Ruediger Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ruediger Elementary School

526 W 10TH AVE, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/ruediger

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Ha IR E

Start Date for this Principal: 12/30/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Ruediger Elementary School

526 W 10TH AVE, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/ruediger

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

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.

Reaching Every Student - All Day, Every Day, in Every Way!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ruediger Elementary School will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Haire, Shannon	Principal	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
Sumner, Melissa	Assistant Principal	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
Gray, Shemeka	Reading Coach	As a literacy leader, the position is responsible for implementing a comprehensive literacy program at the assigned school through coaching, supporting, and guiding teachers in best practices for literacy instruction.
Woodson, Bettye	School Counselor	The school counselor provides education, prevention, early identification and intervention. In addition, elementary school counselor helps students achieve academic success, develop an understanding of career opportunities and develop social/ emotional skills in response to issues they face.
Bodiford, Samantha	Instructional Media	Media Specialist promoting literacy. Evaluates, selects, and requisitions new library materials and equipment. Assists teachers in the selection of instructional materials. Maintains a comprehensive and efficient system for cataloging all library materials and instructs teachers and students on use of the system.
Barnes, Yolanda	Teacher, K-12	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Atkins, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
Gabriel, Ivory	Teacher, K-12	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
DuBose, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
Cineus, Shunteen	Teacher, K-12	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
Schrieber, Leigh	Teacher, K-12	These teachers and administrators comprise our leadership team at Ruediger. The team meets with the principal monthly to bring forth concerns and problem solve as needed. With meeting minutes posted school-wide and members reporting back to their teams, this process is an integral part of our horizontal communication system within the school. Instructional coaches, the guidance counselor, administrators, and teachers of specific students are also part of our weekly

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		MTSS meetings as well as monthly MTSS data reviews designed to monitor progress of all students receiving reading interventions.
Sinclair, Randi	Instructional Coach	As a math leader, the position is responsible for implementing a comprehensive math program at the assigned school through coaching, supporting, and guiding teachers in best practices for math instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 12/30/2021, Shannon Ha IR E

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.*

2

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

500

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.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	78	73	79	72	75	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	24	25	22	26	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	5	0	0	3	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	24	30	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	34	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	9	16	26	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	7	2	9	18	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	7	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	78	74	68	79	79	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	30	24	28	33	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	36	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	1	0	19	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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

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	78	74	68	79	79	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	30	24	28	33	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	36	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	9	16	26	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	1	0	19	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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

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	35%	57%	56%				48%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						50%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						34%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	34%	47%	50%				61%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	51%						66%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						39%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	57%	59%				34%	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	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	56%	-14%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	54%	63%	-9%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	66%	7%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	53%	-22%
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	6	12		10	41		15				
BLK	34	50	46	30	47	52	13				
HSP	33	69		47	62						
MUL	33	30		50							
WHT	70			60							
FRL	31	48	45	30	46	48	19				

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	14	17		20	17		25				
ELL											
BLK	28	18	9	30	27	14	18				
HSP	15			31							
MUL	57			14							
WHT	55			73							
FRL	26	24	23	26	25	21	14				
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	19	25	27	26	50		18				
BLK	45	49	37	59	63	37	34				
HSP	56	69		82	93						
WHT	72	58		78	75						
FRL	44	47	36	56	64	39	32				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	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	53
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
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	38
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?

In the ongoing aftermath of the pandemic, reading achievement scores have improved but are much lower than usual. Based on our EOY progress monitoring data: First and second grade STAR reading scores are also much lower than usual: 48% of first graders scored at the 53rd percentile or higher (proficient); 54% of second graders scored in the proficient range. According to the winter STAR assessment, only 47% of third graders scored in the proficient range (53rd percentile or above), 28% of fourth graders, and 31% of fifth graders.

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

According to the most recent ELA data from the 2022 FSA, the following needs have been identified:
*Reading Proficiency and Reading Gains
*Math Proficiency and Math Gains
*Bottom Quartile Gains in Reading and Math
*5th Grade Science Proficiency

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

After reviewing our progress monitoring data for 2021-2022 and our FSA 2022 scores, we have established our action steps for improvement.

