Chiefland Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Amy Webber

Start Date for this Principal: 5/31/2022

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	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* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

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	27%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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 staff, parents and community will work together to ensure the success of all students while cultivating their dreams for tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will be known forever by the tracks we leave.

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
Webber, Amy	Principal	As the instructional leader of the school, Mrs. Webber provides guidance and support in ensuring that quality instruction is delivered. Informal and formal observations are conducted in an effort to support teachers and students in this task. Conversations concerning instructional practices and student data take place regularly. The principal also overesees campus wide events where all stakeholders are given an opportunity to participate and provide input and feedback.
Hoover, Kelley	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is direct support and assistance to the Principal and joins in providing guidance and support to all stakeholders. She participated in conducting informal and formal observations to support teachers and students in this task. She participates in conversations concerning instructional practices and student data and provides support as needed. She also provides support with the schoolwide PBIS program and assists teachers with strategies for behavior management.
McDilda, Melissa	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will provide support for the school wide PBIS program when needed. She will coordinate and schedule all meetings for ESE students and will provide support to our ESE teachers. She will provide guidance for resources related to guidance and mental health services and referrals for services these services. She will coordinate and facilitate Section 504 plans, and will serve as LEA for IEP and 504 meetings. She will serve as a resource to support families in need at various times throughout the school year. In addition, she will serve as the ESOL coordinator for our school, providing support to all stakeholders.
Warren, Bonnie	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach provides support to all teachers concerning all ELA curriculum and resources. She also provides support to teachers as needed for research based instructional stratgies and best practices for teaching all components of reading. She serves as a key participant in discussing school wide and individual student data. She will also provide professional development for teachers throughout the year and will observe and provide feedback to teachers as needed as well as make a plan for teachers to observe other teachers in an effort to help them grow professionally.
Snyder, Megan	Math Coach	The Math Coach provides support to all teachers concerning all math curriculum and resources. She also provides support to teachers as needed for research based instructional stratgies and best practices for teaching math. She serves as a key participant in discussing school wide and individual student data. She will also provide professional development for teachers throughout the year and will observe and provide feedback to teachers as needed as well as make a plan for teachers to observe other teachers in an effort to help them grow professionally. She serves as the AVID site coordinator as well.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/31/2022, Amy Webber

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.*

27

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

699

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

12

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	111	118	129	93	103	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	648
Attendance below 90 percent	26	55	52	35	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	9	13	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	9	23	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	10	16	2	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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

Monday 8/29/2022

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	108	149	85	122	106	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
Attendance below 90 percent	61	71	39	65	44	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	46	53	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	47	45	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	43	60	19	32	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191

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	7	22	37	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	7	25	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	108	149	85	122	106	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
Attendance below 90 percent	61	71	39	65	44	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	46	53	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	47	45	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	43	60	19	32	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191

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	7	22	37	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	7	25	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	52%	50%	56%				48%	49%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						58%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						66%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	48%	49%	50%				48%	58%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						55%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						43%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	52%	59%				47%	50%	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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	44%	1%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	49%	55%	-6%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	53%	-13%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
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	24	26	18	30	33	22	33				
ELL	23			15							
BLK	28	37	30	11	39	50	25				
HSP	46	69		33	50						
MUL	65	54		39	38						
WHT	54	47	54	56	52	45	51				
FRL	46	46	50	41	48	49	40				

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	23	50	58	33	41	54	47				
ELL	30			80							
BLK	35	65		32	53		38				
HSP	50			65							
MUL	71			50							
WHT	52	63	74	57	59	65	49				
FRL	46	65	75	49	56	67	46				

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	29	48	59	32	54	53	29				
ELL	36	40		64	70						
BLK	33	63		42	63	50	33				
HSP	43			64							
MUL	35			25							
WHT	53	59	64	50	54	44	49				
FRL	43	56	63	42	53	44	41				

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	46
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	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	23
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	49
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	
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	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

In looking at the previous years data, it is determined that students are performing below 50% proficiency on iReady ELA and Math in grades 1-5. However, in grades 3-5, proficiency was higher according to FSA data.
K - ELA, 61%proficient, Math - 54% proficient
1 - ELA 43%, Math 41%
2 - ELA 45%, Math 37%
3 - ELA 48%, 52% (FSA) - Math 29%, 49%(FSA)
4 - ELA 42%, 55% (FSA) - Math 30%, 49% (FSA)
5 - ELA 21%, 43%(FSA), 26%, 41% (FSA)
Across all grade levels, proficiency in ELA and math needs to increase. In grades 3-5, there is a clear incosistency in ELA and Math data.

