Gerald Adams Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gerald Adams Elementary School

5855 COLLEGE RD, Key West, FL 33040

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/363

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 to collaboratively provide a quality learning environment in which ALL children can learn and develop to their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating the LEADers of tomorrow!
Learners – foster a love of learning
Example Setters – character development
Achievers – focused on raising academic achievement
Dreamers – goal focused—success is possible

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
Vinson, Steven	Assistant Principal	Teacher Evaluation Oversee Discipline and Threat Assessment Protocols Safety Drill including (ALICE, Fire Drills, Bus Evacuation Drills) Supervision of Building Work teachers and families on behavioral interventions Attendance Monitoring
Orcutt, Tammy	School Counselor	Individual and Group Counseling Classroom Lesson in conjunction with PBIS and Safer Smarter Kids Support MTSS interventions for behavior (CICO) Section 504 designee CHIPS Contact Threat Assessment Team Member Child Abuse and DCF Reporting Facilitation of Communities Resources and Support for Children and Families
Miller , Donna	Reading Coach	Coaching Data Analysis Reading in Content Areas assistance Literacy Leader Professional Learning Testing assistance
Mellies, Ashley	Math Coach	Coaching Data Analysis Math instructional assistance Professional Learning Testing assistance
Alsobrooks, Melissa	Principal	Manage the daily operations of the school Ensure high quality, standards based instruction is taking place in every classrooms Data analysis to make student-centered decisions Hire, Support and Evaluate Staff Communicate School Improvement Plan and District Strategic Plan with Stakeholders Manage School Budget and Seek additional Grant Funding Opportunities Provide Professional Growth Opportunities for employees

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.

Our SIP is developed collaboratively with our school leadership team. We review our school data and determine our areas of opportunities and areas of strength through our Building Level Planning Team (BLPT). These goals are then shared with our staff through faculty meetings seeking input. BLPT will review any suggestions and make edits to our goals as needed. Once complete our SIP is presented to our SAC for review and input before submitting to the state and district school board for approval.

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))

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 with our SWD students.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
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) 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: C
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	28	28	30	15	16	22	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	37	27	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	12	0	33	37	22	0	0	0	112

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	8	5	7	9	13	0	0	0	44

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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	32	20	18	10	16	14	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	22	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	24	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	32	20	18	10	16	14	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	22	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	24	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	49	54	56	65	70	57
ELA Learning Gains	50	56	61	55	55	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42	46	52	47	46	53
Math Achievement*	53	57	60	58	71	63
Math Learning Gains	65	61	64	60	64	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59	51	55	42	56	51
Science Achievement*	18	48	51	57	66	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	71			72		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	55			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

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	49	50	42	53	65	59	18					71
SWD	30	34	33	31	51	58	7					72
ELL	38	48	47	41	56	42	4					71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	48	39	40	51	44	20					63
HSP	53	49	55	54	70	67	15					78
MUL	73											
PAC												

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
WHT	57	50		63	76		23					
FRL	43	43	40	48	63	58	13					70

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	56	39	31	38	46	46	47					57
SWD	35	17		23	30		22					25
ELL	44	38		25	50		25					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	36		29	45		42					45
HSP	57	31		36	48	50	34					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	62		50	38		77					
FRL	48	39	27	36	53	45	38					56

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	65	55	47	58	60	42	57					72
SWD	52	50	62	42	49	25	52					60
ELL	47	41	27	37	58	48	33					72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60	54	44	43	54	33	20					71
HSP	62	48	43	61	54	44	68					73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	70		70	81		80					
FRL	60	53	47	53	54	38	47					73

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	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	51%	-5%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	49%	-17%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	51%	-13%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	45%	-16%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	44%	-15%	51%	-22%

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.

5th grade math was our lowest performing area this year and showed a decrease from last year. Due to the introduction of new materials/ curriculum and new state standards teachers were acclimating to the change in standards and learning new resources throughout the year.

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

4th grade math showed the largest decline from 21-22 (58%) to 22-23 (37%). Due to the introduction of new materials/ curriculum and new state standards teachers were acclimating to the change in standards and learning new resources throughout the year.