*A master schedule was created to include multiple layers of reading instruction to include a daily intervention block. Reliable baseline data was used to develop tier 2 and 3 intervention groups. Reading endorsed teachers are delivering instruction for all intervention groups.

*A master schedule was created to implement an ESE inclusion model.

* A school tutoring program was created for students in grades 3-5. Attendees will include identified fourth and fifth grade students in the bottom 35%ile based on progress monitoring and prior FSA Reading and Math scores.

*A STEM teacher was hired. STEM has been added to the special area rotation for 3rd-5th.

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

When comparing the FSA 2021 to the FSA 2022, we saw significant gains in the following areas:

*ELA gains went from 23% to 51%

*ELA lowest quartile went from 19% to 47%

*Math lowest quartile went from 18% to 52%

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

The following factors contributed to our improvements in the areas listed above:

*A master schedule that included a daily intervention block. Reliable baseline data was used to develop intervention groups. Reading endorsed teachers delivered daily daily tier three instruction in the classroom.

*A master schedule was created to implement an ESE inclusion model.

* An after-school tutoring program was implemented for students in grades 3-5. Attendees included identified students in the bottom quartile based on progress monitoring and prior FSA Reading and Math scores.

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

We have hired a STEM teacher for the 2022-2023 school year. He meets with our gifted and talented students weekly. This year he will teach a STEM class to all 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students on our special area
rotation.

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 STEM/ gifted teacher attends district training, and then presents that information to the faculty and staff.

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

*Coaching and support for all of our ELA teachers as they plan and deliver tier 3 reading interventions
*STEM teacher has been added to the special area rotation to support math and science
*Revised master schedule to allow for multiple layers of reading support
*Revised master schedule to have an inclusion model for ESE students

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Increase the percentage of proficient students on the ELA. Reading proficiency for matched students declined significantly during the 2020-2021 school year. Multiple barriers due to Covid and distance learning impacted instruction and student achievement We will increase rigor and incorporate high impact reading strategies and instruction. Our reading block contains multiple layers of support to provide intensive interventions for struggling readers and assist with recovering learning loss. Teachers will continue to implementation of Phonics for Reading, Leveled Literacy and Jr. Great Book. The emphasis will be on the use of high impact reading strategies and improvement of student-led discussion and inquiry skills.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022, 35% of matched students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored 3 or above on the ELA. In 2023, 48% of matched students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be proficient on the ELA portion of the EOY state assessment:
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings. 2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shemeka Gray (pittmans@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Increase instructional rigor and incorporate high impact reading strategies across content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers will continue implementation of daily research based tier three interventions. Emphasis will be on use of high impact reading strategies and improvement of student-led discussion and inquiry skills.

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. Reading Coach will plan with teams and support implementation of Phonics for Reading, Leveled Literacy and Jr. Great Book. .

2. Reading endorsed teachers will provide intensive tier 2 and tier 3 instruction to struggling readers.

3. Monitor progress during weekly PLC meetings (classroom assessments, iReady, and STAR).

Person Responsible   Shemeka Gray (pittmans@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Increase the percentage of students proficient or higher on the Math assessment. Math proficiency for matched students increased slightly during the 2021-2022 school year as we continue to recover from Covid learning loss. We will increase rigor and incorporate high impact math strategies and instruction. In addition to our math block, we will continue to provide layers of support and intensive interventions for struggling students and assist with recovering learning loss and closing the achievement gap. We have put the following additional layers of support in place: 1. Morning Math Lab 2. Afterschool Tutoring Program 3. STEM will be on the special area rotation for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade. 4. STEM teacher and math coach will push into classrooms to provide additional support to teachers during the math block. 5. STEM teacher will math coach will push into classrooms to provide additional support to students during during the math intervention block.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022, 34% of matched students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored 3 or above on the Math FSA. In 2023, 50% of matched students will be proficient on the EOY state math assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings. 2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Randi Sinclair (sinclairr2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Increase instructional rigor and incorporate high impact math strategies across content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers will continue implementation of the small group math model. Emphasis will be on use of high impact math strategies and providing additional layers of intensive and targeted instruction during our morning math lab and tutoring programs.

