

Leon County Schools

Canopy Oaks 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Canopy Oaks Elementary School

3250 POINT VIEW DR, Tallahassee, FL 32303

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

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.

To provide a physically safe and emotionally healthy learning environment where all involved (children, staff, parents and community) experience success and believe that they are accepted and valued for the individuals they are and will become.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a continuously growing community of learners experiencing success while becoming conscientious and responsible members of society.

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
Mortham, Staci	Principal	Ms. Mortham is the instructional leader of the school. She tracks data, meets with students, staff, parents, and other stakeholders to discuss the data and the trajectory of the school. In addition, she is the lead in the communication to all stakeholders.
Berigan, Mandy	Reading Coach	Ms. Berigan assists teachers and the reading interventionists to collect and monitor the data and progress of our students in reading. She also works with administration to create and implement intervention groups and also teaches and models lessons for teachers.
Mischler, Paula	Assistant Principal	Ms. Mischler is an instructional leader at our school. She meets with teachers and some parents to ensure that the needs of all students are being met within the classroom.
Chandler, Cedric	School Counselor	Mr. Chandler works with teachers to help with interventions and moving the students through the MTSS process. He also assists with mental health evaluations on our campus.
Kantor, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Kantor is responsible for collecting data related to the Early Warning System and keeping the faculty updated monthly.
Leon, Angela	Math Coach	Ms. Leon is responsible for meeting with teachers to determine which students are in need of tier 3 math interventions. She assists teachers in providing tier 2 in the classroom and pulling out our tier 3 students.
McClurkin, Willie	School Counselor	Ms. McClurkin works with teachers to help with interventions and moving the students through the MTSS process. He also assists with mental health evaluations on our campus.

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.

At Canopy Oaks, the teachers are the first group of stakeholders to review the data and provide input for the school improvement plan. They talk as grade level teams and provide group input for each subgroup. The parents and community members are then provided the opportunity to review the draft of the school improvement plan. They are given the opportunity to review the data, the suggested goals, and send any additional suggestions through an open forum.

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 administration meets with each grade level once a month to track the progress monitoring of all students, but most specifically, those that are on our targeted student list. This data will then be shared at each SAC meeting by Ms. Mortham. As the year moves forward, changes will be made to our intervention groupings and to the plan if the current process is proving to be ineffective.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	16	20	13	8	6	11	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
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	1	23	36	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	34	0	0	0	36
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	0	4	8	0	0	0	12

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	6	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	12	23	21	11	20	22	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	5	13	3	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	13	5	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	21	30	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	34	27	0	0	0	63
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	

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	0	0	2	5	20	15	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	12	23	21	11	20	22	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	5	13	3	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	13	5	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	21	30	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	34	27	0	0	0	63
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	0

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	0	0	2	5	20	15	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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*	47	54	53	53	57	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				52			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			9		
Math Achievement*	40	56	59	45	47	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				31			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				24			14		
Science Achievement*	52	52	54	42	57	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		52	59						

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	201
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	28	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	2	2
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	35	Yes	2	

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	19	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	44			

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%
MUL	37	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	33	Yes	1	

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	47			40			52					
SWD	22			20			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			24			32				4	
HSP	40			35							2	
MUL	63			58							2	
PAC												
WHT	55			46			60				4	
FRL	32			30			29				4	

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	53	52	38	45	31	24	42					
SWD	18	34	24	16	18	14	10					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	33	41	32	25	23	24	24					
HSP	55	57		36	29							
MUL	56	50		33	8		40					
PAC												
WHT	63	57	50	57	38	24	54					
FRL	39	41	34	31	28	31	30					

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	58	37	9	51	31	14	67					
SWD	19			16	30							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	17	14	28	25	18	24					
HSP	59			41								
MUL	68			52								
PAC												
WHT	70	44		63	38		81					
FRL	47	37	10	36	31	10	60					

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	42%	55%	-13%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	57%	-4%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	19%	52%	-33%	55%	-36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	51%	0%

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.

At Canopy Oaks, our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup was our lowest performing group. There are many contributing factors to this. The first is that we are still recovering from COVID. Many of our SWD moved to virtual learning during the COVID pandemic. While this was not the best learning environment for our students, each family needed to make the decision that was best for their families. Unfortunately, this resulted in our students that were already behind in their academics, falling further behind, thus leaving the school with an even greater academic gap to close. Also, last year, we were missing an ESE teacher for part of the school year, leaving our remaining ESE teachers with a much larger load. While this is not ideal, unfortunately in the school setting this can sometimes happen and does cause a situation where class sizes are larger which in turn causes the data and performance level to drop.

