

Leon County Schools

Chaires Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
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: 6/21/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
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 style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">67%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">41%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		C	C	B

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.

Our mission is to focus instruction on developing the whole child. We are committed to providing opportunities designed to meet individual needs and ensure that every child experiences success, academically, emotionally, and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide students with a caring and supportive learning environment that allows each child to reach their full potential through quality instruction and experiences. Chaires Elementary is a community-based school and together we can make a difference in the lives of our students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holmes, Richard	Principal	Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support RTI and communicates with the outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI. Selects one teacher from each grade level to provide information about core instruction, data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure the implementation of Tier 1,2 and 3 instruction and support. Selects one ESE teacher to provide information about intervention instruction, participates in student data collection and collaborates with general education teachers.
Ricciardi, Champayne	Assistant Principal	Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support RTI and communicates with the outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI. Selects one teacher from each grade level to provide information about core instruction, data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure the implementation of Tier 1,2 and 3 instruction and support. Selects one ESE teacher to provide information about intervention instruction, participates in student data collection and collaborates with general education teachers.
Harp, Myra	Reading Coach	Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based interventions strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/21/2021, 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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

471

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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

Thursday 6/10/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	57%	57%	57%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	54%	58%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	47%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	64%	63%	63%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	63%	62%	67%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	45%	51%	42%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	52%	53%	76%	52%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	66%	-12%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade 1- ELA: STAR Early Literacy (Fall & Winter), STAR (Spring)
 Math: iReady (Fall, Winter & Spring)

Grade 2- ELA: STAR (Fall, Winter, & Spring)
 Math: iReady (Fall, Winter, & Spring)

Grade 3- ELA: STAR (Fall, Winter, & Spring)
 Math: iReady (Fall, Winter, & Spring)

Grade 4- ELA: STAR (Fall, Winter, & Spring)
 Math: iReady (Fall, Winter, & Spring)

Grade 5- ELA: STAR (Fall, Winter, & Spring)
 Math: iReady (Fall, Winter, & Spring)
 Science: District Assessment (Fall, Winter, & Spring)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79/38%	79/73%	79/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/19%	26/58%	26/54%
	Students With Disabilities	12/58%	12/50%	12/42%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	79/32%	79/60%	79/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/15%	26/42%	26/50%
	Students With Disabilities	12/50%	12/42%	12/58%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78/64%	78/65%	78/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/50%	26/85%	26/72%
	Students With Disabilities	23/67%	23/76%	23/64%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/27%	78/45%	78/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/31%	26/38%	26/42%
	Students With Disabilities	23/17%	23/26%	23/48%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63/56%	63/56%	63/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/56%	27/50%	27/41%
	Students With Disabilities	10/30%	10/50%	10/30%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63/16%	63/60%	63/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/7%	27/41%	27/44%
	Students With Disabilities	10/0%	10/40%	10/50%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/64%	81/65%	81/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/52%	34/41%	34/50%
	Students With Disabilities	16/58%	16/36%	16/27%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	81/23%	81/53%	81/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/9%	34/32%	34/43%
	Students With Disabilities	16/0%	16/19%	16/17%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77/59%	77/60%	77/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/52%	35/47%	35/44%
	Students With Disabilities	21/13%	21/19%	21/18%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77/32%	77/47%	77/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/23%	35/31%	35/17%
	Students With Disabilities	21/9%	21/9%	21/20%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	77/26%	77/45%	77/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/9%	35/26%	35/37%
	Students With Disabilities	21/9%	21/19%	21/24%
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	20		33	50		28				
BLK	43	43		28	45		33				
HSP	57			57							
WHT	75	47		71	69		78				
FRL	47	32		36	52		48				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
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%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

With COVID altering the learning platforms, the only trend seems to be learning gains comparing 2021 progress monitoring to actual scores for ELA and Math FSA 2021 do not show growth. Most of the progress monitoring data shows a gap between our BLK, SWD and WHT sub-group.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data shows a greater need to focus on the lower 25% in ELA. All sub groups will need interventions to help recover the lost learning gains, Comparing 2019 38% versus 40% for the bottom 25%, it shows a minimal gain. More importantly, there is virtual no gain between the sub groups.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

With two very different learning platforms, there were no way to get accurate data with progress monitoring. Looking at the progress monitoring, the fall data seem to be higher than the spring data. This can maybe caused by students returning in the spring with a learning gap from students in the fall. This can be explained by the importance of students being on campus to receive direct instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Looking at the data, Math scores increased with the social disadvantage students in all but two grades, 1st and 5th. Each grade level increased 3% points too 9% points. .