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. Math Coach will plan with teams and support implementation of the small group math model and high impact math strategies.

2. Monitor progress via Go Math chapter tests, iReady, and quarterly benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible   Randi Sinclair (sinclairr2@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.**	Improve the math EOY state assessment performance of bottom quartile and SWD in grades 3, 4 and 5. We will provide an additional layer of math interventions for our bottom quartile and SWD in grades 4 and 5 daily. bottom quartile and SWD will be provided ongoing support in classroom content as well as additional time on iReady Math to address skills/concepts not mastered.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022, 52% of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students in the bottom quartile earned gains on FSA math. In 2023, 55% of 4th and 5th grade students in the bottom quartile will earn gains on FSA math.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings. 2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Randi Sinclair (sinclairr2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Math Coach, teachers and additional paraprofessionals will engage in frequent formative assessment in order to provide ongoing reteaching and support in current content areas as well as areas/strands of of need identified within iReady math. iReady will be used for ongoing progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Instead of relying upon summative data provided by Go Math chapter tests, we will use formative assessment (such as exit tickets) to identify and address areas of need as they occur. SWD and bottom quartile students will remain in the regular education classroom for at least part of whole group instruction. The ESE teacher will reteach and support ESE students while the classroom para provides intensive daily classroom support to small groups of Level 1 students on current content. The Math Coach and teacher will will also examine interim Go Math assessments and reteach areas of need for regular ed and SWD. Math Coach will also provide additional lab time before school to allow students to unmastered content. For SWD and Level 1 students, we will also focus on teaching basic algorithms and using mnemonics to aide recall.

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 for morning lab.
2. Place paras in classrooms with bottom quartile and SWD
3. Use daily exit tickets to monitor understanding and plan instruction.
4. Monitor progress in mastery of iReady strands.

Person Responsible   Randi Sinclair (sinclairr2@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.**	Improve EOY State Science Assessment performance of fifth grade students. Our science scores are among the lowest in our district. Although the teacher does a great job of teaching the content, student performance breaks down when they are required to read independently and apply concepts. Progress will be monitored using Science Fusions chapter results, with reteaching provided as needed.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022,17% of matched students in grade 5 scored 3 or above on the EOY State Science Assessment. In 2023, 34% of matched students will score 3 or above on the EOY State Science Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings. 2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shannon Haire (haires@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Incorporate effective content area reading strategies into the teaching of science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	To support students in transferring what they learn through hands-on science to independent reading and concept application, the science teacher will work with the Reading Coach and district gifted support person to implement effective reading strategies into teaching the science content. Heavy emphasis will be placed on vocabulary.

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. Enlist ongoing support from the district science contact.
2. Establish a highly visible science vocabulary word wall in the classroom.
3. STEM has been added to our special area rotation for our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students.
4. Principal and reading coach will monitor implementation of reading strategies.
5. Use daily exit tickets to monitor understanding and plan appropriate follow up instruction

Person Responsible	Shannon Haire (haires@leonschools.net)

