

Alachua County Public Schools

Alachua Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Alachua Elementary School

13800 NW 152ND PL, Alachua, FL 32615

<https://www.sbac.edu/alachua>

Demographics

Principal: Holly Burton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
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: D (38%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI

* 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 Alachua County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Alachua Elementary School

13800 NW 152ND PL, Alachua, FL 32615

<https://www.sbac.edu/alachua>

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 3-5	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	61%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Alachua Elementary's mission is to encourage each child to become a lifelong learner by performing to his or her potential in a safe, nurturing and challenging learning environment. We are committed to the success of every student!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alachua Elementary's vision is to provide a climate of strong, supportive relationships and academic excellence in order to promote self-confident, capable life-long learners.

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
Burton, Holly	Principal	Supervise the operation and management of all activities and functions at the school. Provide leadership, coordinate professional development, and monitor delivery of all educational programs. Utilize current research, performance data, and feedback from students, teachers, parents, and community members to make decisions that improve instruction and achievement. Recruit and retain highly qualified instructional and non-instructional staff. Develop and maintain the master schedule. Manage the school's financial resources. Facilitate and participate in school-related events. Create a positive school culture, motivate staff, and foster positive relationships among all members of the school.
Carter, Isabel	Assistant Principal	Provide expertise to classroom teachers on development of appropriate instructional strategies for individual students. Assist in intervention design. Provide expertise to classroom teachers on the development of appropriate behavioral strategies for individual students. Assist classroom teachers with the design and implementation of the Functional Behavior Assessment and development of the Behavior Improvement Plan. Monitor behavior and attendance data. Oversee ESOL program at the school level. Provide ongoing professional development to new hires in order to acquaint them with school expectations and procedures.
Rudзитis, Dana	Instructional Coach	Conduct data analysis process. Meet with teachers to discuss data trends and create action plans to address student needs. Provide assistance and data analysis expertise in administering reading and writing assessments. Provided job embedded instructional support and coaching to teachers based on data trends. Provide support and professional development to teachers on school-wide reading intervention plan. Work with students to provide reading intervention.
Harrell, Jazzlyn	School Counselor	Coordinate implementation of the RtI process. Assist classroom teachers with assessments and interventions. Coordinate and facilitate mentoring program, classroom guidance lessons, mental health services, referrals for services, and Section 504 plans. Provide support to families in need at various times throughout the school year.
Hall, Amelia	Behavior Specialist	Provide behavioral support in all classrooms. Provide professional development and support in the area of classroom management, behavioral interventions, restorative justice, engagement, and social emotional

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		learning strategies for teachers. Manage anti-bullying programs and curriculum. Organize, analyze and decrease suspension data annually, particularly involving disproportionate discipline data. Facilitate all aspects of Positive Behavior Supports and lead the PBIS Committee.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Holly Burton

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

334

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.

14

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	0	0	0	121	103	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	333
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	67	54	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	62	20	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	24	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	28	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	29	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	39	22	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
	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	54	38	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

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	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	0	0	0	111	92	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	26	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	17	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	21	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	0	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	111	92	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	26	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	17	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	21	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	0	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	36%	53%	56%				42%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	56%	61%				45%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	43%	52%				42%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	55%	60%				50%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	38%	58%	64%				56%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	46%	55%				56%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	48%	51%				38%	57%	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
03	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2022					
	2019	29%	55%	-26%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	55%	-18%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2022					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2022					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	55%	-18%	53%	-16%
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	12	32	39	16	28	35	6				
ELL	20	40		47	45						
BLK	20	43	41	20	39	42	14				
HSP	31	41		51	36		29				
MUL	45	67		50	60		25				
WHT	50	42		54	33		53				
FRL	24	43	44	30	35	35	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	17	22		26	28		11				
ELL	21			29							
BLK	22	38	33	19	30		13				
HSP	31			47							
MUL	43			50							
WHT	61	62		77	76		70				
FRL	29	39	29	36	36	43	22				

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	14	29	27	28	47	50	4				
ELL	17			33							
BLK	24	38	39	35	52	59	21				
HSP	41	55		51	45		60				
MUL	60	77		40	54		40				
WHT	58	42		67	64		43				
FRL	33	43	43	41	51	56	31				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 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	46
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	35
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?

Students maintained a similar ELA proficiency and growth rate on the ELA portion of the FSA in the past three years. The math performance declined in all subgroups in proficiency and learning gains. The bottom quartile growth declined in both ELA and Math. Science achievement was 32%.

