science was our area for lowest performance at 49%. Contributing factors include teachers in the grade level new to the content and the shift from paper-based testing to computer-based testing. Additionally, the vertical alignment between the standards and the feeder grades needs to be refined.

Greatest Gap

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA proficiency for grades 3 and 4, which trailed the state average by 8 points. Several factors contributed to this gap, including varying levels of foundational literacy skills and fluency among students. Despite these challenges, our students demonstrated significant improvement, as evidenced by over 65% ELA gains. This indicates that our targeted interventions and instructional strategies are effective. However, to close the gap further, we need to focus on shifting more students from level 2 to level 3 and above. This will involve continued emphasis on data-driven instruction, differentiated support, and professional development for teachers to enhance their instructional practices.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Attendance continues to be an area for improvement. Proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5 is an area that needs to shift.

Highest Priorities

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

Increasing ELA proficiency across all grades.

Increasing science proficiency for 5th grades.

Improving attendance for all grades.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

According to the FLDOE data, Stanley Switlik Elementary School's subgroup, students with disabilities, shows that the 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade cohorts have significant deficiencies in ELA student achievement. Based on the FAST PM3 from 2032-2024 39% of students with disabilities are proficient. The ability to read fluently is a crucial component of comprehension and reading success.

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.

By May 2025, grade 3-5 ELA achievement for the SWD (students with disabilities) subgroup will increase from 39% to 52% proficiency by scoring a level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring

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

We will utilize State/District Progress Monitoring Data to monitor progress toward our goals for ELA growth and proficiency. Growth will be monitored more frequently during the school year and analyzed each quarter. Attention to incremental progress and making instructional adjustments will impact student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kerri Worthington, Literacy Coach

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:

Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly through purposeful readings, exposure to different texts, read-alouds, and choral reads.

Rationale:

The research based fluency building activities, repeated reading, modeling, choral reading, guiding reading, and echo reading, were increase students reading fluency and support their achievement on the FAST ELA assessment.

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

Plan of Action

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

August 30, 2024 before the intervention block begins.

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

The SWD teachers, Literacy Coach and Assistant Principal meet to discuss the plan of action, highlight the goal, activities to implement, and tools that will be used to monitor the student's progress. A baseline assessment will be given to identify the needs of the students. Monitoring will be through fluency-based progress monitoring through Amira.

Action Step #2

Data Meeting

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Prinicipal

By When/Frequency:

September 12, 2024

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

Data meeting to discuss student data from Amira, IStation On demand, and FAST ELA assessment. This data meeting will assist the teachers in developing data-driven instructional lessons within the small group interventions.

Action Step #3

Implementation of Strategies

Person Monitoring:

Kerri Worthington, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

September 16, 2024

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

Teachers will begin to implement research-based fluency strategies to support the fluency rate during reading instructional. Data will be tracked visually and students will monitor their progress in building fluency.

Action Step #4

Data Checkpoint

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

October 14, 2024

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

Data checkpoint to discuss the implementation process and review student improvements and areas of need.

Action Step #5

Continued Implementation

Person Monitoring:

Kerri Worthington, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

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

The implementation plan will continue to cycle through until the end of the school year by assessing the data, creating activities to support the increased rate of fluency, and developing data-driven instruction.

Action Step #6

Data review

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

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

The team will meet to review the FAST ELA assessment data and conclude if the research-based strategies implemented had a positive outcome for student achievement.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

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.

According to the FDOE PM3 2024 data, 53% of 3rd grade, 51% of 4th grade, and 59% of 5th grade scored below the 40th percentile indicating they are performing below grade level. The data indicates our students are lacking comprehension skills and displays a need for targeted Tier 3 interventions focusing on building fluency to support comprehension.

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

N/A

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

Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly through purposeful readings, exposure to different texts, read-aloud, and choral reads.

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

The percentage of proficient students in grades 3-5 will increase by at least 5%, as measured by the FAST PM3 Assessment.

Monitoring

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

We will utilize State/District Progress Monitoring Data to monitor progress toward our goals for ELA growth and proficiency. Growth will be monitored more frequently during the school year and analyzed each quarter. Attention to incremental progress and making instructional adjustments will impact student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kerri Worthington, Literacy Coach

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:

Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly through purposeful readings, exposure to different texts, read-aloud, and choral reads.

Rationale:

The research-based fluency-building activities, repeated reading, modeling, choral reading, guiding reading, and echo reading, increased students reading fluency and supported their achievement on the FAST ELA assessment.

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

Plan of Action

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Prinicipal

By When/Frequency:

August 30, 2024 before the intervention block begins.

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

The SWD teachers, Literacy Coach and Assistant Principal meet to discuss the plan of action, highlight the goal, activities to implement, and tools that will be used to monitor the student's progress. A baseline assessment will be given to identify the needs of the students. Monitoring will be through fluency-based progress monitoring through Amira.

