Canopy Oaks Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Canopy Oaks Elementary School

3250 POINT VIEW DR, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/canopyoaks

Demographics

Principal: Staci Mortham

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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

Canopy Oaks Elementary School

3250 POINT VIEW DR, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/canopyoaks

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	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.

To provide a physically safe and emotionally healthy learning environment where all involved (children, staff, parents and community) experience success and believe that they are accepted and valued for the individuals they are and will become.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a continuously growing community of learners experiencing success while becoming conscientious and responsible members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mortham, Staci	Principal	Ms. Mortham is the instructional leader of the school. She tracks data, meets with students, staff, and parents, and keeps the lines of communication open with all stakeholders.
Mischler, Paula	Assistant Principal	Ms. Mischler is an instructional leader on our campus. She meets with teachers as well as some parents to make sure that student needs are being met in the classroom.
Berigan, Mandy	Reading Coach	Ms. Berigan assists teachers with data collection and monitoring. She also works with Ms. Mortham to create intervention groups as well as teaches intervention groups.
Chandler, Cedric	School Counselor	Mr. Chandler is responsible for the MTSS referral process. He also leads our social-emotional learning on campus.
Kantor, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Kantor is responsible for collecting data related to the early warning system and updates the faculty monthly of areas of concern.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Staci Mortham

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

638

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	99	96	94	111	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	12	23	21	11	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	5	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	34	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	5	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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

Monday 8/8/2022

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	86	101	95	114	102	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	19	32	14	33	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	4	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	86	101	95	114	102	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	19	32	14	33	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	4	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	57%	56%				66%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						54%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						39%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	47%	50%				63%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	31%						50%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%						35%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	57%	59%				77%	52%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	81%	63%	18%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	66%	-14%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	61%	-6%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	53%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	34	24	16	18	14	10				
BLK	33	41	32	25	23	24	24				
HSP	55	57		36	29						
MUL	56	50		33	8		40				
WHT	63	57	50	57	38	24	54				
FRL	39	41	34	31	28	31	30				

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	19			16	30						
BLK	29	17	14	28	25	18	24				
HSP	59			41							
MUL	68			52							
WHT	70	44		63	38		81				
FRL	47	37	10	36	31	10	60				

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	28	19	6	30	39	26	46				
BLK	43	41	29	45	48	35	55				
HSP	42	45		75	36						
MUL	61	43		65	57						
WHT	77	61	45	68	51	30	86				
FRL	55	47	32	55	50	35	67				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Although there was a great amount of growth, in all grade levels, our students in the lowest 25% show a much lower level of proficiency across all subject areas. In addition, our math scores are lower across all grade levels than our ELA scores.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our math scores across all grade levels are low, but fifth grade math data shows the biggest area of concern.

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

Our FSA scores from the 2021-2022 school year in fifth grade showed that only 22% of our students showed proficiency. We have hired a math intervention teacher to assist in pulling small groups of students to help close the gap in the area of math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area that showed the most growth for Canopy Oaks through progress monitoring and FSA data was the lowest 25th% in both reading and math. On the 2021 FSA in ELA, only 9% showed learning gains versus 35% showing gains in 2022. Likewise, on the math FSA in 2021, only 14% showed learning gains versus 24% in 2022.

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

Our teachers had additional resources to provide interventions in the classroom and we provided after school tutoring in the second semester.

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

We have students that travel to other teachers or other grade levels for instruction as appropriate. In addition, our gifted teacher works with classroom teachers to provide support and resources for students to be accelerated in each classroom.

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 staff will focus on providing differentiated instruction in the areas of reading and math across the school. We will have mini-sessions during team meetings or faculty meetings as needed.

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

Our teacher leadership communities will work together throughout the year to ensure that each team and teacher has the supplies and resources needed to help our school reach their instructional and non-instructional goals.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our FSA data from the 2021-2022 school year showed a drop in our proficiency in ELA from 58% to 53%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our students in grades K-5, that are matched and qualified, will show one year's worth of growth, based on data from the 2022-2023 progress monitoring data assessment tools.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the implementation of the BEST standards throughout the year by reviewing all progress monitoring data in grade level groups as well as classroom observations to monitor implementation fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our teachers will be utilizing the Savaas ELA curriculum as a primary tool, to teach the ELA BEST standards in grades K-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Savaas curriculum was chosen for adoption by the school district and has documented evidence to assist students in increasing their knowledge and understanding of the ELA standards.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Classroom walkthroughs will be completed to monitor that standards are being taught with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our FSA data from the 2021-2022 school year showed a drop in our proficiency in math from 51% to 45%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our students in K-5, that are matched and qualified, will show one year's worth of growth, based on the data collected from the 2022-2023 progress monitoring data assessment tools.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the implementation of the BEST standards for math throughout the year by reviewing all progress monitoring data in grade level groups as well as classroom observations to confirm implementation with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our teachers will utilize the Go Math curriculum as a primary tool, to teach the Math BEST standards in grades K-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Go Math curriculum has been shown to assist students in gaining the knowledge necessary to be proficient in their grade level math standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Classroom walkthroughs will be completed to monitor that standards are being taught and progress is being monitored with fidelity.

Person Responsible   Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	In the 2021-2022 school year, 18% of our students had an attendance rate below 90%. If students are not on campus for instruction, they are not able to learn from their teachers.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022-2023 school year 15% of our students will have an attendance rate below 90% as shown in FOCUS (our student management system)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the attendance rate of our students in FOCUS on a daily and weekly basis. We will share progress with the entire school community through the morning news show (students and staff) and the school community (through SAC meetings).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will utilize the Leader in Me program to increase student engagement in the learning process and increase their excitement about coming to school. The students will have responsibilities on campus and will learn the importance of following through with their responsibilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Stephen Covey Leader in Me program has been proven to increase student attendance by giving students a reason to want to be at school through the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The Leader in Me program will be taught in each classroom as well as during one of the special area rotations. This will ensure that common goals and common language are shared campus wide.

Person Responsible	Amy Kantor (kantora@leonschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Although the students in the lowest 25th% showed a great amount of growth in the 2021-2022 school year, as compared to the previous school year, only 35% of these students showed learning gains in ELA and 24% of these students showed learning gains in math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By May 2023, 45% of students in the lowest 25th% will show learning gains in ELA, and 35% of the students in the lowest 25th% will show learning gains in the area of math, based on data collected from the progress monitoring data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data will be analyzed by grade level to continuously monitor if growth is being made. We will meet by grade level teams and subject area teams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will utilize the data collected from the Savaas reading assessments, STAR data, and progress monitoring data collected in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	These resources have been proven to show growth or deficits in student learning over a period of time.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will analyze data collected and implement additional interventions as necessary.

Person Responsible	Mandy Berigan (beriganm@leonschools.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In grades K-2, 56% of students showed proficiency in the area of ELA based on the spring STAR assessment.

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

In grades 3-5, 53% of students showed proficiency in the area of ELA based on the spring 2022 FSA ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, 60% of our students in grades K-2 will show proficiency or a year's worth of growth as reported by the ELA FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

60% of our students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the ELA FAST by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will monitor the growth of students on a continuous basis using the progress monitoring tools set in place by the state as well as the STAR assessment and benchmark mastery assessments administered in the classroom setting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mortham, Staci, morthams@leonschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our teachers will utilize Lexia and Heggerty systems to increase proficiency in all grade levels for ELA. Through these programs, students and teachers will focus on the areas of phonics and fluency. Both of these programs are aligned with the ELA BEST standards and will assist our students in reaching their individual goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Lexia program is being provided by Leon County Schools, due to the reliability and proven ability to increase student proficiency in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
In the area of Literacy Leadership, Ms. Berigan, along with the school administration, will meet to discuss and analyze the progress monitoring data monthly.	Mortham, Staci, morthams@leonschools.net
Literacy Coaching with enable Ms. Berigan time to go into the classrooms and model lessons for teachers and assist with both interventions and small groups as needed.	Berigan, Mandy, beriganm@leonschools.net
Teachers will receive professional development in both the Savaas curriculum (which will be used as a primary tool for ELA) as well as Lexia and Heggerty.	Mischler, Paula, mischlerp@leonschools.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Canopy Oaks Elementary, we utilize the Leader In Me program. Through this program, we are empowering our students to take ownership over their school and their learning. Through partnerships with the local universities, community members, and parents, we are building a family environment for our students. In addition, we utilize the School Advisory Council (SAC) to provide support for the school and address areas of concern.

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

Our primary stakeholder group other than our parents, is our PTO (Parent Teacher Organization.) This group of parents work with the administrative team to support the teachers and help build staff morale. They decorate the school, sponsor school spirit days, and do their coordination through the use of technology tools such as Facebook and Zoom, in an effort to include as many people as possible.

Our School Advisory Council (SAC) also works tirelessly to support our staff and students by reviewing concerns voiced by the parents and community members.