

Alachua County Public Schools

Joseph Williams 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Joseph Williams Elementary School

1245 SE 7TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

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

Demographics

Principal: Anyana Stokes

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (44%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Joseph Williams Elementary School

1245 SE 7TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

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

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 KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

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

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.

We are committed to the success of every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.:

At Williams, our students are loved, believed in, and challenged to be creative risk-takers who are prepared for future success.

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
Stokes, Anyana	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of databased decision-making; Provide opportunities for teacher collaboration and knowledge building; Facilitate implementation of RTI; Provides or coordinates professional development; Attend EPT, IEP, 504 and RTI meetings; Conduct walkthroughs to monitor fidelity and integrity of core curriculum and intervention implementation; Monitor teacher effectiveness; Communicates with all shareholders information regarding school data and student achievement progress: Provides a common vision for student relationship building and behavior management
Roberson, Jenni	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional support and coordinate professional development/coaching support for instructors; Coordinate school wide assessments, conduct walk-throughs to monitor implementation of SIP strategies, monitors behavior intervention, monitors student achievement through analyzing school-wide data, assist with the development of intervention and differentiated instruction; Attend EPT, IEP, 504 and RTI meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Anyana Stokes

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

470

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

9

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

9

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	53	68	76	93	89	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	3	25	17	29	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	6	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	1	8	8	15	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	1	6	4	14	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	26	14	35	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	19	11	30	28	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	1	1	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	21	48	85	111	92	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	27	33	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	12	7	17	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	7	6	16	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	41	56	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	3	8	18	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	21	48	85	111	92	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	27	33	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	12	7	17	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	7	6	16	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	41	56	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	3	8	18	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	45%	53%	56%				42%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						42%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						22%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	40%	50%				41%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%						42%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						22%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	54%	59%				42%	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	35%	57%	-22%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	55%	-15%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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	31%	58%	-27%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	53%	-12%
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	15	32	33	13	25	23	13				
ASN	100	88		100	100		100				
BLK	18	48	51	16	40	45	11				
HSP	100			100							
MUL	60	67		50	61						
WHT	91	88		100	88		100				
FRL	17	47	48	16	43	43	9				
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	16	15		13	27		10				
ASN	98	79		100	93		100				
BLK	16	20	29	14	31	33	7				
MUL	55			50							
WHT	97			97							
FRL	17	22	25	14	32	29	11				
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	17	30	31	21	47	42					
ASN	100	92		100	97		100				
BLK	17	22	23	15	20	21	12				
HSP	60			60							
MUL	43	18		54	40						
WHT	100	75		100	75						
FRL	17	24	22	16	22	24	16				

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	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	98
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	100
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	93
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	32
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 showed improvement in all measurable areas on the 2022 FSA. The greatest schoolwide improvement was in ELA Learning Gains (28%) followed by improvement in ELA Learning gains of the lowest quartile (20%). The lowest rate of improvement was in Math Learning gains of the lowest quartile (9%). 4th grade students scored at the highest rates across all areas. Students with disabilities, African American students, and Economically disadvantaged students continue to score significantly below other subgroups within the school.

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

Greatest need for improvement is in 3rd grade ELA Achievement based on district AIMS progress monitoring, Istation monthly monitoring and state assessments. Overall student achievement in both ELA and Math also continue to be an area for improvement. Less than 1/2 of students are demonstrating proficiency.

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

Students enter KG at a deficit and are are working from the time they enter school to catch up. Student's lack of background knowledge and gaps in foundational skills needed to be successful readers. Emphasis on foundational reading skills in K - 2nd grade has to be intentionally addressed in order to fill the gaps quicker. Implementation of UFLI foundations in K - 2nd grade and focus on new state adopted B.E.S.T standards, will help to address these factors. As well as greater access to technology and opportunities to build background knowledge.

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

Based on progress monitoring data (AIMS) and FSA 4th grade students seemed to demonstrate the most improvement in overall proficiency and learning gains. Improvement was demonstrated in all measurable components of the FSA. Most significantly improvement in Learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA.

