

Leon County Schools

J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood

2400 ORANGE AVE E, Tallahassee, FL 32311

<https://www.leonschools.net/conley>

Demographics

Principal: Ben Threadgill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

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)	77%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

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

J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood

2400 ORANGE AVE E, Tallahassee, FL 32311

<https://www.leonschools.net/conley>

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	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

The mission of J. Michael Conley Elementary is to work in partnership with the community and parents/families to create a strong foundation that meets the individual needs of students, developing leadership skills with an emphasis on service, kindness, and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement.

J. Michael Conley Elementary School @ SouthWood is a place where students achieve their maximum potential academically, socially, physically, and emotionally.

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
Threadgill, Ben	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader and engages in collaborative decision-making with the school leadership team. Together with the team, he establishes and communicates instructional goals for school success. Additionally, he creates and supports an environment of high expectations for teaching and learning.
Williams, Ava	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves to support the principal in the development, implementation, supervision and evaluation of a comprehensive school-based program of educational and student services designed to increase student achievement.
Abbott, Christa	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Representative and Speech-Language Pathologists use a wide variety of assessments, materials, and techniques for remediation of skills. They perform and participate in staffings to complete the placement process for Exceptional Student Education/ESE, (i.e., IEPs and develop IEP goals based on the student's present levels of performance). School Improvement Plan duties include consulting with ESE team members and general education teachers to provide additional strategies and interventions to support MTSS and the implementation of IEP/504 accommodations according to State and Federal regulations.
Webb, Sharon	Reading Coach	The reading coach will provide coaching services in reading and literacy instruction. She will lead professional development, model instructional strategies and techniques, and engage in collaborative lesson planning with teachers. Additionally, she will help to ensure academic decisions are data driven, evidence-based and appropriate for students and teachers to increase achievement.
Smith, Mis'Shaylanqua	Other	This Instructional Coach works as an Intervention Specialist. She works along with the Reading Coach to design, execute and assess individualized student plans based on various factors such as student needs and resources. Goals include ensuring academic decisions are data-driven and planning appropriate support for students and teachers to increase achievement. Efforts are also coordinated with the MTSS Team to put proper interventions in place to help students acquire mastery of grade-level standards.
Weitzel, Linda	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist fosters a welcoming and flexible environment so that the media center is an essential part of

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the learning community. She develops and maintains resources appropriate to the curriculum, the learners, and instructional strategies of the school. More specifically the media specialist provides lessons in the use of information/ literacy skills, respect for intellectual property, digital citizenship, the use of print and non-print resources, research techniques, and conducts activities to provide integrated curriculum and technology-rich literacy experiences for all. Additionally, the media specialist establishes procedures for selection, acquisition, circulation, resource sharing of resources in all formats. Most importantly the Media Specialist promotes a love of reading and lifelong learning as a foundational skill for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment.
Glenn, Kim	Other	This Instructional Coach works as an Intervention Specialist. She works along with the Reading Coach to design, execute and assess individualized student plans based on various factors such as student needs and resources. Goals include ensuring academic decisions are data driven and planning appropriate supports for students and teachers to increase achievement. Efforts are also coordinated with the MTSS Team to put proper interventions in place to help students acquire mastery of grade level standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/14/2022, Ben Threadgill

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

646

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.

6

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	120	92	109	127	96	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	667
Attendance below 90 percent	32	20	29	29	11	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
One or more suspensions	6	1	3	6	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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	48	20	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	48	29	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	11	29	49	8	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	12	5	10	23	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	5	2	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/14/2022

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	126	93	107	123	98	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	19	16	12	18	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	26	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	21	26	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	4	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	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	126	93	107	123	98	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	19	16	12	18	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	26	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	21	26	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	4	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	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	48%	57%	56%				61%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						55%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						40%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	47%	50%				57%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						53%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						19%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	57%	59%				63%	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	61%	61%	0%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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	46%	63%	-17%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	66%	0%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	61%	-4%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
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	22	46	36	21	46	35	18				
ELL	39	60		48	60		40				
ASN	78	85		83	85						
BLK	39	49	40	37	48	37	20				
HSP	46	62		26	33						
MUL	57	53		57	67						
WHT	60	74		58	67		60				
FRL	39	54	46	30	47	42	18				

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	15	50	54	23	31	20	9				
ELL	43			52	40		18				
ASN	75			80							
BLK	40	43	27	31	28	19	30				
HSP	43			40							
MUL	50			57							
WHT	67	72		56	44		47				
FRL	31	47	45	24	29	29	32				
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	30	39	39	32	28	15	41				
ELL	50	53		64	67						
ASN	87	72		94	89		82				
BLK	49	46	33	46	45	16	50				
HSP	67	63		57	59						
MUL	47	58		53	50						
WHT	75	64		68	55	10	74				
FRL	47	44	32	42	42	15	52				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	59
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	64
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	39
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?