#5. 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.**	Increase ELA learning gains. Reading proficiency for matched students increased during the 2021-2022 school year. We continue to recover learning loss due to multiple barriers during Covid and distance learning which impacted instruction and student achievement. With all students returning to in-person learning, we will continue with our increased rigor and incorporation of high impact reading strategies and instruction. Our reading block contains multiple layers of support to provide intensive interventions for struggling readers and an to support the continuation of recovering learning loss. Teachers will continue the implementation of Leveled Literacy and Jr. Great Book. The emphasis will be on the use of high impact reading strategies and improvement of student-led discussion and inquiry schools. Reading endorsed teachers will provide an additional layer of reading interventions during the I/E block each day. In addition, we will continue to enhance implementation of the ESE inclusion model. For struggling readers, we have purchased additional Aimsweb seats which we will use for ongoing progress monitoring. We will also monitor growth on quarterly STAR, iReady Reading, and built-in assessments included with the tier 3 Leveled Literacy Intervention program.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022, 51% of matched students earned gains on the ELA component of the FSA. In 2023, 57% of matched students will earn gains on the ELA portion of the EOY state assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings. 2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shemeka Gray (pittmans@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Continue implementation of Jr. Great Books reading strategies to increase rigor and effectiveness of whole and small group reading (guided practice with stronger modeling and think-alouds; greater emphasis on vocabulary development). All ELA teachers have received training for delivery of tier 3 reading interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for**	Interventions alone will not help struggling students demonstrate great level expectations and close the achievement gap. Highly effective core instruction during

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	whole and small group differentiated reading and a strong layer of high quality reading intervention will enhance learning for all.

1. Reading coach to plan, observe and co-teach whole and small group reading.
2. Use and reinforce vocabulary strategies through all curriculum areas and display word walls in all classrooms.
3. Enlist support of the district reading team.
4. Monitor progress via unit/ chapter tests, iReady, and quarterly STAR.

Person Responsible   Shannon Haire (haires@leonschools.net)

#6. 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.	Improve math performance of bottom quartile students and SWD . Bottom quartile and SWD will be provided with ongoing support in classroom content as well as additional time on iReady Math to address skills/concepts not mastered
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In 2022, 52% of students in the bottom quartile earned gains on FSA math. In 2023, 55% of students in the bottom quartile will earn gains on on the math portion of the EOY state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings. 2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Randi Sinclair (sinclairr2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Math Coach, teachers and additional paraprofessionals will engage in frequent formative assessment in order to provide ongoing reteaching and support in current content areas as well as areas/strands of of need identified within iReady math. iReady will be used for ongoing progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Instead of relying upon summative data provided by Go Math chapter tests, we will use formative assessment (such as exit tickets) to identify and address areas of need as they occur. SWD and bottom quartile students will remain in the regular education classroom for at least part of whole group instruction. The ESE teacher will reteach and support ESE students while the classroom para provides intensive daily classroom support to small groups of Level 1 students on current content. The Math Coach and teacher will will also examine interim Go Math assessments and reteach areas of need for regular ed and SWD. Math Coach will also provide additional lab time before school to allow students to unmastered content. For SWD and Level 1 students, we will also focus on teaching basic algorithms and using mnemonics to aide recall.

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 for morning lab.
2. Place paras in classrooms with bottom quartile and SWD

3. Use daily exit tickets to monitor understanding and plan instruction.
4. Monitor progress in mastery of iReady strands.

Person Responsible   Randi Sinclair (sinclairr2@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

Improve the ELA EOY PM / State Assessment performance of bottom quartile and SWD in grades K-2nd. We will provide an additional layer of reading interventions (Phonics for Reading & Leveled Literacy Intervention) for our bottom quartile and SWD daily. These same students will also engage in weekly fluency work by reading passages on Monday, practicing them during the week, and charting/graphing their progress when they reread on Friday. In addition, we will continue to enhance implementation of the ESE inclusion model. For struggling readers, we have purchased additional Aimsweb seats which we will use for ongoing progress monitoring. We will also monitor growth on quarterly STAR, iReady Reading, and built-in assessments included with the Leveled Literacy Intervention program.

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

Improve the ELA EOY state assessment performance of bottom quartile and SWD in grades 3, 4 and 5. We will provide an additional layer of reading interventions (Phonics for Reading & Leveled Literacy Intervention) for our
bottom quartile and SWD in grades 3, 4 and 5 daily. These same students will also engage in weekly fluency work by reading passages on Monday, practicing them during the week, and charting/graphing their progress when they reread on Friday. In addition, we will continue to enhance implementation of the ESE inclusion model. For struggling readers in grades 3, 4 and 5, we have purchased additional Aimsweb seats which we will use for ongoing progress monitoring. We will also monitor growth on

quarterly STAR, iReady Reading, and built-in assessments included with the Leveled Literacy Intervention program.