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 areas of 4th and 5th grade math have the largest gap between the state average and our school. 4th grade showed 37% with a level 3 or higher while the state average was 61% leaving a 24% gap between GAE and the state. 5th grade showed 30% of students with a level 3 or higher while the state average was 57% leaving a 27% gap between GAE and the state. 3rd grade math also showed a gap of 11% which is not as significant as 4th and 5th. Due to the introduction of new materials/ curriculum and new state standards teachers were acclimating to the change in standards and learning new resources throughout the year. Math is an area that continues to show a declining trend in scores as they increase in grade levels.

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

5th grade ELA improved the percent of students obtaining a 3 or higher by 13% last year while 5th grade science improved by 13% as well.

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

Areas of concern regarding EWS data are attendance below 90% and the number of students with reading deficiencies.

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

Improve proficiency in Students with Disabilities in ELA
Improve Math instruction across all grade levels.
Improve ELA instruction across all grade levels.
Improve attendance for students- reduce numbers of chronically absent students.

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

#1. 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.

Based on review of data from 2021, Gerald Adams demonstrated 40% proficiency for SWD students in the area of ELA. After reviewing our current 22-23 data we continue to struggle with our SWD students demonstrating 28% proficiency for students in grades 3 through 5 on the FAST ELA PM 3.

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

Increase percent of SWD students demonstrating proficiency through scoring a level 3 or higher on PM 3 of the FAST ELA assessment from 28% (2023) to 45%.

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

The percent of SWD students demonstrating proficiency will be monitored using the states FAST ELA progress monitoring assessment that is administered in the Fall (Aug-Sept) and the Winter (Dec-Jan).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

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 through purposeful readings, exposure to different texts, read a louds and choral reads.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction that includes providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly will increase achievement on the PM 3 of FAST ELA.
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/29

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.

Review data with teachers regarding subgroup (SWD) performance. Identify areas of opportunity.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: August 10th, 2023

Implement training for activities like small group instruction, purposeful repeated readings, choral readings, read a louds, and access to a wide variety of text using approved resources during school professional learning and coaching activities.

Person Responsible: Donna Miller (donna.miller@keysschools.com)

By When: October 31st, 2023

Record implementation data through walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: January 31st, 2024

Baseline assessment will be administered to students to determine beginning of the year level.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: September 29th, 2023

Review of progress monitoring data to determine effectiveness of strategies and identify areas of opportunity to improve.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: January 31st, 2024

#2. 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.

Based on our 22-23 school year EWS report, Gerald Adams had 139 student who missed 10% or more of the total days of school, this represents 25% of school population for the 22-23 school year.

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

Gerald Adams will decrease the number of students missing more than 10% of the school year from 25% to 10% of our student population by the end of 23-24 school year.

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

Student attendance will be monitored monthly by administration and our school counselor, letter, emails and calls home will utilized to communicate attendance policies and incentives to students and parents. Students meeting attendance goals will be rewarded through our PBIS system.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

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.)

PBIS is a positive behavior system that reinforces targeted behaviors such as improving attendance through the use of rewards, recognition and positive messaging.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS has a strong culture at Gerald Adams and the use of targeted strategies for intervention has shown success in the past.
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/study/89237

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.

Review attendance from previous year, determine targeted list of students for increased messaging and monitoring.

Person Responsible: Tammy Orcutt (tammy.orcutt@keysschools.com)

By When: September 31st, 2023

Monthly attendance rewards for students who meet attendance goals.

Person Responsible: Tammy Orcutt (tammy.orcutt@keysschools.com)

By When: May 26th, 2024

Monitor attendance data for improvements and trends.

Person Responsible: Steven Vinson (steven.vinson@keysschools.com)

By When: May 26th, 2024

As needed use of the truancy process for students who continue to exhibit a pattern of non-attendance.

Person Responsible: Steven Vinson (steven.vinson@keysschools.com)

By When: May 26th, 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Based on FAST Math PM 3 the areas of 4th and 5th grade math have the largest gap between the state average and our school. 4th grade showed 37% with a level 3 or higher while the state average was 61% leaving a 24% gap between GAE and the state. 5th grade showed 30% of students with a level 3 or higher while the state average was 57% leaving a 27% gap between GAE and the state. 3rd grade math also showed a gap of 11% which is not as significant as 4th and 5th.