Prior to COVID, ELA proficiency in 3rd grade rose from 41% to 56%, but then declined the past two years from 44% to 36%.

The Overall ESSA percentage is below the requirement at 40%. The 5 ESSA subgroups of concern include: SWD - 24% (3 years below 32%), ELL - 40% (3 years below 41% but not below 35%), AA - 31% (3 years below 41%, 1 year below 35%), Hispanic - 40% (1 year below 41%), ED - 40% (1 year below 41%). Of interest, males underperformed with 36%. Multi-racial students maintained proficiency at 46%. ESSA subgroups of greatest concern include: SWD, AA and ELL students. White student data fell from 69% to 46% in the past two years.

Discipline data and climate surveys indicate an increase in discipline across grade levels and an increase in the number of students indicated in the EWS.

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

The greatest need for improvement centers around tier 1 instruction for ELA, Math and Science. Overall levels dropped steadily 47 (18/19) to 43 (20/21) to 38 (21/22).

In addition, SWD and AA students are significantly less likely to be proficient than their peers. Males also show a deficit compared with females.

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

With COVID, school-wide procedures and instructional routines changed. The model of instruction also changed as a result of COVID restrictions. Subgroups may have received differentiated instruction in a way that did not maximize improvement. In addition, the teaching population changed over the past few years, resulting in drastic, decreased instructional experience. These factors contributed to less students having success as student supports declined.

With the new BEST standards, and an inexperienced teaching staff, we will ensure Tier one instruction is implemented and aligned with the new benchmarks in both ELA and Math. New actions will need to include the following: professional development, instructional coaching with feedback cycles, proper student placements and groupings, and collaborative planning coupled with instructional strategies to differentiate grade level instruction during the CORE instructional blocks. This can include Kagan and other instructional engagement methods. In addition, leadership changes, a review of the EWS indicators, and climate survey results, a reset of PBIS and restorative practices will also be needed to improve culture and climate for all stakeholders.

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

In ELA, overall learning gains stayed relatively the same for the past three years which indicates that the interventions were having an impact on approximately 45% of the students.

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

Students received intervention during the extra hour identified for reading.

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

To accelerate learning, instruction will need to reflect the grade level benchmarks and include the instructional materials to support on grade level learning. Differentiation will need to include flexible grouping of students based on progress monitoring data, the use of concrete models and representations to make meaning, real world application and problem solving to aid in deeper understanding and connections, and visual vocabulary support. Foundational reading and math will occur outside of the instructional core. Instructional Interventionists will ensure students receive additional instruction based on student needs. Paraprofessionals will provide additional support in each classroom for students identified.

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.

PBIS

BEST Benchmarks and instructional materials orientation

Use of Illuminate for data

Common assessments - both formative and summative to frequently identify areas of need

Data based decision making and data chats with students and teachers

Collaborative planning supported by administration and coaches

Coaching/Feedback cycles

Kagan and other instructional engagement strategies identified within each benchmark/EE/MTR

Intervention teachers and paraprofessionals to support foundational instruction

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

continuation of PBIS - school-wide expectations identified, practiced and reinforced

BEST Benchmarks and instructional materials orientation will continue to deepen

Use of Illuminate for data

Common assessments - both formative and summative to frequently identify areas of need

Data based decision making and data chats with students and teachers to include families

Collaborative planning supported by administration and coaches

Coaching/Feedback cycles continue

Kagan and other instructional engagement strategies identified within each benchmark/EE/MTR

Intervention teachers and paraprofessionals to support foundational instruction

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

An identified barrier to student learning last year was behavior. 56% of behavior referrals were from African American students in the 21-22 school year. Post COVID, we realize that students are struggling to regulate their emotions and interact with peers and adults in positive, productive ways.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Reduce referrals for African America students by 15%.
Decrease by 10% the number of students who have attendance below 90%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of discipline, suspension, and attendance data in weekly leadership meetings, monthly PBIS meetings, and faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Implementation of a schoolwide PBIS system that includes schoolwide morning meetings using a common language around social emotional learning, recognition of desired pro-social behaviors, and training in Tier II and III behavior interventions. To increase attendance, the addition of a family school liaison will ensure that we support families in need and provide resources to ensure that students have what they need to attend school every day and on time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Building a positive school culture and learning community is at the heart of making a school campus feel safe for all students. As a result, students will be more eager to come to school and less likely to cause classroom disturbances when their socio-emotional needs are met. Through training and common language, teachers and students will be empowered to solve problems effectively and without choices that result in negative consequences such as suspension.

