Alachua County Public Schools

Archer Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Archer Elementary

14533 SW 170TH ST, Archer, FL 32618

https://www.sbac.edu/archer

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Hartwell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2022

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)	94%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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

Archer Elementary

14533 SW 170TH ST, Archer, FL 32618

https://www.sbac.edu/archer

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	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

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 Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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 mission of Archer Elementary School is to establish an educational setting where students have an opportunity to develop into well-rounded individuals. Through strong academics and a focus on the whole student, we strongly believe every child can reach their potential. Archer Elementary will provide each student with the necessary skills to become life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Archer Elementary School is to have every student:
Develop leadership qualities to help them in life.
Build a strong academic foundation in the areas of language arts, math, science, and writing.
Be compassionate and caring of others.
Develop an understanding of community and relationships.

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
Hartwell, Libby	Principal	
Williamson, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Leibach, Tracy	School Counselor	
Hyde, Mary Ferris	Instructional Coach	
Whiddon , Daniel	Behavior Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/26/2022, Elizabeth Hartwell

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
24

Total number of students enrolled at the school
457

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	48	71	65	97	78	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	20	17	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	4	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/20/2022

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	64	65	80	81	84	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	6	6	18	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	12	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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	64	65	80	81	84	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	6	6	18	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	12	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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	56%	53%	56%				62%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						54%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						24%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	40%	50%				61%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						62%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						41%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	54%	59%				70%	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	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	62%	55%	7%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	67%	55%	12%	53%	14%
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	29	40	36	19	20	15	23				
BLK	23	50	52	19	36	32	18				
HSP	66	70		62	58		58				
MUL	67			55							
WHT	64	58	38	64	51	20	57				
FRL	40	49	46	40	35	25	33				

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	11			18							
BLK	38	50		35	50		29				
HSP	64	54		64	54		64				
MUL	67			52							
WHT	66	41	33	75	48		58				
FRL	39	32	29	40	33	27	26				

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	12	21	18	26	53	53	8				
ASN	90			80							
BLK	40	40	17	32	50	45	35				
HSP	68	56		65	63						
MUL	58	64		63	64						
WHT	70	60	27	72	65	36	87				
FRL	39	44	31	42	53	38	43				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	

English Language Learners	
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
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	61
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	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

The achievement levels for ELA, Math and Science have declined. ELA went from 61% to 56%, Math went from 63% to 55% and science 53% to 50%.

When comparing achievement levels of third grade ELA scores there has been an overall decline in students being ready for third. In 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2020-21 the ELA achievement score for third graders was either 59% or 60%. In 2021-22 the score dropped to 47%. This most likely is contributed to the lose of instruction in primary grades during COVID.

All areas of learning gains showed an increase. ELA learning Gains and lowest 25th percentile showed the most significant increases by 9% and 15% respectively. Math overall gains went from 48% to 50%. The lowest quartile was 22% and increased to 27%.

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

Based off of our progress monitoring and 2021 state assessments, the greatest need for improvement is in our learning gains for our students in the lowest 25th percentile in Math.

However, the decline in overall achievement in ELA, Math and science is also an area of focus due to the downward trend.

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 major contributing factor are the gaps created in student learning during the COVID pandemic due to virtual learning. We have increased student attendance monitoring to ensure students are here everyday and are offering rigorous instruction across all grade levels. Our MTSS team also meets bi-monthly to discuss students who may need additional intervention to reduce the gaps.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2021 state assessments, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25 percentile showed the most improvement, increasing by 9 percentage points, from 33% in 2021 to 48% in 2022.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement included more targeted intervention facilitated by teachers and interventionist in small group ELA instruction.

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

Strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning are: grade level data chats; reteaching standards; intervention groups using SIPPS, Great Leaps, and Istation remediation lessons; UFLI curriculum in all K-2nd grade classrooms; increase support for 5th grade with the addition of a class size reduction teacher.