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

Gerald Adams will increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FAST Math PM 3 from 40% to 55% by May of 23-24.

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

The percent of students demonstrating proficiency will be monitored using the states FAST Math progress monitoring assessment that is administered in the Fall (Aug-Sept) and the Winter (Dec-Jan).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

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

Use of a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of math manipulatives, or concrete and semi concrete representations can help students conceptualize
the connection between the representations and the mathematics.
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/WWC2021006-Math-PG.pdf#page=28

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.

Review data with teachers regarding Math performance. Identify areas of opportunity.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: September 30th, 2023

Baseline assessment will be administered to students to determine beginning of the year level.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: September 30th, 2023

Implement training for activities like small group instruction, purposeful repeated readings, choral readings, read a louds, and access to a wide variety of text using approved resources during school professional learning and coaching activities.

Person Responsible: Ashley Mellies (ashley.mellies@keysschools.com)

By When: October 31st, 2023

Record implementation data through walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: January 31st, 2024

Review of progress monitoring data to determine effectiveness of strategies and identify areas of opportunity to improve.

Person Responsible: Melissa Alsobrooks (melissa.alsobrooks@keysstudents.net)

By When: January 31st, 2024

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 Gerald Adams, 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

Based on 2023 Spring STAR Reading assessment data 67% of 1st grade and 56% of 2nd grade students scored below the 40th percentile indicating they are performing below grade level. The data indicates students need to improve reading comprehension, in order to improve reading comprehension students must develop decoding skills for complex multisyllabic words. Improved decoding skills will lead to greater fluency and improve overall comprehension. Students will receive targeted small group interventions using ESSA evidenced based reading interventions.

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

Based on 2023 Spring FAST ELA assessment data 67% of 3rd grade, 55% of 4th grade and 54% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3 indicating they are performing below grade level. The data indicates students need to improve reading comprehension, in order to improve reading comprehension students must develop reading fluency. Improved fluency skills will improve overall comprehension. Students will receive targeted small group interventions using ESSA evidenced based reading interventions to provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly. .

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

Based on the Spring 2023 STAR Reading 1st grade data, 33% of students scored above the 40th percentile and 2nd grade data, 44% of students scored above the 40th percentile. For the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of current 1st graders will score above the 40th percentile or higher on the STAR

Reading assessment for PM 3 and 55% of current 2nd graders will score above the 40th percentile for PM 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the Spring 2023 FAST ELA 3rd grade data, 33% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher, 4th grade data, 45% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher and 5th grade data, 46% of students scored a level 3 (proficient) or higher. For the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of current 3rd graders will score a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment, 55% of current 4th grade students will score a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment and 55% of current 5th grade students will score a level 3 (proficient) or higher on the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment.

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.

Explicit data driven instruction using IES guides will be provided to all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students through the Flamingo Literacy Small Group Model and Benchmark Advance daily lessons. Administrative walk throughs, monthly data chats discussing iStation data, and quarterly data chats discussing FAST data, as well as targeted teacher learning will be ongoing to ensure that teachers and students are progressing adequately towards our measurable outcome.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Alsobrooks, Melissa , melissa.alsobrooks@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?

Using the Flamingo Small Group Literacy Instruction Model and Benchmark Advance daily lessons teachers will implement differentiated literacy centers that target the needs of all their students. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be receiving explicit interventions using IES guides, and/or UFLI phonics.

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?

The Flamingo Small Group Literacy Instruction is a comprehensive, research-based, five step model that aligns instruction to student data, a phonics scope and sequence, and emphasizes oral language development through the lesson. UFLI is a program of fully developed lessons that follow a specific scope and sequence. It is designed for and has been tested with whole-class instruction, but it has also been translated into intervention. UFLI employs multisensory methods that involve the mouth movements used in phoneme production.

