

Leon County Schools

Bond Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Bond Elementary School

2204 SAXON ST, Tallahassee, FL 32310

<https://www.leonschools.net/bond>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Bond Elementary School is to provide learning opportunities that meet the unique needs of our students in a safe, nurturing environment to produce responsible citizens who respect all people.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Bond Elementary School is to provide a positive environment that will enhance students' academic performance utilizing evidence-based curricula and strategies. Bond Elementary will develop master teachers while providing pragmatic professional development that will ultimately lead to students and teachers taking accountability of their personal and professional growth.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jackson, Delshauna	Principal	The principal's role is to coordinate and align the leadership efforts and resources within the school to create a quality educational setting, and thereby, increase student achievement. She consistently reviews student data and provides the necessary resources to teachers to ensure student mastery.
Peterson, Ronald	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal reviews curricula for all content areas. The assistant principal is responsible for reviewing data on a weekly basis to ensure students are mastering the standards set forth in pacing guides. In addition, he will monitor and model instructional programs and strategies for teachers.
Williams, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
Harris, Yolanda	Teacher, K-12	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
Robinson, Shanterria	Teacher, K-12	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
Dantzler, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
Ford, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
Hogan, Dexter	Dean	The dean is responsible for monitoring and organizing attendance records, calling parents regarding disciplinary issues, circulating in high visible areas during school hours, and overseeing student arrival, departure, and monitoring the cafeteria during breakfast and lunch. Additionally, he helps coordinate safety and security efforts.
Williams , Ryan	Teacher, K-12	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
Sailor , Jasmine	Reading Coach	The instructional coach is responsible for making certain the core English Language Arts (ELA) program is implemented with fidelity. Also, she reviews data on a weekly basis to make sure all students' needs are being met. The instructional coach develops and provides inservice to all teachers.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

Walker, Myioishi	Teacher, ESE	The responsibilities of the grade level chairperson is to orient new teachers to the team, facilitate meetings, attend leadership meetings, provide minutes to the principal, and submit required documentation from the grade level team.
------------------	--------------	--

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Committee which includes all stakeholders will provide input regarding the School Improvement Plan at our school's initial meeting. Goals and action steps will be adjusted where needed based on all stakeholders feedback and/or suggestions that are relative to our school accelerating academically.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The goals and action steps outlined in the School Improvement Plan will be monitored via school, district, and state assessments. The leadership team, faculty, and staff will monitor growth made towards goals and revise where needed. Additional monitoring will occur for those areas in which we have the greatest achievement gap more regularly during our data and/or departmental meetings to ensure we are meeting the needs of those students. Monitoring the evidence of impact will be crucial to ensure adequate progress of identified goals is evident.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

<p>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)</p>
<p>School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	<p>2021-22: B 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: D</p>
<p>School Improvement Rating History</p>	
<p>DJJ Accountability Rating History</p>	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	23	59	37	30	40	35	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	3	13	14	18	18	0	0	0	66
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	30	32	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	24	20	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	17	20	0	0	0	40

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	12	10	3	1	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	15

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	26	45	41	47	32	28	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	2	4	6	8	15	19	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	25	28	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	20	18	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	0	7	10	9	0	0	0	27

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	4	3	11	22	20	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	13	10	14	8	0	0	0	0	55
Students retained two or more times	0	3	3	5	9	2	0	0	0	22

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	26	45	41	47	32	28	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	2	4	6	8	15	19	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	25	28	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	20	18	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	0	7	10	9	0	0	0	27

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	4	3	11	22	20	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	13	10	14	8	0	0	0	0	55
Students retained two or more times	0	3	3	5	9	2	0	0	0	22

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	54	53	40	57	56	26		
ELA Learning Gains				61			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			41		
Math Achievement*	71	56	59	59	47	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				79			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				80			71		
Science Achievement*	38	52	54	41	57	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	52	59	86			13		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	270
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT				
FRL	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	52			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	50			71			38					55
SWD	44			64			20				4	
ELL	27			73							3	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49			70			36				5	64
HSP	45			82							3	45

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	51			71			37				5	54

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	61	54	59	79	80	41					86
SWD	35	63	50	41	71	69	36					
ELL	40			60								86
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	61	56	58	79	82	39					
HSP	62			77								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39	60	52	59	77	77	39					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	26	42	41	40	51	71	31					13
SWD	17			39								
ELL	15			43								13
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	41	41	39	50	69	24					13
HSP	36			60								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	24	40	40	37	45	64	31					14

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	50%	-12%	51%	-13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science is the lowest data point at 37%. The contributing factors to low performance is the lack of foundational knowledge, attendance, behavior, and English Language Learners (ELLs). We will ensure students are receiving science instruction at every grade level to ensure they receive the prerequisite which are needed to master the concepts on the science assessment.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Science achievement decreased from 41% to 37%. The contributing factors to low performance is the lack of foundational knowledge, attendance, behavior, and English Language Learners (ELLs). We will ensure students are receiving science instruction at every grade level to ensure they receive the prerequisite which are needed to master the concepts on the science assessment. In addition, we will ensure our science teacher is given the opportunity to attend workshops to increase science capacity. In addition, our third and fourth grade students will participate in the district's interim assessment so that we can monitor growth as it relates to science instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Science had the greatest gap when compared to the state's average. Science achievement was 37% compared to the state's average of 51%. Students lack of foundational skills, attendance, behavior, and English Language Learners (ELL) impacted student achievement.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was math achievement in grades 3-5. Math achievement increased from 59% to 74%. Actions that attributed to improvement in this area is a schoolwide focus on the B1G-Ms and ensuring students were exposed to the instructional task items as well as instructional items on a daily basis. In addition, teachers were required to reference this document prior to teaching the new BEST mathematics standards. On the other hand, we supplemented our mathematics instruction with the new Acaletics program which is aligned to the new BEST standards in all grades levels. As a result, our students were exposed to multiple standards every day which allowed many opportunities to practice many problems.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on EWS data, two potential areas of concern are:

