

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 3
 - A. School Mission and Vision 3
 - B. School Leadership Team 3
 - C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 6
 - D. Demographic Data 7
 - E. Early Warning Systems 8
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 17
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 20
- III. Planning for Improvement 21
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 26
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 29
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 34

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Nothing Less Than Success...For ALL!

Provide the school's vision statement

We are Cubs!

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Jennifer Deke

Position Title

Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- ELA data analysis
- Facilitate collaborative planning
- Provide professional development
- Coaching cycles

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Sarah Baldwin

Position Title

Mathematics Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Mathematics data analysis
- Facilitate collaborative planning

- Provide professional development
- Coaching cycles

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

James Vernon

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Data analysis
- Plan for and provide resources for improvement
- Conduct walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback
- Monitor actions steps
- Monitor formative assessments
- Make adjustments to school improvement plans based on data

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jessica Smith-Jaekel

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Data analysis
- Plan for and provide resources for improvement
- Conduct walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback
- Monitor actions steps
- Monitor formative assessments
- Make adjustments to school improvement plans based on data

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Marie Brown

Position Title

MTSS Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Data analysis
- Monitor formative and summative assessment data
- Facilitate problem-solving/MTSS meetings
- Coaching cycles

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Marie Navarro

Position Title

School Social Worker

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Data analysis related to attendance
- Conduct attendance meetings with families
- Attendance incentive programs

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Daria Stephenson

Position Title

Dean

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Behavior data analysis
- Behavior intervention coordinator
- Monitor the implementation of PBIS at the individual, class, and school level
- Professional development related to behavior and PBIS

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

To develop our school improvement plan, we actively involve a range of stakeholders. This includes our school leadership teams (program planners, Performance Partnership Council, core team, and Student Advisory Council), teachers, and staff. At the end of the year, we present data to all teachers and staff and gather their input during evaluations. These questions center around how we can improve as a school and what we are doing well as a school. Data is also shared with our School Advisory Council (SAC), where we identify key priorities. At the start of the school year, we review the plan at our back-to-school meetings, focusing on our Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals with every staff member to gather feedback and state how each staff member's role helps us reach our goals. We complete the same activity with the SAC and seek final approval. We review these goals at the beginning of each month at a faculty meeting and mid-year at the SAC meeting.

SIP Monitoring

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

School improvement plan data will be monitored monthly.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	34.6%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	94.9%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: B 2022-23: B* 2021-22: B 2020-21: 2019-20: A

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	11	25	26	18	36	25	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	5	3	12	0	0	0	25
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0						0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0						0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	2	3	4	0	0	0	12

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	4	32	15	37	28	24				140
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	3	7	2				18
Course failure in ELA				5	9	9				23
Course failure in Math				5	16	21				42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				9	8	22				39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				8	13	16				37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		11	11	27						84

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2		9	24	22				58

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

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	3	2	8						14
Students retained two or more times				1	1	1				3

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	62	56	57	58	56	53	61	59	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	64	59	58	57	60	53			
ELA Learning Gains	59	53	60				58		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	49	52	57				37		
Math Achievement *	64	59	62	66	59	59	68	48	50
Math Learning Gains	62	54	62				67		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	51	45	52				58		
Science Achievement *	55	52	57	55	54	54	57	65	59
Social Studies Achievement *								61	64
Graduation Rate								56	50
Middle School Acceleration								53	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	80	62	61	48	65	59			

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	61%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	546
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
61%	59%	58%	51%		64%	58%

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

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	45%	No		
English Language Learners	80%	No		
Black/African American Students	48%	No		
Hispanic Students	54%	No		
Multiracial Students	59%	No		
White Students	61%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	No		

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	2	
English Language Learners	48%	No		
Black/African American Students	45%	No		
Hispanic Students	54%	No		
Multiracial Students	54%	No		
White Students	62%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	No		

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	1	

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%
English Language Learners	61%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students				
Black/African American Students	46%	No		
Hispanic Students	57%	No		
Multiracial Students	63%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	59%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	57%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	62%	64%	59%	49%	64%	62%	51%	55%					80%
Students With Disabilities	34%	29%	59%	48%	41%	63%	53%	33%					
English Language Learners													80%
Black/African American Students	50%	43%	56%		50%	40%		50%					
Hispanic Students	53%	60%	57%	73%	51%	60%	59%	17%					
Multiracial Students	60%	60%	53%		60%	60%							
White Students	65%	69%	59%	46%	69%	65%	55%	62%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	56%	57%	47%	55%	57%	46%	45%					