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
Monthly Data Chats discussing students iStation monthly ISIPs will be held with the Reading Coach. These data chats will be an ongoing review of student assessment data throughout the school year to address the students' learning needs. Quarterly Data Chats will take place, discussing students FAST/ STAR data, breaking down the students Florida B.E.S.T standards mastery/ STAR benchmark reports with teachers so they can provide targeted small group instruction.	Miller , Donna , donna.miller@keysschools.com
Targeted school-wide professional learning using the Flamingo Literacy Small Group Instructional Model and incorporating Benchmark Advanced lessons. This will be a four part professional learning. The Flamingo Literacy Small Group Instructional Model was selected in order to provide students with targeted small group instruction. Based on intensive data analysis of students mastery of the B.E.S.T standards through review of FAST and STAR, targeted small group instruction will provide students the differentiated interventions they need to improve fluency and overall reading comprehension.	Alsobrooks, Melissa , melissa.alsobrooks@keysschools.com
UFLI resource binders will be provided to K-5 teachers. The UFLI resource binder will provide teachers with differentiated phonics resources from UFLI, that will be used during their targeted small group instruction. These binders will be developed and created by the Literacy Coach, who will provide modeling and support in using the resources in the binder.	Miller , Donna , donna.miller@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.

Our SIP and SWP will be distributed to parents through the use of our school website, our social media sites as well as communicated through our SAC meetings and parent engagement events. Through collaboration with our parent educators we are able to provide translation for our primary languages.

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))

Consistent communication is key to effectively building positive relationships within our community and with our parents. Through the use of the school website, social media sites, our Blackboard messaging system, use of our FOCUS student information system and newsletters in our weekly folders we are able to share a variety of information to our families. We host multiple parent engagement activities throughout the year such as our Title I Open House, STEM Fair, Literacy Nights, and our EL Parent Engagement events. We also hold monthly SAC meetings that are open to our community to attend.

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 grade level daily schedules were modified to improve instructional blocks and meet the needs of students. With the new schedules teachers will focus on the use of fluency building activities and concrete math examples centered around targeted small group instruction in the classroom. Through the use of targeted small group instruction students can be provided enrichment and acceleration in an appropriate manner that meets their needs and skill level.

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))

When developing our school wide goals and SIP we collaborate with all stakeholders including our district and any applicable services to support our students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school currently has a school counselor and a school social worker who are full time on staff to assist with students who need specialized support services. Our district also contracts with our local mental health services, Guidance Care Center, to provide crisis support and also provide educational programs throughout the school year such as the Apple a Day program. All of our services are rooted in the MTSS model that emphasizes providing the appropriate level of support to students as needed. We utilize Studies Weekly as our character education program and it is provided 30 minutes weekly to students in grade K-5.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We are a PBIS School and we have implemented the I-Believe Core Values throughout the building. We teach the rules and practice them with our students. Through the use of our student wellness screener and our progress monitoring system we are able to identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports in out MTSS process.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teacher and paraprofessionals are provided opportunity throughout the year to engage in meaningful professional learning that is specifically tied to school data. By conducting a needs assessment at the beginning of the school year, we are able to plan and provide PL that aligns with our needs as a school. Staff then participates in selected learning to improve their instructional skills or knowledge of resources. This additional support allows us to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers.

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

It is the policy of the Monroe County School District to support successful transitions for children and their families when entering Pre-Kindergarten Kindergarten. Administrators, Teaching Staff, and Family Service Staff work together with the parents to provide successful transitions to Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten. Each year the district works with inter-agency groups to collect data/information on incoming Kindergarten Students. Through the state's T&TA Steering Committee, Child Find, the ELC, our Early Childhood Department, and the districts Pre K ESE department we maintain and inter-agency agreement and communication to help transition Pre-K and/or Kindergarten students with special needs.

At the end of the school year, Information regarding enrollment into the Kindergarten is communicated to MCSD prekindergarten students and posted on the district's webpage. Information regarding Kindergarten is shared with Private Providers and Interagency Groups.

Across the district, each school holds a "Kindergarten Round-up" to invite future Kindergarten students and parents to attend transition meetings at the school they choose to attend. While the students tour the school with a current Kindergarten teacher. The parents discuss the following: registration, attendance, school policies and other school communication.

In addition, Head Start and VPK Teachers prepare student files to be transferred to school department chair. Transition meetings are held with school administration, department chairs, and Head Start/VPK personnel to discuss student transitions. During the month of May, parents of children transitioning to kindergarten will receive a packet that includes their child's physical, immunizations, IEP (if applicable), developmental progress report, assessment information, "What My Child Needs to Know" and summer learning. Special transition meetings are held with the Early Childhood Learning department for both Head Start and VPK students/families.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes