

Leon County Schools

# Chaires Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Richard Holmes**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 72%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (59%)<br>2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: B (57%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 72%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 45%  |

### School Grades History

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

### 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

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  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Holmes, Richard  | Principal           | Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensure implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support TTI 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, participate in student data collection, and collaborate with general education teachers. |
| Harp, Myra       | Instructional Coach | Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assist with the design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective strategies.   |
| Sperling, Brooks | Assistant Principal | Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensure implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support TTI 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, participate in student data collection, and collaborate with general education teachers. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 6/11/2021, Richard Holmes

**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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

459

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

4

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

3

**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                              | 66          | 85 | 81 | 81 | 73 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 453   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6           | 18 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 3  | 0  | 5  | 3  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 7  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| 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 | 1           | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |

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     | 4           | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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                              | 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     |

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 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     |

## 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             | 58%    | 57%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 53%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 56%    |          |       |        |          |       | 50%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 42%    |          |       |        |          |       | 38%    | 47%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 64%    | 47%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 64%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 70%    |          |       |        |          |       | 65%    | 63%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 57%    | 57%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 53%    | 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 | 60%    | 61%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 57%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 56%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 48%    | 63%      | -15%                       | 62%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 66%      | -12%                       | 64%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -48%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 61%      | 2%                         | 60%   | 3%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 54%      | -2%                        | 53%   | -1%                     |
| 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                                       | 36       | 38     | 29          | 32        | 52      | 43           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 32       | 40     | 35          | 32        | 59      | 59           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       |          |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 54       |        |             | 57        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 73       | 65     |             | 79        | 75      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 43     | 30          | 46        | 60      | 48           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 59   |
| 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                                       | 410  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 95%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 37   |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                | 42  |
| 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  | 73  |
| 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   | 56  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| 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   | 72 |
| 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                                | 44 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| 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?

Proficiency in ELA was down compared to previous years but Learning Gains in ELA were up. Math proficiency was up compared to the last few years but Learning Gains and Lowest 25% Learning Gains saw significant improvements when compared to years past. Students with Disabilities scored 37% in the ESSA Federal Index, with ELA and Science being the two content areas with the lowest percentages. The ELA percentages were up from the previous two years and Science was consistent with scores from previous years.

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

ELA (proficiency, learning gains, and L25 learning gains) is the area with the greatest need for improvement.

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

Learning loss sustained due to the pandemic is one factor contributing to this need for improvement. Additionally, about a quarter of our student population are students with disabilities and their pathway to proficiency often takes longer. We saw improvements in our overall Learning Gains and Lowest 25% Learning Gains and our Students With Disabilities showed significant improvements in Proficiency and Learning Gains. This data tells us that we are reaching these students, but will need to continue to provide an infrastructure of ESE services and Tiered instructional supports. In order to continue to impact ELA instruction across the board, we need to ensure that we are making data driven instructional decisions and using our standards to drive our instruction. In an effort to encourage more reading for pleasure, as we recognize simple reading is a key factor in strengthening this area, we are instituting school-wide focuses on pleasure reading and celebrating students' efforts.

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

Math was our area of greatest improvement. All components of math saw significant improvement from the previous few years.

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

While the impact of the pandemic left gaps in math just as in ELA, identifying the areas of need and providing those lessons proved more direct than with ELA which is very spiraled in nature. Teachers were able to use standards mastery data from progress monitoring tools to provide instruction and/or remediation in areas of need.

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

Progress monitoring data will need to be analyzed regularly in order to drive instructional decisions. Students who are meeting academic targets will need to be exposed to high cognitive demand tasks in order to synthesize new information and move forward. Students needing Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions will regularly receive their interventions using evidence based instruction. The school will have two interventionists this year to assist in ensuring we are accelerating learning for all.

**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.**

Teachers are implementing both new standards and new curriculum materials this school year. Additionally, we will be introducing the new FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment in grades 3-5. In an effort to meet those professional development needs we have set monthly grade level meetings to discuss instructional needs, to analyze progress monitoring data, and to provide professional development support. During those monthly meetings, instructional needs may arise that require additional professional development and we will work in collaboration with our district curriculum development department to offer those opportunities.

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

Students in grades K-3, who are not meeting grade level expectations, will have the opportunity to participate in "beyond the bell" tutoring after school during the first semester. Additionally, students in grades K-4, who are not demonstrating mastery of grade level standards, will be offered the opportunity to participate in a summer learning loss recovery program with an emphasis on literacy.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our students with disabilities performed below the Federal Index threshold of 41%.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Proficiency for ELA was 38% in the 2022 school year and 32% in math. We would like to see and increase of at least 2% in both areas.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student classroom assessments and progress monitoring data will be reviewed to identify areas in need of reteach and/or remediation. Students will receive instructional support and ESE support.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.