A clear trend that has emerged is with our subgroups, students with disabilities, Black/American Students and economically disadvantaged students. Since 2019, the students with disabilities' subgroup which is 32% has not risen to the level required by ESSA, which is 41% proficiency in ELA and Math. In 2021, our African American subgroup had 40% percent proficiency and economically disadvantaged at 39%.

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

Based on the 2021 progress monitoring data using STAR, the area that performed the lowest was Math. When comparing the Fall, Winter, Spring data the following was observed: 1st grade had an end of the year loss of 4%, 2nd grade had a loss of 8%, 3rd grade had a loss of 7%, 4th had a loss of 0%, and 5th grade had a gain of 6%. Across the grade levels there was minimal growth. When comparing the Spring progress monitoring data to the 2021 FSA Math data, the scores are reflective of low performance: 3rd grade had 40% proficiency, 4th grade had 55% and 5th had 39% proficiency. Math will need to be monitored closely overall since there was a decrease or little growth throughout the year when progress monitoring and there has been a significant loss in overall proficiency when comparing the 2021 and 2020 proficiency levels.

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

Factors that contributed to this low performance included the low beginning of the year benchmark assessment scores for many students, inadequate differentiation for individual student needs during the learning process, and student attendance. Additionally, there was not a sufficient amount of targeted focus on intense interventions and enrichment services for students. Trends for student achievement on benchmarks were also not used effectively to plan strategies for instruction, address areas of skill deficit for students and support professional development needs for teachers. The performance of our students with disabilities has also dropped significantly since the start of the COVID pandemic.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the learning gains in ELA and Math. FSA 2021-2022 ELA Learning gains were 59% and FSA 2021-2022 Math Learning Gains were 56%.

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

New actions taken in this area that contributed to academic improvement were increased focus, support, professional development, and programs that provided educational support. Strategic staff development to enhance teacher knowledge in the area of Math and data usage as well as sufficiently scheduled and effectively used time for instruction. We also changed how we provided interventions to students to ensure every student's needs were being met.

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

The strategies that need to be implemented to accelerate learning are increased reading and math interventions, ongoing progress monitoring, and professional development. In addition, behavior and academic incentives with the implementation of PBIS and AR incentives. We will remain consistent with our intervention approach with the addition of literacy coaching. We will continue to adjust our intervention groupings and curriculum to see continued growth in our students.

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 instructional coaches and the administrative team meet with each grade level weekly to go over the week's standards, assessments, and goals. These sessions are designed to assist the teachers with planning highly effective strategies every single day. Professional development opportunities include LEXIA training, Behavior Support training, BEST standards training, and data training for new teachers.

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

In addition to our high-level classroom instruction and teacher-led interventions, we will provide additional resources and support through our literacy team with team meetings to focus on data, standards, and curriculum. The Literacy team will provide additional support with co-teaching and small group interventions. In addition, the MTSS team will continue to offer a tiered system for support for those students who need additional academic and behavior support.

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 Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to 2021-2022 FSA Math data, results show a decrease in the percentage of students scoring at the proficiency level for successful grade-level achievement. 3rd-grade math scores show a decrease from 61% proficient in 2020-2021 to 40% proficient in 2021-2022. 5th-grade math scores show a decrease from 54% proficient in 2020-2021 to 38% proficient in 2021-2022.

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

The math proficiency of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will show a minimum of 51% of students scoring at the proficient level as measured by the FAST PM3 Assessment.

The implementation of iReady, differentiated small group math instruction and the close monitoring of student performance will serve as key components to increased student performance in math. Data will help determine decisions for student needs and guide implications for teacher instruction. Monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held to include math performance, data analysis and instructional implications for students. Additionally, we will increase focus on the foundational skills in math to include fluency with the basic math facts. One goal will be to build fluency from conceptual understanding.

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

This area of focus will be monitored at monthly progress monitoring meetings. Data gathered from the quarterly FAST assessments will be analyzed and used to group students for instruction based on specific needs.