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

When reviewing data it is clear that the greatest need for improvement is math, specifically for 2nd and 5th grades, however, all grade levels need an increase in proficiency for ELA and math.

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 FSA and iReady data, we have found that there is an inconsistency in data between those. This may be due to inconsistent implementation with iReady and follow up with teachers concerning student data.

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

Based on our 20-21 FSA ELA data, 3rd graders increased from 49-55% proficiency and 4th graders increased from 39-43% proficiency.

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

This increase in proficiency was possible due to the implementation of resources available for the newly adopted ELA currciculim. There were also ELA cadre meetings allowing teams of people to come together to dicuss the new currciuclum and strategies necessary to implement with fidelity.

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

In order to accelerate learning, student itnterventions must be consistent, targeted, and differentiated. Consistent data chats with teachers regarding instructional strategies and best pratices will need to take place. Follow up from admin and instructional coaches will be necessary as well.

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.

We will continue to provide training on the new ELA and Math B.E.S.T standards. We will also continue to provide training on iReady, and how to best utilize the program to provide instruction as well as how to use reports to help guide in understanding the data that it provides. We will continue to provide AVID training in an effort to enhance student engagement and support student organizational skills.

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

Consistenet data chats will be implemented to discuss how to best support students, teachers, and families. Administration and Instructional coaches will provide support and feedback to staff, students, and families.

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.	Data was reviewed from the previous year and it was determined that there needs to be a significant increase in ELA achievement. Less than half of students are proficient.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	For the 2022-2023 school year, Chiefland Elementary School will increase ELA proficiency from 52% proficient to 67% proficient (15%) in all students, including our ESSA identified subgroups, as evidenced by the iReady diagnostic 3 using end-of-year view.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The leadership team will be analyzing data using iReady on a regular basis during monthly data chats and PST meetings with teachers to discuss instructional strategies that will have a positive impact on student achievement, including student usage, pass rates, and diagnostic scores from all three diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Chiefland Elementary School will run a block of intervention time with fidelity, 4 out of 5 days a week, that utilizes evidence-based instructional strategies specified in our decision tree. Examples include Sadlier Vocabulary Workshop, From Phonics to Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, and Leveled Literacy Intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Staff input identified intervention as an area that could be improved from years past. During intervention time we will target specific student needs which will increase student achievement.

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

Beginning of the year data chats to discuss student achievement levels through iReady diagnostic 1 to help determine specific intervention materials.

Person Responsible	Bonnie Warren (bonnie.warren@levyk12.org)

Monthly PSTs to continue discussions about student performance, instructional strategies, and intervention materials. Reading coach will train on iReady program implementation. She will model in classrooms and provide coaching for instructional staff.

Person Responsible	Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)

Mrs. Webber will follow up on implementation of curriculum by completing classroom walk throughs.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#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.**	Data was reviewed from the previous year and it was determined that there needs to be a significant increase in Math achievement. Less than half of students are proficient.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	For the 2022-2023 school year, Chiefland Elementary School will increase Math proficiency from 48% to 67% (15%) in all students, including our ESSA identified subgroups, as evidenced by the iReady diagnostic 3 using end-of-year view.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The leadership team will be analyzing data using iReady on a regular basis during monthly data chats and PST meetings with teachers to discuss instructional strategies that will have a positive impact on student achievement, including student usage, pass rates, and diagnostic scores from all three diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Math teachers will use the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning standards as outlined in the Florida's B.E.S.T. math standards to provide effective instruction and facilitate applicable knowledge in our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	MTR standards promote deeper learning through clear language so all stakeholders can easily understand them. This strategy was selected through the Florida Department of Education's B.E.S.T. standards that were implemented this year.

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.

B.E.S.T. math standards professional development was delivered during pre-planning.