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.

Train teachers in how to use SEL curriculum throughout morning meetings and monitor fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible Jazzlyn Harrell (harrelljm@gm.sbac.edu)

Provide Tier 1 PBIS training for schoolwide implementation

Person Responsible Isabel Carter (carterig@gm.sbac.edu)

Plan and implement schoolwide PBIS incentives and events. Support teachers with tier II and tier III interventions.

Person Responsible Amelia Hall (hallae@sbac.edu)

Increase support to families via resources and accountability by adding a family school liaison to our staff.

Person Responsible Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

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

Based on 21-22 FSA data, our greatest need for improvement centers around tier 1 instruction for ELA, Math and Science. Overall levels dropped steadily 47 (18/19) to 43 (20/21) to 38 (21/22).

In addition, SWD and AA students are significantly less likely to be proficient than their peers. Males also show a deficit compared with females.

In order to achieve a school grade of C all areas must achieve an average of 41% during the 21-22 school year.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

The percent of students scoring at or above proficiency In ELA/Math/Science will average 41% or higher.

All ESSA Subgroups will achieve a score of 41% or higher on the ESSA Federal index.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walk-throughs, FAST PM data, DIBELS assessments, ISIP, and common unit assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Provide benchmark-aligned instruction to all students. Implement a differentiated approach to instruction in all content areas that accelerates learning for those students who may need additional intervention support and challenges students who exceed the grade level expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

All students require high quality Tier 1 instruction directly aligned to BEST standards and Science Florida Standards. With new standards and new curriculum in both ELA and Math, it is important for teachers to understand the depth of the new standards and how the core instructional materials align to them. Additionally, leveraging support staff to provide high quality intervention will ensure that all students grow significantly in reading and math fluency.

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.

Implement collaborative planning cycles for grade level teams using backwards planning protocols as well as student assessment data.

Person Responsible Dana Rudzitis (rudzitisdl@gm.sbac.edu)

Train teachers in BEST standards and high-yield instructional practices. High-yield instructional practices we will be focusing on this school year include cooperative learning structures, engagement strategies, planning using the MTSS process to allow for differentiation for all learners, student use of technology in the content areas, Gradual Release Model, and CRA model for math and vocabulary instruction. Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional coaching cycles focused on application of high-yield instructional practices with district content area coaches and beginning teacher coaches.

Person Responsible Isabel Carter (carterig@gm.sbac.edu)

Leverage support staff to provide explicit reading instruction to intervention groups in addition to the core instruction received during ELA block.

Person Responsible Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

Implement standards-aligned Science labs across grade levels to deepen understanding and provide needed background knowledge of Science content.

Person Responsible Isabel Carter (carterig@gm.sbac.edu)

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

NA

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

For the 21-22 school year, FSA ELA performance reflected the following:

63% of 3rd graders scored below a level three on the 2022 FSA ELA

63% of 4th graders scored below a level three on the 2022 FSA ELA

67% of 5th graders scored below a level three on the 2022 FSA ELA

In addition, 39% of incoming 3rd graders for 22-23 school year scored in the overall high risk designation

on the DIBELs beginning of the year assessment.

Areas of focus related to Reading/ELA instructional practice for grades 3-5 includes the following:

3rd Grade - Professional learning for teachers on the Science of Reading and implementation of UFLI Foundations whole group and UFLI intervention for students who scored high risk on the beginning of the year DIBELs assessment. Hiring two Title One intervention teachers to provide small group intervention. Upon review of DIBELs data for incoming 3rd graders, it was determined that students have foundational reading gaps and would benefit from tier one explicit reading instruction as well as supplemental intervention support for those who scored in the high risk and at risk DIBELs level.

4th & 5th Grade - Professional learning for teachers on new BEST ELA Standards via our assigned SRLD, implementation of coaching cycles focused on standards aligned instruction/tasks with support from our district literacy specialist, collaborative grade level lesson planning (data-driven instructional decision making), and hiring two Title One intervention teachers to provide small group intervention. Upon review of 21-22 FSA ELA data, we determined the need for consistent professional learning including coaching support to deepen teacher understanding of how to execute standards-aligned lessons and tasks. Additionally, with a fairly new staff, we believe teachers would benefit from a more guided approach to collaborative lesson planning that includes data chats to drive instructional decisions.