Action Step #2

Data Meeting

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Prinicipal

By When/Frequency:

September 12, 2024

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

Data meeting to discuss student data from Amira, IStation On demand and FAST ELA assessment. This data meeting will assist the teachers in developing data driven instructional lessons within the small group interventions.

Action Step #3

Implementation of Strategies

Person Monitoring:

Kerri Worthington, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

September 16, 2024

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

Teachers will begin to implement research-based fluency strategies to support the fluency rate during reading instructional. Data will be tracked visually and students will monitor their progress in building fluency.

Action Step #4

Data Checkpoint

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

October 14, 2024

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

Data checkpoint to discuss the implementation process and review student improvements and areas of need.

Action Step #5

Continued implementation

Person Monitoring:

Kerri Worthington, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

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

The implementation plan will continue to cycle through until the end of the school year by assessing the data, creating activities to support the increased rate of fluency, and developing data-driven instruction.

Action Step #6

Data Review

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

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

The team will meet to review the FAST ELA assessment data and conclude if the research-based strategies implemented had a positive outcome for student achievement.

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.

2023-2024 5th grade science proficiency rate was identified at 49% per the F.A.S.T science assessment. This proficiency rate is below both the state and district averages.

Measurable Outcome

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

Based on the 2023-2024 5th grade science assessment, there is a need to improve the understanding of basic science concepts, increased interest in science, and higher performance in standardized science assessments.

2022-2023 5th grade science proficiency rate was identified at 54% per the F.A.S.T. science assessment. There was a 5% decrease in proficiency in the 2023-2024 year.

By May 2025, grade 5 science achievement will increase from 49% to 60% proficiency by scoring a level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring

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

The 5th grade team will use the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. Science results, to identify lagging 3rd and 4th grade science standards that need additional focus utilizing a standards checklist.

The 4th-grade team will use the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. science results, to identify lagging 3rd-grade science standards that need additional focus utilizing a standards checklist. .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tanya Sly

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:

Students will experience hands-on activities, experiments, and investigations where students learn by exploring scientific concepts through direct experience.

Rationale:

Inquiry-based learning helps young students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills by engaging them in the scientific process. This approach aligns with research showing that active learning enhances comprehension and retention.

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

Assessment

Person Monitoring:

Kaia Miller-5th grade team leader

By When/Frequency:

continuously

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

Assessments: Pre- and post-intervention assessments, periodic quizzes, and standardized tests with assistance of district supports.

Action Step #2

Classroom Observation

Person Monitoring:

District Science Coordinator

By When/Frequency:

quarterly

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

Observations: Periodic classroom observations by science coordinator.

Action Step #3

Student/Teacher Data conferences

Person Monitoring:

Tanya Sly

By When/Frequency:

quarterly

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

Feedback: Teacher and student feedback collected through student conferences.

Action Step #4

Supplemental Science Experiences

Person Monitoring:

Michael Sessler

By When/Frequency:

by May 2025

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

Working with local community resources, science experiences through the science special area class lessons will align and support the tested standards for all grades.

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.

Attendance is crucial to succeed in school. The average daily attendance rate for 2023-2024 was 92.52% school-wide with Kindergarten having the lowest at 91.64%

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 the importance of attendance.
- Attendance team weekly meeting.
- Refer to the district when necessary.

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.

By May 2025, average daily attendance will improve to 95%. Baseline data by grade level is

- K - 91.64%
- 1 - 93.44%
- 2 - 93.06%
- 3 - 94.25%
- 4 - 93.02%
- 5 - 93.56%

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.

Data will be monitored according to Tiers

Tier 1

- Weekly attendance reports for all students
- Weekly attendance of 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, School Counselor

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:

Weekly reward opportunities for students who are present, arrive on time and remain all day. Parents call when three days are missed. A parent letter home. Parent meeting. Weekly attendance team meeting. Refer to the district when needed.

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Data Collection and Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Chris Willis, School Counselor

By When/Frequency:

weekly

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

Data will be collected weekly to determine average daily attendance and reviewed by the school attendance team. Attendance will be incentivized by recognizing students who are present, arrive on time, and do not leave early each week during lunchtimes.

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.

<https://f102202360.schoolwires.net/domain/1382>

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))

<https://f102202360.schoolwires.net/domain/2899>

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))

Support for English language learners will be enhanced with additional classroom support for newcomers. The school master schedule includes intervention and enrichment time with a dedicated time for differentiated technology focus time.

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))

Our plan includes a focus on parent engagement and school activities that align with Title I guidelines. Additional Title I events are planned to highlight the benefits of being a Title I school.

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))

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.

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))

N/A

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)).

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 support. 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 support 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 affect 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 are discussions regarding 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.

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)).

Building-level PLC will be implemented to support evidence-based, best practices in ELA and Math. These practices will then be used to deliver a 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.

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))

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

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.

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 a 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.

Specifics to Address the Need

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

All resources will be evaluated utilizing data to determine if the needs are being addressed continually throughout the school year.

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