Person Responsible	Megan Snyder (megan.snyder@levyk12.org)

Lesson plans will be checked monthly to ensure teachers are utilizing MTRs with fidelity. Math coach will assist teachers with curriculum implementation and will model in classrooms.

Person Responsible	Kelley Hoover (kelley.hoover@levyk12.org)

Mrs. Hoover will follow up on implementation of curriculum by completing classroom walk throughs.

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

In the 21-22 school year, Chiefland Elementary School had an average of 49% of students in grades K-2 test below grade level on iReady diagnostic 3. In Phonics specifically, 52% of students in grades K-2 tested below grade level.

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

In the 21-22 school year, Chiefland Elementary School had an average of 50% of students in grades 3-5 test below proficiency. In Vocabulary specifically, 69% of students in grades 3-5 tested below 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)

In the 22-23 school year, Chiefland Elementary School will increase its Phonics proficiency in grades K-2 from 66% to 76% (10%) as evidenced on iReady diagnostic 3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In the 22-23 school year, Chiefland Elementary School will increase its Vocabulary proficiency from 59% to 69% (10%) in grades 3-5 as evidenced on iReady diagnostic 3.

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.

The use of Heggerty in K-1 and From Phonics to Reading in K-2 for core Phonics instruction, and Benchmark Advanced in 3-5 for core Vocabulary instruction will be monitored through monthly lesson plan checks. These methods will also be discussed at monthly PST meetings with teachers and the leadership team, along with iReady diagnostic scores over the year.

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

Hoover, Kelley, kelley.hoover@levyk12.org

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?

Heggerty and From Phonics into Reading do not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence; however, the following IES Practice Guide recommendation(s) support the program: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, recommendation number two - Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. This recommendation has strong evidence. This program is monitored via standards-based report card assessments and intervention documentation for students who use the program on a Tier 2 or 3 level. Benchmark Advanced is classified as moderate/promising evidence according to Florida's definition.

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?

These programs have been identified and selected through our district leadership team as being effective tools to support phonemic, phonological, and vocabulary instruction. These resources are research based and proven effective for struggling students.

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
The School Literacy Leadership Team will support the creation and implementation of ELA blocks in all grades K-5, in order to create instructional structures that reflect a deep understanding of the Science of Reading, including prioritizing foundational skill instruction in K-3.	Warren, Bonnie, bonnie.warren@levyk12.org
The school leadership team will facilitate data analysis regarding phonics and vocabulary proficiency through iReady diagnostics three times per year.	Webber, Amy, amy.webber@levyk12.org
Chiefland Elementary School teachers will participate in our school-based iReady professional development day that will have a focus on Phonics and Vocabulary.	Webber, Amy, amy.webber@levyk12.org

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment in several ways. One way is the implementation of our school wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports framework. Our PE teacher, along with the admin team (Prinicpal, Assistant Principal, counselor), oversees the program. Through this framework, teachers are able to provide incentives to students and postive behavior referrals. Staff sends positive postcards to families and families are able to participate in celebrating students that receive student of the month. In addition, grade levels host a social each month allowing opportunities for faculty and staff members to engage in fellowship and nurture relationships. Staff shout outs can be written for any staff member that highlights any positive action, characteristic, etc. Our Parent-Teacher Organization hosts events often for students and staff. Parent involvement nights are offered quarterly inviting families to come on campus with students for academic and casual events. Volunteers are

encouraged on campus to assist teachers and help with students. We are also an AVID school and address positive culture through the framework by using the Coaching and Certification Instrument.

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

Students - encouraged to take ownership of their education and follow school-wide expectations, to lead by example, and to persevere.
Faculty/Staff - support students and families and have an open line of communication, as well as consistently promote and reward positive behavior that aligns with SWPBIS.
Administration/Leadership - maintain an open line of communication with all stakeholders and promote positive behavior school wide.
Families - support our school and school-wide expectations at home. Participate in and support school wide events and celebrations.
Local Businesses and Community Groups - Local businesses and community groups support PBIS by making monetary or physical donations to the PBIS School Store or the quarterly reward events.
Volunteers - Serve the school in multiple ways, including PBIS school store.