Formative and summative assessments at the classroom level will also be used to monitor student achievement in math. Such classroom data will inform instructional decisions about student needs and help to guide teacher instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

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

The evidence-based strategies that will be implemented to increase instructional practice and student performance in math are increased practice via cooperative learning, visual representations, mathematical models and hands-on explorations. Math Talks will also be utilized to help students explain their thinking and develop a deep understanding of the concepts. Emphasis will be placed on building procedural fluency from conceptual understanding. Individualized learning experiences and targeted small group instruction will also be strategies implemented to increase math achievement.

Additionally, ESE teachers will work closely with the regular education teachers to meet the needs of the students. Co-teaching, modeling lessons, providing feedback and the inclusion of instructional walks will also serve as strategies for improvement. Furthermore, a school-based Math Interventionalist will support the implementation of iReady, small group interventions and the usage of data to increase performance. Math performance,

data analysis and instructional implications will be included in the monthly Data Meetings.

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

These strategies are selected to close the achievement gaps and increase student performance in math by providing them with hands-on explorations, individualized and/ or targeted small group learning experiences and increased focus on conceptual understanding over procedural understanding.

Close monitoring of these specific strategies and data analysis will lead to discussions, planning, and further improvement of instructional practices for teachers. As a result, students will have an enriched environment which will lead to effective classroom engagement and increased learning.

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.

Targeting planning between ESE and regular Education Teachers1. Ongoing discussions about student data and its implications for instruction, and professional development on effective usage of data. Administrators and coaches will monitor the implementation of curriculum and effective instructional strategies, observations in classrooms with feedback provided by the administrative team, and provide support through an instructional coach. Teachers are identifying/correlating rigorous questions within their plans, with engagement activities, think-pair-share, whiteboards, and educational games.

Person Responsible

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

#2. 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.

An area of focus is to increase the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) performing at the proficiency level on the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA and Math. The goal is to increase the percentage above 41%. To help meet this goal, Conley has developed a support system for academic interventions aligned to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities. An intervention plan has been devised to provide targeted support to students. The plan will prescribe interventions to help students acquire academic standards, and ensure they are engaged in both ongoing progress monitoring and annual assessments. This area was identified as a critical need based on subgroup data for students with disabilities that show a percentage of proficiency below 41% in the previous school year.

Goals for Students with Disabilities:

1. Ensure targeted interventions are received to meet individual student needs
2. Engage in ongoing progress monitoring and ensure participation in Baseline Assessments as well as Annual State Assessments
3. Set individual student goals based on needs and standards

Evidence-based action steps will be taken to achieve the goals including hiring an intervention coach, providing additional support for group size reduction, planning for targeted curriculum for intervention support, providing guidance on differentiation, the use of assessments and instructional rigor as well as conducting observations to provide support and guidance on improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 51% of our students with disabilities will make a learning gain on the 2022 FAST Progress Monitoring 2.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored with the use of iReady Math, STAR Reading / STAR Math, and Lexia. In addition, to monthly data meetings, ongoing progress monitoring, classroom and intervention group assessments, and feedback/support from administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

ESE teachers are working closely with the regular education teachers to meet the needs of the students. Lesson Plans are targeted for the deficient

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

areas. New instructional personnel
has been hired to meet the needs of the students.

Evidence-based action steps will be taken to achieve the
goals including hiring an
intervention coach, providing additional support for group
size reduction, planning for
targeted curriculum for intervention support, providing
guidance on differentiation, the use
of assessments and instructional rigor as well as
conducting observations to provide
support and guidance on improvement.

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.

Targeting planning between ESE and Regular Education Teachers Ongoing discussions about data and
its implications for instruction. In addition, professional development on effective usage of data
administrators and coaches will monitor the implementation of curriculum and effective instructional
strategies, observations in classrooms with feedback provided by the administrative team, and provide
support through an instructional coach and intervention specialist.

Person Responsible

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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 are below the federal index of 41%, and have been so for gone year. Currently they are at 39% and their target is 41%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our Black/ African American students to 50% proficiency in math and reading.

Monitoring:

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

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, STAR and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

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

By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students and provide the required intensive interventions necessary for academic gains. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based coaches will provide the opportunities for teachers to have the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains and proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our desire is to engage all students at high levels of thinking that will produce deeper understanding. Teachers will plan together and focus on high yield strategies that target differentiation and intervention.

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. Identify students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards on the FAST progress monitoring and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

1. Identify students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards on the FAST progress monitoring and address the instructional gap.