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	58%	57%			66%			55%					48%
Students With Disabilities	38%	29%			49%			44%					
English Language Learners	45%				50%								
Black/African American Students	46%	47%			54%			33%					
Hispanic Students	51%	71%			52%			43%					
Multiracial Students	58%	50%			54%								
White Students	60%	57%			71%			61%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	50%	51%			57%			46%					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2020-21	C&C ACCEL 2020-21	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	61%		58%	37%	68%	67%	58%	57%					
Students With Disabilities	41%		46%	24%	51%	53%	33%	29%					
English Language Learners	57%		62%		57%	69%							
Native American Students													
Asian Students													
Black/African American Students	46%		56%	50%	50%	50%	40%	31%					
Hispanic Students	57%		58%	53%	59%	68%	58%	48%					
Multiracial Students	60%		64%		55%	73%							
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	63%		56%	23%	73%	68%	64%	65%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%		59%	51%	61%	67%	55%	47%					

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

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

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

SUBJECT	GRADE	2023-24 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	3	62%	57%	5%	55%	7%
Ela	4	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
Ela	5	67%	56%	11%	55%	12%
Math	3	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Math	4	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
Math	5	60%	51%	9%	56%	4%
Science	5	53%	49%	4%	53%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Our ESSA category, Students with Disabilities, showed the most improvement (5%). We adjusted our master schedule and the way in which we provide interventions and instruction for our students with disabilities.

Lowest Performance

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

Our ELA L25 Learning Gains were the lowest. We believe that we had good systems in place overall. However, we had a few classrooms where as a leadership team, we did not provide struggling teachers with the support and professional learning that was needed to help the students in those classes succeed.

Greatest Decline

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

Deep Creek Elementary had the greatest decline in mathematics achievement. We declined by 2 percentage points. Once again, we believe we have good systems in place, but our leadership team did not provide the necessary supports to help the few classrooms where teachers were struggling.

Greatest Gap

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

The areas that showed the greatest gaps compared to state averages were in the lowest quartile for both ELA and math. Contributing factors include the presence of new teachers in these subjects and the need for a more consistent focus on these students throughout the school year. Moving forward, we will provide targeted support for new teachers and implement systems to ensure sustained attention on the academic progress of students in the lowest quartile, including regular progress monitoring and targeted interventions.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Two areas of concern identified from the Early Warning System (EWS) data are the number of students missing 10% or more of instruction and the performance and growth of students in the lowest 25% (L25). These issues highlight the need for focused interventions to improve attendance and provide targeted academic support to ensure that our L25 students are making adequate progress and closing the achievement gap.

Highest Priorities

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

1. ELA L25 Learning Gains
2. Math L25 Learning Gains
3. Students missing 10% or more of instruction

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small-group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Deep Creek Elementary has identified English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics learning gains, particularly among the lowest 25% of students, as a critical area of focus this year. This decision was based on a thorough review of last year's data, which highlighted significant gaps and underperformance in these areas, indicating a crucial need for targeted interventions and supports to improve student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome

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

Deep Creek Elementary will increase learning gains of L25 students in ELA from 51% to 59% and increase learning gains of L25 students in Mathematics from 50% to 57%.

Monitoring

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

Deep Creek Elementary will monitor learning gains by conducting weekly and bi-weekly assessments including intervention progress monitoring, unit assessments, and state progress monitoring assessments. Academic teams will meet monthly to evaluate the ongoing data and determine if adjustments need to be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Marie Brown

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Guided Reading is small-group instruction that is tailored to meet the needs of small-groups of students. This instruction targets each group's specific needs.

Rationale:

Guided Reading allows teachers to select appropriate texts, facilitating growth in reading fluency, comprehension, phonics, and overall literacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

All students will take the Reveal Readiness Diagnostics prior to instruction in order to identify what pre-requisite skills students may be missing that will impact their ability to access instruction on grade level.

Rationale:

Teachers will be able to use the information generated in the Readiness Diagnostics to plan interventions that will target specific gaps in student learning. The Readiness Diagnostics will be give one unit in advance, giving teachers time to provide interventions and fill in gaps prior to the start of grade level instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention.

Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Ongoing Guided Reading Professional Learning

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Deke

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

UFLI (phonics) training at the beginning of the year, Guided Reading training at the beginning of the year, and coaching cycles. These actions will be monitored with walkthrough data.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining

how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Deep Creek Elementary has determined that increasing rigor through more thoughtful and meaningful work will increase student achievement in all academic areas. We were able to identify this area of need through data that was collected by Model Schools.

Measurable Outcome

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

Deep Creek will increase ELA achievement in grades 3-5 by 1% (to 62%) and increase Math achievement in grades 3-5 by 3% (to 65%) as measured by the FAST ELA and Math assessments.

Monitoring

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

Deep Creek Elementary will monitor for the desired outcome by analyzing state testing data after PM1 and PM2. We will also use formative assessments at the end of each ELA and Math unit to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

James Vernon

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Deep Creek Elementary will present students with meaningful work that engage students at higher levels of rigor.

Rationale:

Increasing the frequency of thoughtful and meaningful work will allow students more opportunities to engage in rigorous learning activities. We believe this will result in increased achievement for all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention.

Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Model Schools Professional Learning

Person Monitoring:

James Vernon

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

A team of teachers and school leaders attended the Model Schools conference. They will engage teachers in professional learning each month related to thoughtful and meaningful work.

Action Step #2

Rigor Walkthroughs

Person Monitoring:

James Vernon

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

The leadership team will complete regular walkthroughs to collect data on the frequency of thoughtful and meaningful work. Each walkthrough will record the questions that students are answering. Each question will be record and assigned a rigor level. This data will be shared with teachers in order to have discussions on how to increase the frequency of higher rigor questions and work.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Deep Creek Elementary has determined that attendance will be an area of focus this year. Last year, 18 percent of students were chronically absent. Increasing attendance will increase instructional time and should result in increased achievement and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome

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

Deep Creek Elementary will decrease the percentage of students who are chronically absent by 2% from 18% to 16%.

Monitoring

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

Attendance will be monitored weekly through FOCUS. Monitoring for students who are missing 10% or more of instructional time will allow us to develop intervention plans for those students. We believe providing individualized intervention plans will result in increased attendance for those students who are chronically absent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Marie Navarro

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Attendance Letters

Person Monitoring:

Marie Navarro

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Each month we will pull attendance reports from FOCUS. Letters will be sent to families that have dropped below 90% attendance as a first notification of their attendance and our desire to work together to improve it.

Action Step #2

Attendance Meetings

Person Monitoring:

Marie Navarro

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Each month we will pull attendance reports from FOCUS. We will have in person or telephone meetings with families that have dropped below 90% attendance for a second month. During these meetings, we will discuss barriers to attendance and help problem-solve with families.

Action Step #3

Individual Attendance Incentive Plans

Person Monitoring:

Marie Navarro

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Students who drop below 90% attendance for three months will be put on individual incentive plans. These plans will be customized to ensure they are reinforcing for each student. Students will earn incentives for being at school.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

Deep Creek Elementary disseminates the SIP to the community through a variety of ways including SAC meetings, our school website and social media. The SIP is made publicly available at www.yourcharlotteschools.net/dce.

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

Deep Creek Elementary prides itself on the relationships that are built with students, families, and the community. We will continue to partner with all stakeholders through frequent communication via our social media, flyers, and community events.

Our PFEP is publicly available at www.yourcharlotteschools.net/dce.

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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

Providing ongoing professional learning for teachers in the areas of small group instruction and rigor will increase the the amount of time that students engage in thoughtful and meaningful work. This will

result in increased achievement for all students.

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

Our school improvement plan is developed in coordination with students, staff, families, and the community. We disseminate data and gather feedback to determine areas of focus and learning priorities for the upcoming school year.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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

Deep Creek Elementary regularly examines data from a variety of sources and matches counseling, school-based mental health and mentoring services to ensure that students receive instruction or interventions as needed outside of the academic subject areas. This data is examined monthly at leadership team meetings.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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

Deep Creek Elementary uses a tiered PBIS plan to address problem behaviors and provide early interventions.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

Deep Creek Elementary provides professional learning throughout the school year in the form of full professional learning days, quarterly early release days for professional learning, and monthly professional learning learning meetings.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

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

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00