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.

UFLI: Professional Development Specialists and Instructional Intervention Coaches will be attending weekly sessions with the UFLI implementation team via Zoom, Thursdays from 9-11.

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

UFLI Foundations - This program provides our teachers and students with a resource that puts into practice years of research from the body of knowledge known as the Science of Reading. Not only that, this program is being continually updated based on the feedback from our teachers, so that ongoing refinement will make a program with proven success even better.
Small Group Intervention - Intervention groups will be determined based on beginning of the year ISIP scores. K-2nd grade intervention groups will utilize SIPPS, 3rd-5th grade groups will utilize SIPPS, UFLI and/or remediation lessons.
Progress monitoring for all groups will be performed monthly with Istation ISIPs as well as the three FAST assessments.

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.	Last year 56% of students were proficient in ELA. In the lowest quartile 48% of students made a learning gain and 59% of all student made a learning gain.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	On the 3rd FAST ELA test, 65% of all students will be proficient. All subgroups including African Americans and students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency levels above 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	ELA proficiency will be monitored using the FAST PM1 and PM2. Additionally monthly ISIP's and oral fluency assessments will be used to help determine student progress and the need for intervention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students in K-2 will receive UFLI instruction for phonics. Students who are identified as struggling with phonics will receive additional instruction through a Title I intervention teacher for an extra 30 minutes of phonics in small group. Students in third through fifth grade who are identified as struggling readers are screened and placed accordingly in SIPPS. Also all students have access to Accelerated Reader.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	COVID impacted the phonics instruction of students in K-2 creating a deficit in students who are performing on grade level. We are focused on early intervention to fill in the gaps created through the loss of instruction in phonics.
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.	
UFLI training for K-2 teachers	
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)
ISIP and fluency assessment progress monitoring	
Person Responsible	Mary Ferris Hyde (hydemd@gm.sbac.edu)

SIPPS training for Intervention Instructors

Person Responsible Mary Ferris Hyde (hydemd@gm.sbac.edu)

Monitor Fidelity of Interventions

Person Responsible Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu)

Accelerated Setup, training and incentives

Person Responsible Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

#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.**	Last year 55% of students were proficient in Math. In the lowest quartile, 27% of students made a learning gain and 50% of all students made a learning gain.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On the 3rd FAST test, 65% of students will be proficient in Math. All subgroups including African Americans and students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency levels above 41%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Math proficiency will be monitored using the FAST PM1 and PM2. Additionally chapter tests from Go Math will be discussed in monthly data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Reflex math will be used to increase fact fluency in multiplication/ division 3-5 and in addition/subtraction in 1st and 2nd grade. School wide, "What's My Place, What's My Value" will be used to develop a stronger number sense.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Students are struggling in fact fluency creating a barrier for more complicated multi-step problems. Number sense is an area of weakness throughout the school, K-5.

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 how to use reflex, set up classrooms, and assign tasks

Person Responsible Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

Order materials for "What's My Place, What's My Value"

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Train teachers, "What's My Place, What's My Value"

Person Responsible Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

Monitor implementation of Reflex and "What's My Place, What's My Value"

Person Responsible Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Last year, 50% of students were proficient in science
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On 5th grade FAST assessment in Spring of 2023 65% of students will be proficient. All subgroups including African Americans and students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency levels above 41%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The district wide AIMS assessments will be used to monitor the progress three times a year in third through fifth grade. Student in 5th grade will also use FCIM mini lesson assessments to
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	In 5th grade teachers are using science mini lessons for each standard. Students are provided key vocabulary and central ideas. Each lesson provides multiple summarizing opportunities and questions. All 5th grade students will have access to our science lab and science lab teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Students need additional practice with science vocabulary and questions related to science mastery

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.