1. Attendance below 90%
2. Substantial Reading Deficiency

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

The highest priorities for our school this school year are as follows:

1. Improve science achievement;
2. Decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance rate;
3. Decrease the number of students scoring below the 40th percentile on Star Early Literacy, Star Reading, and FAST English Language Arts;
4. Maintain and/or increase FAST English Language (ELA) and mathematics achievement and;
5. Increase teachers' capacity in all core academic areas.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the 2022-2023 school year, 224 students did not have an attendance rate of 90% or higher. As a result of this percentage of students not attending school at a 90% or higher rate, academic achievement is impacted in all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bond Elementary School's total amount of students will decrease by 45% who are reported to have an unsatisfactory rate of attendance less than 90% for the school year.

Monitoring:

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

The dean and resource teacher will run reports daily to monitor students who are absent and tardy daily. The dean will be responsible for communicating with teachers the rosters of students who are approaching the required absences to begin the CSAP process. At this point, the teachers are responsible for implementing the district's attendance policy. The CSAP process will begin for documentation purposes at 5, 10, and 15 days. The attendance contracts will be employed for students who are in danger of being considered truant.

In addition, the social worker will assist with home visits where needed and offer resources to families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dexter Hogan (hogand@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Student attendance will be monitored and tracked and when the district's attendance policy has been violated, the CSAP process will be employed by the teachers for documentation purposes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The CSAP process is the attendance tracking mechanism utilized by the school district. Excessive absenteeism is associated with poor academic performance and measures must be taken in promoting and enforcing attendance as a means of improving student performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The dean and resource teacher will run reports daily to monitor students who are absent and tardy daily. The dean will be responsible for communicating with teachers the rosters of students who are approaching the required absences to begin the CSAP process.

Person Responsible: Dexter Hogan (hogand@leonschools.net)

By When: Daily

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

37% of fifth grade students scored at or above level 3 on the NGSS science assessment during the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of fifth grade students will score at or above level 3 on the NGSS science assessment during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly and interim assessments will be administered for progress monitoring purposes. Based on weekly and interim assessment data, interventions will be implemented via small groups. In addition, hands-on activities will be implemented weekly to provide students an opportunity to learn through experiences while acquiring new skills. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure standards-based instruction is implemented daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delshauna Jackson (jacksond5@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Progress monitoring will be implemented to determine students' mastery of the standards and the effectiveness of small groups, hands-on-activities, and standards-based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By utilizing these strategies to track students' progress, alignment of curriculum and the projection of the overall goal will be monitored effectively.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Interventions will be implemented via small groups based on students' weekly and interim assessments.

Person Responsible: Delshauna Jackson (jacksond5@leonschools.net)

By When: Daily

Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure standards-based instruction is occurring as well as hands-on activities daily.

Person Responsible: Delshauna Jackson (jacksond5@leonschools.net)

By When: Daily

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

38% of kindergarten students scored at the proficiency level on the spring Star Early Literacy assessment.

35% of first grade students scored at the proficiency level on the spring Star Early Literacy assessment.

40% of second grade students scored at the proficiency level on the Star Reading assessment.

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

39% of third grade students scored at or above level 3 on the FSA ELA assessment.

31% of fourth grade students scored at level 3 or above on the FSA ELA assessment.

41% of fifth grade students scored at level 3 or above on the FSA ELA assessment.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

55% of kindergarten students will score at or above level 3 on the statewide ELA assessment.

55% of first grade students will score at or above level 3 on the statewide ELA assessment.

55% of second grade students will score at or above level 3 on the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

55% of 3rd grade students will score at or above level 3 on the statewide ELA assessment.

55% of grade 4 students will score at or above level 3 on the statewide ELA assessment.

55% of grade 5 students will score at level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Students will be provided additional interventions in the area of ELA based on the baseline assessments administered at the beginning of the school term. The instructional coach and resource teachers will assist with small group instruction where needed.

The leadership team along with teachers will review students' weekly assessment data and monthly progress monitoring assessments to ensure fluid interventions, best instructional strategies, and curriculum alignment are occurring and aligned with all students progressing throughout the school year. Data chats will be held between teachers and students and goals will be established based on students' performance levels at various interims throughout the school year. Evidenced-based strategies will be implemented with all subgroups to ensure their individual needs are met.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jackson, Delshauna , jacksond5@leonschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

The SAAVAS literacy program will be utilized in grades K-5. This programs satisfies Florida's definition of an evidenced-based program. This program is clearly aligned to the new B.E.S.T. standards and parallels with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan. The SAAVAS program provides a balanced approach to teaching reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing using a collection of authentic texts and writing workshops.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The SAAVAS literacy program is embedded with varied resources to meet the needs of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III students. Due to many of our students lacking the foundational skills necessary to become proficient on the statewide ELA assessment, this program will address many areas of deficiencies such as phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to disaggregate reading data and analyze the effectiveness of schoolwide strategies to ensure we are progressing toward the desired outcomes. In addition, the Literacy Leadership team will develop and implement schoolwide initiatives as it relates to reading and provide professional development opportunities where needed.

Sailor , Jasmine ,
sailorj@leonschools.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No