

Leon County Schools

Chaires Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

<http://www.leonschools.net/chaire>

Demographics

Principal: Richard Holmes

Start Date for this Principal: 5/20/2006

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

<http://www.leonschools.net/chaire>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>57%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>42%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Chaires Elementary it is our mission to focus instruction on developing the whole child. We are committed to providing opportunities designed to meet individual needs and to ensure that every child experience success, academically, emotionally and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chaires Elementary school will build academic achievement by discovering the individual talents of each child, and by providing an environment where students want to learn and naturally discover their true passions.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Prescott, Michele	Principal	<p>Principal and assistant principal: Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support RTI and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI.</p> <p>Select General Education Teachers: One representative from each grade level provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support.</p> <p>Select ESE teachers: (Varying exceptionalities, speech, gifted) Provide information about intervention instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborate with general education teachers.</p>
Ricciardi, Champayne	Assistant Principal	<p>Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support RTI and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI.</p> <p>Select General Education Teachers: One representative from each grade level provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support.</p>
Harp, Myra	Instructional Coach	<p>Assist coaching all academic areas using data to drive instructional practices. Participate in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective teaching strategies.</p>
Nelson, Shawna	Instructional Coach	<p>Reading Coach: Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective teaching strategies.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date
 Saturday 5/20/2006, Richard Holmes

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	93	89	72	79	75	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	11	2	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	89	93	112	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	7	15	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	15	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	37	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	9	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	89	93	112	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	7	15	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	15	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	37	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	9	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	57%	57%	66%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	58%	67%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	47%	53%	61%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	64%	63%	65%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	63%	62%	70%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	45%	51%	54%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	52%	53%	68%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	48%	56%	-8%	56%	-8%
	2018	62%	57%	5%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	64%	-7%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	66%	-12%	64%	-10%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	63%	61%	2%	60%	3%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	23	32	30	25	50	40	27				
BLK	41	44	39	39	55	44	45				
WHT	60	52	38	66	71	38	55				
FRL	45	41	31	46	59	35	46				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	40	33	30	37	26	33				
BLK	43	44	35	53	67	45	53				
WHT	62	55	39	68	69	39	82				
FRL	47	48	50	58	58	44	64				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	35	43	39	23	29	29	27				
BLK	51	53	56	46	51	38	52				
WHT	72	76	68	74	78	75	76				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
FRL	52	58	63	57	67	56	60				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Approximately 45% of students in grades 3-5 scored below the proficiency benchmark on the last STAR reading progress monitoring assessment. There was a higher percentage of 5th grade students scoring below proficiency than 3rd or 4th.

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

3rd grade students scoring above the proficiency benchmark on the last iReady math progress monitoring showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Contributing factors may include students new to the school who may have been unidentified as having an academic need.

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.

Our ELA lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our students with disabilities are making the fewest gains.

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

Adequate Progress in Math showed the most improvement. Mathematics teachers in 4th and 5th grade adequate growth scores have been significant and consistent for the prior 2 years. Small group instruction has made a difference.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Although our attendance data shows fewer students with attendance below 90%, going from 14% to 8%, 10% of our students in K-2 have attendance below 90%.

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

1. ELA Bottom 25%
2. ELA being Proficient
3. 4th Grade ELA Adequate Progress
4. Learning Gains for SWD in ELA
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students in the bottom 25 percent in 4th and 5th grade showed the lowest gains in ELA . When looking at our students combined STAR and iReady projection they were projected to make 60% adequate progress. We are looking to increase learning gains to 61% in the bottom 25 percent.

Measurable Outcome: 61% of our ELA lowest 25% students in 4th and 5th will show adequate progress

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shawna Nelson (nelsons@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students in 4th and 5th grade will be ability grouped for small group reading intervention allowing us to focus our resources on the specific needs of each student or group. 4th and 5th Grade Language Arts teachers will receive coaching in rigor and specific writing strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be placed in a remediation group according to their needs as determined by the Progress Monitoring Team. Strategies were selected because they are evidenced based and Cloud Nine is a multi-sensory tool.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify T1, T2 and T3 Students using prior year data, Iready, STAR and Wonders Assessments
2. Serve students in remediation groups
3. Monitor Progress through RTI team using STAR, and IReady
4. Change/continue with remediation instructions
5. Continue to Monitor Progress

Person Responsible Shawna Nelson (nelsons@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students in grades 3-5 showed a lower percentage of being proficient in ELA than projected. Based on our progress monitoring assessment of iReady and STAR our students in 3-5 were projected to be 54% proficient. We are looking to have 55% of our students be proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: 55% of our students will be proficient in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shawna Nelson (nelsons@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 3rd,4th and 5th Grade Language Arts teachers will receive coaching in rigor and specific writing strategies.
TIER 1 - Wonders and Progress Monitored through IREADY
TIER 2 - IREADY Lessons based on Diagnostic
TIER 3 - Visualizing and Verbalizing, Reading Mastery, Wonder Works,

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be placed in a remediation group according to their needs as determined by the Progress Monitoring Team. Strategies are all evidenced based and Visualizing and Verbalizing is multi-sensory.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify T1, T2 and T3 Students using prior year data, Iready, STAR and Wonders Assessments
2. Serve students in remediation groups
3. Monitor Progress through RTI team using STAR and IReady
4. Change/continue with remediation instructions
5. Continue to Monitor Progress

Person Responsible Michele Prescott (prescottm@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students in 3rd grade showed a lower percentage of being proficient in Math than projected. Based on our progress monitoring assessment of iReady are students in 3rd grade were projected to be 40% proficient. We are looking to have 45% of our 3rd grade students be proficient in Math.

Measurable Outcome: 45% of our 3rd Grade students will be proficient on the Mathematics FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michele Prescott (prescottm@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 1 Students will receive Go Math
Tier 2 students will receive Reteach
Tier 3 Students will receive Cloud 9
Teachers were trained in Math Strategies over the Summer.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be placed in a remediation group according to their needs as determined by the Progress Monitoring Team. Strategies are all evidenced based and Cloud Nine is multi-sensory.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify T1, T2 and T3 Students using prior year data, Iready, and Go Math
2. Serve students in remediation groups
3. Monitor Progress through RTI team using GO Math and IReady
4. Change/continue with remediation instructions
5. Continue to Monitor Progress

Person Responsible Michele Prescott (prescottm@leonschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Our most recent FSA data show that only 30% of our students with disabilities (SWD) made learning gains in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2021 FSA data will show that 45% of our students with disabilities made learning gains in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shawna Nelson (nelsons@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be monitored monthly for growth and progress toward learning gains as determined by iReady. Students will receive individualized Tier 3 small group instruction with Visualizing and Verbalizing or Reading Mastery, depending on their determined need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier 3 intervention will be determined based on the level and need of the student. Students who need phonics instruction will receive Reading Mastery, while students needing to increase comprehension will receive Visualizing and Verbalizing.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Communicate classroom and school news to parents through monthly newsletters; listserv, invitations to fun, interactive activities at the school, and community share nights. We also hold several events on campus for parents and stakeholders to be apart such as: STEAM night, Literacy Night, Grandparent's Day, Daddy Daughter Dance, Bingo for Books and Curriculum Night. We are currently on hold for all activities involving guests on campus due to COVID Restrictions.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0491 - Chaires Elementary School			\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0491 - Chaires Elementary School			\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0491 - Chaires Elementary School			\$0.00
Total:						\$0.00