Chester Shell Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
supportive environment
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chester Shell Elementary School

21633 SE 65TH AVE, Hawthorne, FL 32640

https://www.sbac.edu/shell

Demographics

Principal: Edward Haukland

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 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: D (40%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (41%)
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

Chester Shell Elementary School

21633 SE 65TH AVE, Hawthorne, FL 32640

https://www.sbac.edu/shell

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	49%

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.

The faculty and staff at Shell Elementary School are dedicated to providing a safe, positive, and enriching environment where each student is empowered and inspired to reach his or her full academic, social and leadership potential. Through a collaborative atmosphere, the faculty and staff of Shell Elementary will model the ideals of respect, diversity, cooperation, leadership and diligence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Shell Elementary School aims to cultivate a partnership where school, home, and the community support the well-rounded development of the children we serve. We will create challenging, diverse, and a differentiated learning environment with the aim of shaping our students into self-sufficient, confident, and responsible leaders.

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
Haukland, Edward	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.
Robinson, Kathleen	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.
Mitchell, Stacey	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, such as holidays. Serve as community liaison for our school to develop and maintain partnerships
Goans, Sabreena	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. Support implementation of high yield instructional practices via coaching

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bundrick, Sarah	Dean	Provide behavioral support in all classrooms. Provide professional development and support in the area of classroom management, behavioral interventions, restorative practices, and social emotional 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, Edward Haukland

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

345

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

10

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

10

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	49	44	53	63	60	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	2	28	27	33	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	3	18	15	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	1	4	13	12	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	27	16	24	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
	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	2	15	21	26	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	2	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	41	59	74	71	59	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	26	27	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	4	13	12	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	1	6	12	13	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	17	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	20	17	14	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	1	6	13	13	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	1	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	41	59	74	71	59	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	26	27	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	4	13	12	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	1	6	12	13	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	17	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	20	17	14	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	1	6	13	13	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	1	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	28%	53%	56%				44%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	56%	61%				51%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	43%	52%				69%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	55%	60%				40%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%	58%	64%				32%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	55%				38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	48%	51%				33%	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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	34%	55%	-21%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	21%	60%	-39%	64%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	55%	-21%	53%	-19%
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	14	46	62	22	37	27					
BLK	20	34		28	32	43	23				
HSP	45			64							
MUL	25			27							
WHT	31	52	67	38	38	36	28				
FRL	22	41	62	32	39	46	28				

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	8			5	6		6				
BLK	18	19		30	13						
MUL	20			9							
WHT	30	17		31	13		22				
FRL	23	20	18	28	11	8	15				
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	24	42	62	21	25	42					
BLK	28	45	67	17	6	8	17				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	47	48	67	49	38	60	39				
FRL	42	51	65	37	32	36	26				

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	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	281
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	26
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

Overall, students not performing on grade level in Math, ELA, and Science is the most important trend that we are aiming to address. This goes for all subject areas, including ESSA subgroups: African-American, Multi-Racial, and Students with Disabilities.

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

Students not performing on grade level will be addressed through small group interventions, High Dose Tutoring and ESE pullout interventions. All students during core instruction will receive grade level content and rigor.

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

The greatest factor is the number of students whose attendance fell below 90%. We will be implementing the "I'm Not Tardy Party" as well as tracking daily attendance and posting the previous day's tardy total on the school marquee. Principal will call families whose attendance and tardy occur regularly.

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

The Learning Gains of the Lowest 25 percent in Math and ELA.

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

Last year we implemented intentional intervention in fundamental reading skills across all grade levels. We utilized SIPPS, small group UFLI instruction (3rd grade only), and Heggerty Phonics instruction for grades 3-5. We also reduced the sizes of the 4th grade math classes by pulling out an advanced group that left an average of 12 student in each homeroom for math instruction, which allowed for more targeted small group instruction.

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

The Read Naturally program will also address accelerated readers because we have purchased levels 1.0-5.0 for all 3-5 classes. We are also implementing the accelerated 3rd grade math curriculum. In addition to this, core instruction will center around grade level content standards.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will receive instruction on the Coaching Cycle and then be assigned a peer to practice the coaching sequence. Teachers will also be provided PD on Standards Based Instruction, Student Engagement, and Higher Order Questioning. These three strategies will be implemented throughout the coaching sequence during the school year. School based leadership will provide support throughout the

process. In conjunction with Lesson Planning and Lesson Study, instructional practices will improve as a result of peer mentorships and targeted reflection. As a result of improved instructional practices students will be able to demonstrate grade level proficiency.

