

Monroe County School District

Horace O'Bryant School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Horace O'Bryant School

1105 LEON ST, Key West, FL 33040

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/496>

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), (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. 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.

We are committed to working collaboratively to provide a safe, positive, learning environment in which all children will be engaged, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating the BUCs of tomorrow!
Becoming Life-Long Learners--Foster a love of learning
Ultimate Achievement--High academic achievement
Character--7 C's-Live by the Buccaneer Code of Honor
Success--Goal setting-Reach for your goals and dreams

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
Desilets, Brian	Principal	Provide Leadership, guidance and supervision to all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.
Meier, Scott	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Means, Marissa	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Ring, Dana	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Murray, Nanette	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Ray, Monet	Attendance/ Social Work	As the school's social worker, the primary goal is to encourage, support and foster positive relationships and development between students, staff and families. The school social worker will connect students and their families to community support systems as needed to ensure a holistic approach to meet the needs of the child.
Buchanan, Amelia	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach

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.

We utilized our school Building Leadership Planning Team to review and develop the SIP Goals. Our SIP is reviewed by our School Advisory Council and progress is discussed at monthly meetings.

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))

Our plan and progress will be monitored monthly meetings with the Building Leadership Planning Team. Data will be consistently monitored and supports will be provided for those students with the greatest need. Our school has revamped our MTSS program and our Interventionists will be reporting and assisting staff with deep data dives to address our students with the greatest achievement gap. The SIP will be revised as needed through meetings and discussions with our BLPT and our SAC.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	60%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	10	13	7	8	14	10	39	38	32	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	3	3	1	4	9	4	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	22	9	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	20	79	119	81	321
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	65	66	59	208
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	

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	0	1	1	10	8	33	47	26	126

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	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	1	2	15

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	
Absent 10% or more days	13	9	6	12	10	15	27	35	28	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	1	4	1	2	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	8	7	59	45	65	190
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	12	12	65	63	67	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	33	4	52

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	0	3	6	5	19	17	19	69

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	3	5	1	2	2	18

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	13	9	6	12	10	15	27	35	28	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	1	4	1	2	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	8	7	59	45	65	190
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	12	12	65	63	67	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	33	4	52

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	0	3	6	5	19	17	19	69

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	3	5	1	2	2	18

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*	47	54	57	56	64	61
ELA Learning Gains	45	51	55	58	61	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38	41	46	46	51	54
Math Achievement*	48	57	55	58	66	62
Math Learning Gains	54	63	60	60	64	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49	54	56	49	51	52
Science Achievement*	42	57	51	58	67	56
Social Studies Achievement*	64	75	72	80	85	78
Middle School Acceleration	75			61		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	64			68		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	46			
HSP	51			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	48			

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	47	45	38	48	54	49	42	64	75			64
SWD	21	34	31	22	37	40	21	47	69			65
ELL	31	44	43	34	50	48	20	62	58			64
AMI												
ASN	75	73		82	91							
BLK	35	39	36	34	44	39	22	60	76			71
HSP	45	45	40	46	56	55	40	55	64			62
MUL	75	67		59	69							
PAC												
WHT	55	47	30	62	56	50	59	78	80			
FRL	41	41	38	42	51	44	32	61	69			64

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	52	48	33	50	44	29	40	66	62			35
SWD	26	35	30	28	34	23	21	46				6
ELL	41	43	40	37	40	47	26	58	67			35
AMI												
ASN	83	70		83	80							
BLK	42	39	25	36	33	18	18	52				29
HSP	49	47	36	48	42	34	39	56	56			35
MUL	67	45		41	50		60					
PAC												
WHT	62	55	41	66	54	44	53	89	69			
FRL	49	44	31	44	40	28	38	53	54			38

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	56	58	46	58	60	49	58	80	61			68
SWD	26	44	47	32	44	41	31	51				55
ELL	39	52	46	40	55	54	36	62	29			68
AMI												
ASN	77	77		85	62							
BLK	45	48	40	40	54	49	47	82	47			65
HSP	52	59	46	55	58	48	50	71	49			68
MUL	63	58		66	58		71		69			
PAC												
WHT	69	64	63	74	69	50	72	91	72			
FRL	49	55	46	50	56	48	48	76	42			63

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	48%	49%	-1%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	47%	-12%	47%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	42%	-7%	47%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	25%	45%	-20%	47%	-22%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	49%	-9%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	34%	54%	-20%	54%	-20%
07	2023 - Spring	45%	60%	-15%	48%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	51%	-2%	61%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	57%	-14%	55%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	45%	-7%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	45%	-9%	44%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	44%	-11%	51%	-18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	53%	34%	50%	37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	63%	33%	48%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	68%	-15%	66%	-13%

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.