3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

1. Identify students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards on the FAST progress monitoring and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our economically disadvantaged students are below the federal index of 41%, and have been so for two consecutive years. Currently they are at 39% and their target is 41%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our economically disadvantaged students to 41% proficiency in math and reading.

Monitoring:

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

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, STAR and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

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

By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students with disabilities and provide the required intensive interventions necessary for academic gains. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based coaches will provide the opportunities for teachers to have the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains and proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our desire is to engage our economically disadvantaged students at high levels of thinking that will produce deeper understanding. Teachers will plan together and focus on high yield strategies that target differentiation and intervention.

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. Identify students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards on the FAST progress monitoring and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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

According to 2021-2022 STAR data, results showed an increase in student proficiency of 6% in grades Kindergarten and first, whereas second grade according to STAR data decreased by 5%. The overall average in K-2nd that are not on track of scoring a level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment is 34%.

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

According to 2021-2022 FSA school data, in third grade 39% did not show proficiency in ELA, fourth grade 57% of the students did not show proficiency, and in fifth grade 46% did not show proficiency.

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)

Increase reading proficiency in Grades K-2 as measured by the STAR (FAST) data Monitoring. At least 50% of our students with disabilities will make a learning gain.

Kindergarten STAR Early Literacy - end of the year assessment 78%
1st Grade STAR Early Literacy - end of the year assessment 74%
2nd Grade STAR Early Literacy - end of year assessment 45%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase proficiency in Grades 3, 4, and 5 as measured by the FAST and STAR. With a focus on fourth grade proficiency level increase of at least 50%.

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.

This area will be monitored using progress monitoring data through STAR and FAST PM as well as formative and summative assessments.

In addition, the use of research-based strategies to retrieve information and improve comprehension on text read to include the use of graphic organizers and direction/guidance from the MTSS team for specific students identified as in need of extra support to meet standards or grade level expectations. Implementation of STAR, IReady Math, Lexia, and close monitoring of the usage and data provided. Monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held to include data analysis and instructional implications for students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Threadgill, Ben, threadgillb@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?

ESE teachers are working closely with the regular education teachers to meet the needs of the students. Lesson Plans are targeted for deficient areas. New instructional personnel have been hired to meet the needs of the students. Evidence-Based Practices included:
Intervention Block

Literacy team (reading coach and intervention specialists)

Professional Development with Best Standards, New ELA Curriculum, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, Lexia (focusing on phonics and phonemic awareness). Including New Teacher Book Study - Mindset/The New Psychology of Success

Monthly data meeting

Teacher Modeling/Co-Teaching
Common Planning Time

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 monitoring of program usage and data analysis will lead to discussions, planning, and further improvement of instructional practices for teachers. As a result, students will have an enriched environment which will lead to effective classroom engagement and increased learning. The identified need is for fourth grade to show proficiency on state assessments by 50%. The resources/practices and programs such as science-based reading interventions is focused on student's area of deficiency 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
Targeting planning between ESE and Regular Education Teachers Monthly meeting with ESE staff to review data and alter plans. In addition, weekly team meetings to provide literacy coaching and professional development with the BEST standards and intensive interventions.	Threadgill, Ben, threadgillb@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.

Building a positive school culture and establishing a healthy environment for all stakeholders at Conley Elementary is very important for faculty members, students, and school growth. Positive school culture is one main key to our success. We believe in the saying that "If you create a great place to work, great work takes place." The following strategies are used to help build a positive culture at our school:

1. Strong Leadership with an established vision to include clear expectations and priorities
2. Collaboration which involves asking questions and soliciting input from stakeholders
3. Communication
4. Encouragement, Support, and Celebrations
5. Relationships

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

The stakeholders include the student, teachers, faculty/staff, parents, and community/ business partners. With constant communication via LISTserv and Principal's weekly updates: "Week and Beyond", PTO, School Advisory Council, and District Advisory Council.

School Community - Support school goals and initiatives, provide resources so that stated goals and an initiative can be met by partnering with teachers to provide additional support and resources.

Parents/Families - Support school goals and initiatives, partner with teachers to support the academic growth and development of students, partner with teachers and the school community to support the social and emotional growth and development of all students

Teachers - Partner with the school community, parents/families, students, the school admin, and colleagues to

provide a learning environment for students that is conducive to producing excellence; continually seek opportunities for growth and development, support school and district initiatives

Administration - Provide leadership as well as whole and total support for all stakeholders, prioritizing teachers and students

Students - Be respectful, responsible, and ready to learn each day