Planning the dates for each lesson and scheduling opportunities for all 5th grade students to use the lab	
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Collaborative planning monthly for each lesson and science lab use	
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Monitoring implementation of FCIM lesson	
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@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

K-2 teachers use UFLI for phonics instruction daily - all students receive 30 minutes of phonics instruction.
Intervention teacher specifically for K-2 using UFLI - working to increase phonics

In K-2, we are working on building fluent readers. We recognize that students need explicit phonics instruction to become fluent readers. Teachers also practice grade level sight words. Biweekly students are assessed on the number of words read per minute.

On FSA assessment in 2022, 47% of students scored on grade level. We are working to build basic phonics and also fluency prior to entry into third grade.

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

In 3-5 teachers use Benchmark materials to teach during the reading block. Students who are identified as struggling readers receive intervention using SIPPS materials. SIPPS provides instruction in phonics, fluency and comprehension. Students were screened and grouped based on ability.

On FSA assessment in 2022, 47% of students scored on grade level. We are working to build basic phonics and also fluency prior to entry into third grade.

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)

On the 3rd FAST test, 65% of students will be proficient in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the 3rd FAST test, 65% of students will be proficient in ELA.

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

ELA proficiency will be monitored using the FAST PM1 and PM2. Additionally monthly ISIP's and oral fluency assessments will be used to help determine student progress and the need for intervention.

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

Williamson, Elizabeth , williaea@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?

Students K-2 will receive UFLI instruction for phonics. Students who are identified as struggling with phonics will receive additional instruction through a Title I intervention teacher for an extra 30 minutes of phonics in small group. Students in third through fifth grade who are identified as struggling readers are screened and placed accordingly in SIPPS. Also all students have access to Accelerated Reader.

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?

COVID impacted the phonics instruction of students in K-2 creating a deficit in students who are performing on grade level. We are focused on early intervention to fill in the gaps created through the loss of instruction in phonics.

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
Anaylze data and place students in remediation groups	Williamson, Elizabeth , williaea@gm.sbac.edu
Train teachers in UFLI instruction	Hyde, Mary Ferris, hydemd@gm.sbac.edu
Monitor implementation of UFLI Tier 1 instruction and in remediation groups.	Hartwell, Libby, hartwelles@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.

Archer Elementary uses the Ron Clark Academy model. Every student, faculty and staff member at Archer Elementary is assigned to one of four houses: Altriusmo, Amistad, Reveur or Isbindi. Students are able to earn points for their houses in a variety of ways. Some are academic like mastery of math facts or AR points and others are behavioral. At the end of the week, the house with the most points has their flag raised on the house flag pole. Students also participate in events schoolwide for their house and wear their house colors on Wednesdays.

We are a PBIS school. Students are able to earn "Archer bucks" for displaying positive behavior expectations. Using the Archer bucks students are able to purchase items in a school store or pay to participate in school wide events. Teachers also have classroom stores where students are able to purchase items.

Our school counselor works with every grade level on specific age appropriate lessons. She coordinates with the media specialist during "Start with Hello" week. Students in every class create an affirmation leaf and post on the wall next to our art and music rooms. We also installed a "buddy bench" on the playground

and students were explicitly taught how to use it.

Once a month, our PTA and family liason coordinate a lunch, breakfast or snack area for teachers. There are also birthday cards and treats for faculty and staff.

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

Mrs. Hyde and Mrs. Thompson are the leaders on the Ron Clark committee. They coordinated our beginning of the year wheel spin where students were assigned houses. They also monitor our house points system. Mrs. Thompson plays the video on the morning announcements for the weekly flag raising.

Mr. Whiddon and Mrs. Acosta organize and manage donations for the school store and plan our school wide events. Mr. Whiddon reviews behavioral data with our team leaders monthly and presents professional development.

Dr. Leibach organizes "Start with Hello" week. She also teaches classroom guidance lessons for every grade throughout the year.

Mrs. Hyden works with PTA and other community members to coordinate donations for Food 4 Kids, staff and student incentives.