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 21-22, 63% of 3rd graders, 63% of 4th graders, and 67% of 5th graders scored below a level three on FSA ELA. For the 22-23 FSA ELA, we will increase the percentage of students in grade 3-5 who score a level 3 and above by the following:

3rd grade - 13 percentage points (50%)

4th grade - 4 percentage points (41%)

5th grade - 8 percentage points (41%)

Monitoring:

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

We will use the following assessments to monitor progress toward our school's ELA/Reading areas of focus: District Common Assessments for ELA, DIBELs progress monitoring 3-5, FAST progress monitoring 3-5

We will also evaluate fidelity of implementation of UFLI and intervention support via classroom walkthroughs, formative assessment data, and intervention logs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Burton, Holly, burtonha@gm.sbac.edu

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?

We will utilize the district adopted core curriculum - Benchmark Advanced for tier one ELA instruction. For small group intervention, we will utilize UFLI Intervention, SIPPs, and IRLA Intervention Toolkits. These programs and instructional approaches align to the BEST ELA standards and the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based reading plan. Systematic, explicit reading instruction is an evidence-based practice evident in UFLI foundations and intervention.

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?

UFLI Foundations and Intervention support address the need for supplemental small group instruction for students who have foundational reading gaps. In 21-22, Alachua county K-2 classrooms provided UFLI Foundations whole group. Our plan to continue this instructional practice into 3rd grade as well as add additional intervention support personnel will help us close achievement gaps in literacy.

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
Provide initial professional learning on BEST Standards (SRLD); more extensive PD weekly during collaborative PD process. UFLI intervention/foundations PD - ongoing job embedded throughout the school year (District UFLI Coach and team at UF)	Carter, Isabel, carterig@gm.sbac.edu
Utilize state and district literacy support to implement coaching cycles around literacy instructional practices. Coaching cycles will provide feedback and support on PD re: high-yield instructional practices (cooperative learning structures, engagement strategies, planning using the MTSS process to allow for differentiation for all learners, student use of technology in the content areas, Gradual Release Model, and CRA model for math and vocabulary instruction).	Burton, Holly, burtonha@gm.sbac.edu
Implement collaborative ELA lesson planning in grades 3-5- Train teachers in BEST standards and high-yield instructional practices. High-yield instructional practices we will be focusing on this school year include cooperative learning structures, engagement strategies, planning using the MTSS process to allow for differentiation for all learners, student use of technology in the content areas, Gradual Release Model, and CRA model for math and vocabulary instruction. Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional coaching cycles focused on application of high-yield instructional practices with district content area coaches and beginning teacher coaches.	Carter, Isabel, carterig@gm.sbac.edu
Increase opportunities for students to receive small group reading intervention- UFLI intervention/foundations PD - ongoing job embedded throughout the school year (District UFLI Coach and team at UF)	Burton, Holly, burtonha@gm.sbac.edu

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.

School leaders cultivate a positive culture and environment for all stakeholders. Various stakeholders are invited to participate in the planning process for Alachua Elementary. Our SAC committee meets four times each year to discuss needs for students and teachers. During SAC meetings, the committee gives input regarding budgetary needs and votes on monetary expenses that are requested by the principal. Our PTA was established in 2020-21 in order to build a stronger relationship between teachers and parents.

School leaders meet with the PTA to discuss and develop activities and events that foster a home/school connection. Our goal is to involve parents in our school culture to allow for feedback regarding concerns and/or aspirations for their child(ren)'s education.

School leaders also build relationships with community stakeholders by attending local city meetings which review the infrastructure and development of the City of Alachua. Discussions also include how the city commission can assist the school by adding programs within the community that will impact student achievement and success.

School leaders reinforce a positive school culture among teachers, students, and staff members through the use of various strategies. Teachers are given opportunities to join in on the decision making process regarding instructional pacing, and school activities. Students are celebrated weekly on the morning announcements to highlight their positive character trait of the week. Students also participate in monthly PBIS events to help cultivate a positive environment. The leadership team all participate in hosting the activities. School leaders also give "shout outs" to faculty and staff who go above and beyond the call of duty in the weekly memo.

School leaders attend professional development sessions that focus on student equity, race relations, and a plethora of other best practices that allow for growth as an educator with a focus on student success.

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

Leadership Team - Oversee all facets of school culture and environment including the implementation of monitoring of school-wide PBIS program.

PTA - Parent Teacher group who works to build relationship between parents and school.

SAC - School Advisory Council that serves as advisory board and sounding board to the principal. Provides input and feedback on all matters related to school and school improvement.

Team Leaders - Serve a representative body of the faculty.