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

By implementing the Coaching Cycle, teachers will be personally involved in professional development and will take ownership/leadership of the 3 instructional strategies that will be practiced in the current year as well as feedback provided from administration district level coaches in areas of defined growth.

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 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.	In the 21-22 school year, 31% of our students scored on or above grade level in fundamental reading skills on the DIBELS assessment and only 28% of our students in grades 3-5 performed on or above grade level on the ELA FSA assessment. As the new state benchmarks include both fundamental reading skills and comprehension skills at all grade levels, we have determined we need to focus on standards-based planning, instruction, and learning in all curriculum areas, with an emphasis on reading.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We want to see the percentage of students who are scoring on grade level increase from 28% on last year's FSA to meet the district average of 52% on the final summative FAST assessment. We want to see the percentage of students scoring on grade level on the DIBELS assessment increase from 31% to the district average of 55%. Unit assessments in ELA and Math will also be included.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the success of this Area of Focus through this year's DIBELS assessments and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring in addition to weekly unit assessments in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We utilizing collaborative planning sessions to hone in on standards aligned instruction. Grade level supports will honor vertical alignment ensuring teaching and learning targets the expectations of that grade level. District coaches, school based leadership, and district SI support (Turnaround Principal) will attend lesson planning and conduct learning walks to observe planned instruction in order to provide feedback and identify trends in a continuous improvement cycle. Supports will include creating and utilizing lesson planning tools to support grade level instruction connected to the benchmarks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	While our FSA scores demonstrated gaps in our ELA standard knowledge in grades 3-5, on grade level instruction will be implemented with fidelity within all grade levels with rigor using district supported curriculum in EL, Math, and Science.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Collaborative planning sessions will take place bi-weekly with teachers and administration. Planning sessions will focus on grade level instruction and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible   Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will receive professional development training regarding the implementation of the Coaching Cycle. Once trained, teachers will work collaboratively to address individual needs for improving teaching and student achievement.

Person Responsible   Sabreena Goans (goanssl@gm.sbac.edu)

Support provided by District Principal Leader that will focus on the implementation of school-based priorities. Walkthrough and assessment data will be used to identify priorities and planning sessions will be implemented to address identified needs.

Person Responsible   Diane Leinenbach (leinenbachjp@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	In the 21-22 school year, 62% of our lowest quartile students showed gains on the ELA FSA, but only 28% of our students scored at or above grade level. On the Math FSA 43% of our lowest quartile students showed gains, but only 36% of our students scored at or above grade level. These numbers indicate that we are having some success with our lowest quartile from year to year, but they are still not performing on or above grade level. All of the ESSA subgroups at Shell Elementary are represented in the lowest quartile.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By providing additional learning opportunities and support for our lowest quartile students we expect to maintain our gains scores for these students at or above the levels from the previous school year, as well as increase the percentage of our lowest quartile students who achieve at or above grade level on reading and math by 10%. This will also result in increased performance in our ESSA subgroups.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the success of this Area of Focus through DIBELS and FAST assessments, unit assessments. Reflex Math will also be monitored.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sabreena Goans (goanssl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will use Title 1 Paras and Intervention Teachers to deliver targeted interventions to students, starting with those in the lowest quartile. Students will be reevaluated after each progress monitoring assessment and the groups and interventions will be adjusted accordingly. In addition, these students will also receive tier 1 grade level instruction. Collaborative planning will include strategies to support differentiation while maintaining grade level expectations. Targeted tutoring as an extension of the school day will also be implemented ensuring the needs of each subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	The students we are targeting with interventions are performing significantly below grade level, and have an academic history of low performance. We will use Title 1 approved intervention materials to fill in gaps in their knowledge base. As student performance approaches grade level standards, groups will be reevaluated using the Title 1 intervention process to continue to address student needs effectively.

resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Small group tutoring and intervention pullout scheduling will be organized to address student needs in accordance with progress monitoring. Student groups will be based on individual needs, using multiple data points (DIBELS, F.A.S.T., ISIP, Prior FSA results) monitored weekly by IIC and AP.

Person Responsible   Sabreena Goans (goanssl@gm.sbac.edu)

Attendance will be monitored and families contacted who are habitually tardy. The "I'm Not Tardy Party" will focus on the highest needs students and work to promote them attending school regularly.

Person Responsible   Edward Haukland (hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu)

Collaborative planning and professional development will include moderate to strong evidence based engagement strategies. These strategies will be based on content and grade level requirements according to the benchmarks and their clarifications.