### 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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

#### Person

#### Responsible

Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

## #2. 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.

ELA Proficiency was one of two areas where we saw a drop in our percentage from the previous year.

### Measurable

#### Outcome:

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

We would like to see our proficiency increase by at least two percentage points taking us to 60% or higher.

### Monitoring:

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

Student classroom assessment and progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students' progress.

### Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

### 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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

#### Person

#### Responsible

Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

**#3. 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.**

Math was the area where we saw the most success. Our students performed at 64% proficiency, 70% learning gains, and 63% learning gains in the lowest 25%. We want to, at minimum, maintain these percentages.

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

We want to maintain, or increase, our overall math proficiency.

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

Student classroom assessment and progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students' progress.

**Person  
responsible for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

### 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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

#### Person

#### Responsible

Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Science was one of two areas in which we saw a drop in our proficiency from the previous year.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

We would like to see our proficiency raise by a minimum of two percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student classroom assessment will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students' progress.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.

**Rationale for****Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

**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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

**Person****Responsible**

Richard Holmes (holmesr@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**

Kindergarten--Using a structured literacy approach, kindergarteners will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for kindergarten will be to ensure they are receiving explicit phonics instruction every day using a phonics scope and sequence. During the 21-22 school year 28% of kindergarten students were not on track to score a Level 3.

1st Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 1st graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 1st grade will be to ensure they are receiving explicit phonics instruction every day using a phonics scope and sequence. During the 21-22 school year 33% of 1st grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

2nd Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 2nd graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 2nd grade will be to ensure they are receiving explicit phonics instruction every day using a phonics scope and sequence. During the 21-22 school year 49% of 2nd grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

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

3rd Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 3rd graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 3rd grade will be to strengthen comprehension by building vocabulary and background knowledge. During the 21-22 school year 35% of 3rd grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

4th Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 4th graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 4th grade will be to strengthen comprehension by building vocabulary and background knowledge. During the 21-22 school year 54% of 4th grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

5th Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 5th graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 5th grade will be to strengthen comprehension by building vocabulary and background knowledge. During the 21-22 school year 37% of 5th grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

### **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)**

During the 21-22 school year each grade, K-3, had fewer than 50% of students not on track to score a Level 3 by the end of the school year. We would like to decrease the percentage of students not on track to score a Level 3 by a minimum of two percentage points at each grade.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

During the 21-22 school year, the 4th grade students had 54% of students who scored below a Level 3. We would like to decrease that percentage by a minimum of 2 percentage points in the 22-23 school year. We would like to see both 3rd and 5th grades decrease their percentage of students performing below Level 3 by a minimum of two percentage points as well.

### **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.



Each grade level is scheduled to meet monthly with the Leadership Team to discuss student progress and problem solve to further impact student achievement. Additionally, all grade levels are holding a Professional Planning Day, following the initial round of Progress Monitoring, to develop a long-term plan for meeting academic needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Holmes, Richard, holmesr@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. Â§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?

Students will receive core instruction using Savass MyView. Additionally, students will use Lexia Core5 to supplement their academics. Students will receive both whole group and differentiated small group instruction. Students who need Tier II or Tier III interventions will receive them daily using either Lexia Core5 teacher lead interventions, Savaas My View interventions, Phonics for Reading, and/or Corrective; decisions about intervention materials will be based off of data derived from student assessments and ongoing progress monitoring.

**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 core curriculum materials are aligned to the newly adopted state standards and meet the state's definition of and evidence-based program. Further, each of the possible intervention materials that may be employed meet the state standards for evidence-based as well.

**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           |
|---|---|
| Literacy Coaching--Chaires has a full time Literacy Coach who works alongside both teachers and students to monitor and impact ELA instruction. Additionally, the Literacy Coach participates in all monthly Progress Monitoring meetings and oversees all Interventions. | Holmes, Richard,<br>holmesr@leonschools.net |
| Assessment--Using data from core curriculum, Lexia Core5, and FAST 3-5, student progress will be monitored and discussed at monthly Progress Monitoring meetings. These data will be used to drive instruction and made academic decisions.                               | Holmes, Richard,<br>holmesr@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.**

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 feel 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 school's culture.

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

Our stakeholder provide support to the school community in myriad ways. They can be found volunteering in the classrooms to promote literacy in our Pre-K and Kindergarten classrooms, organizing school supply drives to ensure that our teachers and students want for nothing, helping us incentivize both our students and staff to promote excellence in all areas, and much more. Regardless the effort, our stakeholders'

actions on campus are invaluable in promoting a positive and effective learning environment for faculty and students.