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

Improvement of instructional systems, such as collaborative planning and instructional coach support. 4th grade benefitted from small class sizes, average 15 students. We feel that the departmentalization of 5th grade also contributed to improved performance.

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

Building foundational skills acquisition in K - 2nd grades. We must continue to build teacher capacity and efficacy. Continue to expose students to grade level standards and rigorous curriculum. Provide engaging opportunities to build background knowledge.

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.

Professional development will be provided to address UFLI Foundations Implementation, teacher use of technology to support student engagement, small group instruction, and release of learning.

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

Support for teachers in adoption of new BEST standards and new math curriculum. Continue school-wide collaborative planning support. Increase instructional support across subject areas and grade levels.

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.

Improve achievement of all students as well as improve the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. We must engage students in their education and provide opportunities to strengthen background knowledge. Many of our lower quartile students are performing 2 or more grade levels behind. We must provide targeted intervention and support of foundation skills while also providing access and success on grade level tasks for students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase learning gains of lowest quartile by 10%.
Increase achievement of all under-performing subgroups in ELA by 3%
Raising all ESSA groups to 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.

Grade Level common assessments.
Quarterly grade level teacher data chats led by administrators and instructional coaches

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anyana Stokes (stokesay@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Early identification of students in lowest quartile and under performing subgroups. Progress Monitoring through quarterly data meetings with teachers led by administrators. Increase student's background knowledge. Provide Extended day, beyond the bell learning opportunities. Support for and increase teacher planning opportunities and professional development in standards based and aligned instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teacher identification of students and continual monitoring of student progress and assist with selecting appropriate strategies and interventions.
We know that acquiring usable knowledge will support student acquisition of and provide links to new learning.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Weekly grade level collaborative Instructional Planning. 1 1/2 hours per week focused on standards and standards task alignment.
2. Quarterly teacher and student data chats.
3. UFLI Foundations, Small group instruction and literacy stations within ELA, High dose tutoring to support ELA Foundational Skills
4. Increase student access to extended learning opportunities. (Field trips, Extended Day Intervention)
5. Teacher PD and PLCs (B.E.S.T. Standards, Student Engagement, Release of Learning, Differentiation)

Person Responsible

Jenni Roberson (robersonjc@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.

Increase achievement for all students and learning gains of lowest quartile in Math. FSA scores from the 2019 school year show a trend of low performance and learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in math. We must engage students in their education and provide opportunities to see math in real world application. Many of our lower quartile students are performing 2 or more grade levels behind. We know that math builds upon itself. We must provide remediation of foundational math skills while also providing access and success on grade level tasks. The same is true for students with disabilities, AfricanAmerican students, economically disadvantaged students, and multiracial students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase learning gains of students in the lowest quartile by 10%.
Increase achievement of all under-performing subgroups in Math by 3%.
Raising all ESSA groups to 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.

Monthly grade level common assessments.
Quarterly grade level data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anyana Stokes (stokesay@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Early identification of students in lowest quartile and under performing subgroups. Progress Monitoring through quarterly data meetings with teachers facilitated by administration. Increase awareness of career and real world application of skills/strategies. Increase access to technology as a tool for learning. Support for and increase teacher planning opportunities and professional development to improve student access to standards based and aligned instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teacher identification of students and continual monitoring of student progress and assist with selecting appropriate strategies and interventions. We know that acquiring usable knowledge will support student acquisition of and provide links to new learning.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Weekly grade level collaborative Instructional Planning; 1 1/2 hours per week focused on standards and standards task alignment.
2. Quarterly teacher data chats facilitated by administrator.
3. Small group instruction within Math
5. Teacher PLCs (B.E.S.T. Standards, Student Engagement, Differentiation, Release of Learning)

Person Responsible

Jenni Roberson
(robersonjc@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

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

A review of attendance data led us to identify Improve student attendance as an area of focus. Twenty-four percent of Williams students had attendance below 90% (113 students). It is important for students to be in attendance at school in order to receive the full advantage of educational opportunities. We must engage students in a way that they are eager to attend and willing participants in school, in their education.

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

Monthly monitoring of Skyward Truancy Reports. Monthly target 90% of students attendance above 90%. For the year, 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.