Person Responsible   Edward Haukland (hauklaea@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

In the 21-22 school year, 31% of our students scored on or above grade level in fundamental reading skills on the DIBELS assessment. In Kindergarten, 70% of our students scored a level 1 on their end of the year composite score. In first grade, 37% of our students scored a level 1 on their end of the year composite score. In second grade, 43% of our students scored a level 1 on their end of the year composite score.

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

In the 21-22 school year, 28% of our students in grades 3-5 performed on or above grade level on the ELA FSA assessment. In third grade, 33% of our students scored a 3 or higher. In fourth grade, 29% of our students scored a 3 or higher. In fifth grade, 17% scored a 3 or higher.

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 kindergarten we have set a goal of 40% or more scoring above a level 1 on their end of the year composite score in DIBELS.
In first grade we have set a goal of 70% or more scoring above a level 1 on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.
In second grade we have set a goal of 67% or more scoring above a level 1 on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.
On grade level proficiency will be monitored through unit assessments and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In third grade, we have set a goal of meeting the district average of 50% of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the final summative assessment.
In fourth grade we have set a goal of meeting the district average of 58% of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the final summative assessment.
In fifth grade we have set a goal of meeting the district average of 51% of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the final summative assessment.

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 monitor our measurable outcomes through the DIBELS and FAST progress monitoring assessments, to be delivered three times this year (beginning, middle, and end). We will collecting data from unit assessments as well. Using teacher self assessments and walkthrough data, as well as identified instructional needs based on last year's data, the instructional leadership team will establish specific areas of focus for PD this year.

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

Robinson, Kathleen, robinsonkh@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. §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 be using the UFLI foundational reading program whole group for grades K-2 and as an intervention in grades 3-5. We will be using SIPPS as an intervention in high dose tutoring for grades 1-5. We will be using the Read Naturally Program to develop fluency for grades 1-5. These intervention processes will occur alongside tier 1 grade level instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

   ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The practices/programs we are putting in place will address the lack of fundamental reading skills in all of our grade levels. We used many of these programs last year and we had 62% of the students in our lowest quartile make learning gains in ELA, and 44% of our students over all make learning gains in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

   ◦ Literacy Leadership

   ◦ Literacy Coaching

   ◦ Assessment

   ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership - 1. - Meet at minimum one after each progress monitoring assessment window to evaluate the effectiveness of our literacy programs and practices. Literacy Coaching - 1. - Create a coaching plan to sort all teachers into a tiered level according to assessment data and walkthrough data in the area of literacy. 2. - The Instructional Leadership Team will meet monthly to determine the effectiveness of the coaching plans and evaluate teacher needs to be sure they are still in the correct coaching Tier. Assessment - 1. - Communicate the ELA benchmarks to be assessed on each of the three FAST progress monitoring assessments. 2. - Create a testing schedule that meets all student needs and allows for students to show their best work. 3. - Meet with teachers within a week to analyze the reading assessment data and create an instructional plan for remediation.	Haukland, Edward, hauklaea@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.

This year, we continued our PBIS/RP committee. Every grade level and team is represented on this committee to ensure that all stakeholder voices are heard. The purpose of this committee is to develop school wide behavior expectations as well as ideas for positive reinforcement and restorative practices. We continue to incorporate a protected Morning Meeting time for each grade level in the master schedule. We also partner with our SAC and Building Concerns committee to address any concerns that stakeholders may have about the school. Newsletters will be sent home weekly for families that outline events and opportunities at the school. Faculty newsletters will include "shout outs" for those deserving of recognition. We will also conduct an evening "Open House" in the first few weeks of school.
Attendance monitoring will include absences and tardies. Partnerships with families will be formed with the school liaison to help families who demonstrate the highest need. Targeted attendance plans will be created focused on improving attendance and/or tardies. Positive climate and reinforcement of attendance will occur to include the (I'm not) Tardy Party and the Atten"dance" celebration.

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

SAC Committee (community members, parents, teachers, ESP's, administrators) - the role of the SAC committee is to provide feedback on decisions made in regard to the school and approval for funding

associated with those decisions. A positive school culture and environment supported by the SAC will allow activities, rewards, and recognition for identified priorities with stakeholder input.

PBIS/RP Committee (representatives from grade levels, resource team, specials team, ESPs) - The role of this committee is to develop school wide behavior expectations as well as ideas for positive reinforcement.

Building Concerns Committee (ACEA union representatives, administrators) - The role of this committee is to provide feedback to administration when concerns arise that may impact school culture.