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)

Kindergarten, first and second grade EOY STAR reading scores for 2022: 86% of kindergarteners scored at the 53rd percentile or higher (proficient); 48% of first graders scored at the 53rd percentile or higher (proficient); 54% of second graders scored in the proficient range. In 2023, 80% of kindergarteners will score at the 53rd percentile or higher on STAR Early Literacy (proficient); 45% of first graders scored at the 53rd percentile or higher (proficient); 55% of second graders scored in the proficient range.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2022, 47% of matched 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students in the bottom quartile earned gains on the ELA component of the state assessment. In 2023, 51% of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students in the bottom quartile will earn gains on the ELA.

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.

1. Student data and progress is reviewed, monitored and discussed during weekly grade level PLC meetings.
2. Student progress and fidelity of instruction is monitored during monthly MTSS data review meetings with our entire problem solving team.

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

Gray, Shemeka, grays@leonschools.net

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

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

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

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

Level 1 students and SWD will receive up to receive 3 layers of reading instruction:
*Daily grade level instruction in their regular education classrooms for a portion of the reading block.
*ESE teachers will push in to provided small group instruction for SWD.
*During the intervention block, students will be placed into small groups with similar needs for an additional 45 minutes (daily) of daily tier 3 instruction provided by a reading endorsed teacher.

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?

Research suggests that students must be provided with additional time for high quality reading instruction and
intervention in order to speed progress and close the achievement gap. That is the purpose of our plan - to provide effective core instruction with an additional layer of intensive intervention on a daily basis.

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 & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING: 1. Train reading endorsed teachers and Reading Coach to deliver research-based tier three reading interventions with fidelity 2. Support program via master schedule 3. Reading Coach to consistently monitor program implementation 4. AimsWeb assessment every two weeks and monthly monitoring on individual and group progress by MTSS team. 5. If progress is insufficient, revisit fidelity of program implementation and/or provide alternate intervention. 6. Purchase additional reading intervention materials	Haire, Shannon, haires@leonschools.net
LITERACY LEADERSHIP TEAM: Member: Shannon Haire-Principal, Melissa Sumner-Assistant Principal, Shemeka Gray- Reading Coach, Nicole Jackson- Intermediate ELA Teacher, Kimika Smith- Primary ELA Teacher, Taylor Gargan- ESE Teacher, Caitlyn Whitley- ESE Teacher The team will meet monthly to probe the PM data for all groups. Progress will be monitored via program assessments, iReady, AimsWeb, and quarterly STAR. . If progress is insufficient, revisit fidelity of program implementation and/or provide alternate intervention.	Gray, Shemeka, grays@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.

We will maintain a strong social media presence and our open door policy for all stakeholders. We will also host Family Orientation and our Annual Title 1/Open House meeting. In addition, we will continue to host heavily attended family nights focused on literacy and math, as well as Curriculum/ State Assessment and Kindergarten Family Nights, spring and fall book fairs, Father Daughter/Mother Son dance, and STEAM/ College Night. Equally important, one of our local churches sponsors monthly All Pro Dads meetings.

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

Stakeholders: School Administrators, Faculty and Staff, Students, Families, School Community & Partners
Our positive culture begins and ends with kids. As a school community, we address the social, physical and intellectual needs of our students. Each one demands adult contributions and effective engagement at all levels. We all work together to ensure that:
1. Students are safe, physically, emotionally, as well as treated fairly and with equity
2. Students are supported: meaningful connections to adults, positive peer relationships, effective and

readily available supports in place

3. Students are challenged: high expectations, strong personal motivation, strong and diverse academic opportunities

4. Students are socially capable: emotionally intelligent, culturally competent, responsible, co-operative, and contribute to the school