Monthly meetings with attendance team.
 Monthly analysis of attendance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anyana Stokes (stokesay@gm.sbac.edu)

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

Continued implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports. Professional Development and PLCs for teachers. Increase teacher capacity to engage students and manage classroom behaviors. Increase family engagement with and in the school through phone calls, home visits, newsletters, teacher communications.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Basis of PBIS is to reinforce desired student behaviors and create a positive school culture. Through PBIS we will establish a common language and a school-wide set of expectation. It will also allow us a systematic way in which to intervene and follow up. We also want to increase and improve beyond school enrichment opportunities (clubs, groups). Helping to build individual determination within our students.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Improve student engagement using Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports
2. Provide teacher PD and support in the area of students engagement.
3. Provide support for and improve family engagement through improved and increased communication.
4. Beyond school day enrichment, engagement through the establishment of clubs and activities.

Person Responsible

Anyana Stokes (stokesay@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

Improve foundational reading skills for K - 2nd grade students by provide explicit and systematic instruction that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading.

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

Improve overall ELA achievement of all students in grades 3 - 5. Currently only 45% of students demonstrate proficiency in ELA. As well as improve learning gains for students in the lowest quartile. Build upon foundational skills all the while providing students with rigorous grade level tasks and curriculum.

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)

Increase student achievement on progress monitoring assessments (F.A.S.T., DIBELS, and/or Istation) by 10% as demonstrated on end of year assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase student achievement on progress monitoring assessments (F.A.S.T., DIBELS, and/or Istation) by 10% as demonstrated on end of year assessments.

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.

Monthly analysis of common assessment data.

Quarterly analysis of Istation data.

Quarterly grade level meeting with teachers to analyze data and discuss student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stokes, Anyana, stokesay@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?

K - 2 UFLI Foundations, small group instruction,
3 - 5 Small group instruction, Literacy Stations

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 listed provide evidence of addressing the needs of our targeted population. UFLI Foundations implementation within our district last year yielded significant impact on student achievement. Small group instruction and literacy stations are also proven to yield significant impact on student achievement.

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
<p>UFLI Foundations Implementation:</p> <p>Leadership will be provided by our school based IIC/Title 1 Lead Teacher. She will frequently monitor implementation and provide teachers with feedback.</p> <p>Coaching will be provided by both the school based Lead Teacher and district provided Literacy Coach and UFLI Specialist.</p> <p>Assessment is embeded within program, will be frequent and ongoing.</p> <p>Professional Learning Opportunities will be provided at the school level, district level, UF Literacy Center.</p> <p>3 - 5 Small group instruction and literacy stations:</p> <p>Leadership will be provided by our school based instructional coach. She will frequently monitor implementation and provide teachers with feedback.</p> <p>Coaching will be provided by both the school based instructional coach and district provided Literacy Coach.</p> <p>Observation and assessment will be frequent and ongoing.</p> <p>Professional Learning Opportunities will be provided at the school and district levels.</p>	<p>Roberson, Jenni, robersonjc@gm.sbac.edu</p>

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.

Positive school culture includes a well-maintained school facility and school wide expectations for all members. Students and staff adhere to the expectations: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Kind. Students and teachers are held to high expectations of how we treat each other and the effort that we put forth. Students from all races are celebrated, valued, and welcomed. All students feel a sense of belonging and know that they are an important part of our school community. Our teachers are dedicated to culturally responsive and relevant instruction.

Members of the leadership team are easily accessible and dedicated to supporting students, staff, and families. Parents and community members are encouraged and welcome to participate on the School Advisory Committee and within the PTA. Principal attends community events by invitation and works to partner with local businesses and community organizations. We maintain an up to date website and providing a bi monthly newsletter. School events are posted on the marquee as well as phone home reminders. Parents and students are frequently surveyed to assess needs and provide input.

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

Stakeholders include school leadership, teachers, and staff. All of whom are responsible for projecting a positive image of the school by talking favorably, modeling positive behaviors, and positive attitudes towards the school. Families are stakeholders who by being active participants in the school community help to promote a positive culture. The school's PTA, community and business partners also support a positive school culture by providing needed resources and support of school initiatives.