25% of Grade 6 achieved proficiency. The majority of our ESE students are not proficient in reading or math as indicated by STAR and FAST progress monitoring. Contributing factors are still recovering from the Pandemic and also filling necessary vacancies due to a staffing shortage.

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

6th grade ELA dropped by 22 percentage points from 47% to 25% in 21-22.

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.

6th grade ELA has the 22% gap when compared to the 47% state average. The cohort performs low overall as Math also had the greatest gap (21%) when compared to the state average.

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

7th grade math increased from 16-44% proficiency. A teacher implemented differentiated centers for Tiered Math instruction.

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

The 6th grade group has greater than 10% absences.

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

1. Restructure our ESE & EL scheduling though the use of an Inclusion Network to make sure that our underperforming students are getting the tiered instructional support they need.
2. Hire certified and qualified staff members.
3. Deep Data Dives after each progress monitoring to identify and remediate areas of weakness through Horizons period and tiered ELA and Math instruction.
4. Ensure that teachers are utilizing the district curriculum guidelines.

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.

We are addressing our culture and climate and making the school a safe and engaging place for our students. This school year we are implementing and expanding our use of AVID schoolwide system, bolstering PBIS behavior program with grade level initiatives based on survey data. We are continuing to hire qualified staff who understand the importance of building positive relationships with students. We are revamping our new teacher program to make sure they feel adequately supported by implementing a 15 minute a week check in with administration.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our level of positive culture and climate from 50% to 60% average and measure it by utilizing student and staff Panorama surveys. We will communicate with the parents and community by using newsletters and other forms of communication informing them of the wonderful work being done at our school and obtaining their input.

Monitoring:

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

We will analyze the panorama data completed by our students and staff to look for trends and areas of positive or negative responses. Our Building Level Planning Team will desegregate the data and provide recommendations and commendations for their team. Students will be recognized with Buc Bucs for positive recognition daily. Beacons are announced weekly on newsletters and in social media as they are nominated by their colleagues. Parents will be kept informed of our PBIS initiatives and Survey results via School Advisory Council Meetings which are held both in person and virtually and provide opportunity for input and feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Meier (scott.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.)

Our school will be decorated using our iBElieve program which is linked to PBIS behavior expectations. We will track the number of BucBucs distributed and the number of referrals issued.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will regularly monitor to measure the effectiveness of the implementation of our schoolwide strategies intended to reduce problematic behavior that interfere with the ability of students to attend to and engage fully in instructional activities.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Distribute Panorama Surveys to students and staff

Person Responsible: Monet Ray (monet.ray@keysschools.com)

By When: Quarter 1 end

BLPT reflect on survey data and support teachers and students from their respective groups by offering support and resources to acknowledge or increase positive responses.

Person Responsible: Monet Ray (monet.ray@keysschools.com)

By When: Within a week of the BLPT meeting after each survey is distributed.

Update the parents and community by using newsletters and other forms of communication and at SAC meetings

Person Responsible: Brian Desilets (brian.desilets@keysschools.com)

By When: ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

This area of focus was predetermined due to the fact that our Federal Index for Students with Disabilities was at 39% which is below the 41% benchmark for the Index. Collaborative Data Chats lead by ESE staff and Literacy Coach will ensure that teachers are using student performance data from FAST and STAR, to inform instruction during E/I block in the elementary grades and during the Horizons period in the middle grades. They will implement Flamingo differentiated literacy centers in the Elementary grades and AVID multisensory sets from AVID weekly in the Middle Grades to accelerate learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup will seek to improve to meet and exceed the Federal Index of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by analyzing progress monitoring test outcomes, conducting data chats between teacher and student and during grade level and department meetings implementing the Flamingo, Benchmark and SAVVAS ELA data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Desilets (brian.desilets@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.)

Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly by utilizing Flamingo small group literacy instruction and Benchmark Advance daily lessons in elementary school. Middle grades will have Horizons period 2 times a week to divide groups into differentiated centers where they will compare text sets to make connections and identify theme in poetry or prose, using articles from AVID weekly .

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative Data Chats will ensure that teachers are analyzing student performance data, using the data to inform instruction, and using the data to encourage student achievement and support the Reading Program. Teachers will discuss best practices, needs and effective use of data.

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 Coach provides training for BLPT to analyze data from FAST and STAR PM.

Person Responsible: Amelia Buchanan (amelia.buchanan@keysschools.com)

By When: During BLPT's October 2 meeting, the first meeting to occur after PM1 window ends and after every PM window.

BLPT members collaborate with their respective teams to identify insights and instructional plans regarding performance on the focus area of Fluency in grades K-2, comprehension in grades 3-5, and text to text connections and identifying theme in poetry and prose in the middle grades, after each PM window.

Person Responsible: Brian Desilets (brian.desilets@keysschools.com)

By When: October 16 BLPT meeting after PM1 Jan BLPT meeting after PM2

Horizons homeroom teachers will implement lessons created by the AVID teacher to accelerate learning in the identified areas related to poetry and prose.

Person Responsible: Dana Ring (dana.ring@keysschools.com)

By When: Monthly check ins with AVID teacher and ELA team leaders

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 Horace O'Bryant School, the Building Leadership Planning Team identifies and gather 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

This area of focus was predetermined due to the fact that our Federal Index for Students with Disabilities was at 39% which is below the 41% benchmark for the Index. Collaborative Data Chats lead by ESE staff and Literacy Coach will ensure that teachers are using student performance data from FAST and STAR, to inform instruction during E/I block in the elementary grades and during the Horizons period in the middle grades. They will implement Flamingo differentiated literacy centers in the Elementary grades and AVID multisensory sets from AVID weekly in the Middle Grades to accelerate learning.

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

Our Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 will seek to improve to meet and exceed the Federal Index of 41%.

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.

This Area of Focus will be monitored by analyzing progress monitoring test outcomes, conducting data chats between teacher and student and during grade level and department meetings implementing the Flamingo, Benchmark and SAVVAS ELA data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Desilets, Brian, brian.desilets@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?

Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly by utilizing Flamingo small group literacy instruction and Benchmark Advance daily lessons in Grades 3-5.

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?

Collaborative Data Chats will ensure that teachers are analyzing student performance data, using the data to inform instruction, and using the data to encourage student achievement and support the Reading Program. Teachers will discuss best practices, needs and effective use of data.

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
Data Coach provides training for BLPT to analyze data from FAST PM.	Buchanan, Amelia, amelia.buchanan@keysschools.com
BLPT members collaborate with their respective teams to identify insights and instructional plans regarding performance on the focus area of Fluency and comprehension in grades 3-5, after each PM window.	Desilets, Brian, brian.desilets@keysschools.com

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.

SAC newly organized PTO members will be informed through concise agenda points. We also will post on approved social media pages and the school newsletter Pirate Post.

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))

Through regular and frequent parent and community engagement events such as SAC, Parent Nights, EL nights and Community Events where students share the progress of their learning in creative ways. In addition to the school website linked below, all teachers also send a weekly communication through email or approved apps, providing content updates and instructional expectations.

<https://www.keysschools.com/hob>

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)

This year HOB will provide district curriculum team and school administration led professional learning opportunities to increase student led instruction and other highly engaging instructional best practices.

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))

1. In person and virtual School Advisory Council Meetings.
2. The weekly Pirate Post newsletter and K-8 Weekly Emails sent to all families.
3. Weekly editions of the staff newsletter, The Navigator and HOB's teacher website, The Buoy.
4. Frequent updates and kudos on our HOB Website, Facebook page, School Marquee, Blackboard Connect, and Remind app.
5. Parent/Teacher Conferences throughout the school year.
6. Standing agenda items on Building Level Planning Team.
7. Teaming with Keys to be the Change to provide student mentoring in addition to our HOB Staff to student MentorSHIP program.
8. Partnership with Rotary, United Way and local churches to provide Thanksgiving and Holiday Cheer baskets
9. Thriving student organizations such as TSIC, NEHS, NJHS, SAVE Promise Clubs, Student Councils, and athletic teams including Special Olympians.