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

This can be explained by lesson with Canvas or Go Math video instructions being understood by these students. Students were able to watch videos that provided step by step instruction on each problem.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will have a better understanding of what students need, while monitoring their progress in the classroom. Using IReady, Lexia and Reflex, our intervention specialist will be able to fill in the gaps the students need to be successful.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our intervention specialists has provided their programs and schedule to the teachers to assist with the classroom plan. In addition, we will be using the MTSS process to identify students that are having difficulties in the classroom. We will use the intervention specialist to support the students needs.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

By tracking the data from Reflex and Lexia, we hope to fill in the gaps of learning for our L25% student group. If these software programs are successful, we will continue with this in the future to increase our gains.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With the new adoption of the BEST standards, we need to ensure the curriculum is being implemented and students understand the instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Because the progress monitoring does not match with the BEST Standards, teachers will be using alternate assessments with in the grade level to ensure we have data on the implementation of the new standards.
Monitoring:	Although Iready is not linked to the new standards, we will use it to ensure students are learning. Teachers will also use their made assessments to monitor growth with the BEST standards
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myra Harp (harpm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using the district provided resources to implement the BEST standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our rationale is the district has vetted the resources for the BEST standards

Action Steps to Implement

Using progress monitoring to ensure learning is taken place	
Person Responsible	Myra Harp (harpm@leonschools.net)
Using resources provided by the district for BEST standards	
Person Responsible	Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With COVID putting students behind, we have identified our ELA learning gains for the L25% group as a priority.
Measurable Outcome:	In addition to using quality Tier 1 instruction, we will be using Iready, Lexia and small group pullouts to help close the learning gap with the L25% group and Tier 3 students.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring with Iready and Lexia programs to ensure students are learning
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myra Harp (harpm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Iready is a program that will help track our group in learning gains, along with using Lexia to focus on comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These are proven programs to promote learning gains and monitor the areas of special need.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor Iready and Lexia data for growth, share the results with our stakeholders to ensure plan is working. If not, teachers will meet with the intervention specialist on how to adjust the plan.

Person Responsible Myra Harp (harpm@leonschools.net)

Ensure small group pullouts are using Iready and Lexia by our intervention team, if adjustments are needed, admin will oversee the changes to ensure they are meeting the needs of our students.

Person Responsible Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@leonschools.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Being new to the school, it is important to understand the faculty, curriculum and way of work within the school. I will be reviewing progress monitoring from iReady, Stars and Reflex math. In addition, we are implementing Lexia. This will be another program I will be looking at data.

Measurable Outcome: I will be using the walkthroughs to ensure these programs are being implemented with buy in by all stakeholders.

Monitoring: We will be reviewing progress monitoring data collected by the intervention specialist after each 9 weeks grading period. We will monitor for growth and if the programs are working.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: By using Leads to justify the walkthrough grades, we can better understand the needs of the teachers and grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In Leads, it explains the grading for each element which will be used as resource and grading criteria.

Action Steps to Implement

Collecting progress monitor data to compare with the grading of teachers in Leads

Person Responsible Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@leonschools.net)

Meet with intervention specialist, reading coach and AP to review data for each teacher regarding progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Being that Chaires has an EBD program, we have students that act out with violence. Overall, our students are not very aggressive. Our school culture is one of positive behavior and parent involvement.

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.

Chaires is a community school. With our teachers and staff, we promote a "student need" culture. The diversity of our faculty and staff is a representation of our students and parents. This allows students to fill like they are a part of the community and promotes a trusting learning environment. Our outside stakeholders are just as diverse. They are volunteers, college students and business leaders. These stakeholders allow our mission of developing future leaders to come together and improve our schools culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our business leaders volunteer with the faculty to increase literacy and promote learning with our pre-k and kindergarten students. These leaders provide learning insensitive for reading challenges, along with reading to our students. Regardless of the stakeholder, their actions on our campus are invaluable to promoting a positive and effective learning environment for faculty and students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00