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

At Canopy Oaks, our students in the Multi Racial subgroup was our greatest decline. While I cannot give the full explanation, we do know that many of these students came to Canopy Oaks as new students last year and they were significantly behind upon arrival. While they did make growth at Canopy last year, the gap remains between their proficiency level and the level needed to be considered on level.

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.

At Canopy Oaks, our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup was our group with the largest gap when compared to the state average. There are many contributing factors to this. The first is that we are still recovering from COVID. Many of our SWD moved to virtual learning during the COVID pandemic. While this was not the best learning environment for our students, each family needed to make the decision that was best for their families. Unfortunately, this resulted in our students that were already behind in their academics, falling further behind, thus leaving the school with an even greater academic gap to close. Also, last year, we were missing an ESE teacher for part of the school year, leaving our remaining ESE teachers with a much larger load. While this is not ideal, unfortunately in the school setting this can sometimes happen and does cause a situation where class sizes are larger which in turn causes the data and performance level to drop.

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

At Canopy Oaks, our science scores showed the biggest amount of growth. At Canopy, over the last 4 years, we have placed a much greater emphasis on making sure that science is taught at all levels. We purchased science textbooks and online materials for teachers at all grade levels to encourage teachers to use these as additional ways to teach reading. By ensuring that the background is laid in the primary grades, the students science knowledge is deeper than it was in years past, allowing our intermediate teachers to dive deeper into the content.

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

Our biggest concern is the low percentage of students that showed proficiency on the FAST last year in 4th and 5th grade.

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

Our highest priorities for the new school year are our students with disabilities, our economically disadvantaged students, and our 4th and 5th grade percentage of proficient students.

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 Teacher Attendance**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, our teacher attendance was lower than in the past years, at a low 86% average daily attendance. We know, from research, that the number one thing that can impact a student's learning is the teacher. When we have teachers that are not at school, for whatever the reason, our students can not learn to their full potential.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our teacher attendance will increase from 86% average daily attendance during the 2022-2023 school year to 92% in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The number of absences per teacher will be monitored daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Staci Mortham (morthams@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.)

Peter Dewitt explains that teachers that have an opportunity to collaborate and plan what happens in their school, feel valued and are more willing to put in the time needed to make students successful. Our teachers will be given one half day per semester to work with their colleagues for team strategizing and planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By allowing teachers planning time to collaborate with their colleagues and plan what needs to be done to best help each of their students learn, teachers will have more of a sense of ownership and want to come to work to implement their plan.

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.

All teachers, Pre-k through 5th grade will be given 1 half-day in September with their team to collaborate and plan for interventions and accelerations that our students need to be most successful.

Person Responsible: Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

By When: This will be implemented by September 30, 2023.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

Our students with disabilities subgroup only had a 19% proficiency rate based on the data from 2021-2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our students with disabilities subgroup will increase in proficiency from 19% as recorded during the 2021-2022 school year to 41% on the 2023-2024 FAST test.

Monitoring:

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

The ESE team and general education teachers will meet monthly with the literacy leadership team to examine and discuss the interventions that are in place and the students growth as a result of the interventions. If the response is not positive, the students interventions will be revisited and adjusted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Berigan (beriganm@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.)

We will be utilizing the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support format to monitor our students growth and response to interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we closely monitor our students response to current interventions frequently, we can adjust their services being received and increase them as necessary to allow our students the intensity of intervention needed to make growth.

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 Literacy leadership team will meet monthly with the ESE teachers and general education teachers to monitor the growth of our students with disabilities and the impact their interventions are having on our students.

Person Responsible: Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the last day of each month.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**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.

Our Multi-racial subgroup only had a 37% proficiency rate based on the data from 2021-2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our multi-racial subgroup will increase in proficiency from 37% as recorded during the 2021-2022 school year to 41% on the 2023-2024 FAST test.

Monitoring:

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

Teams will meet monthly to examine and discuss the interventions that are in place and the students growth as a result of the interventions. If the response is not positive, the students interventions will be revisited and adjusted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Berigan (beriganm@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.)

We will be utilizing the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support format to monitor our students growth and response to interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we closely monitor our students response to current interventions frequently, we can adjust their services being received and increase them as necessary to allow our students the intensity of intervention needed to make growth.

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 Literacy leadership team will meet monthly with the general education teachers to monitor the growth of our multi-racial students and the impact their interventions are having on our students.

Person Responsible: Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

By When: These will be completed by the last day of each month in the 2023-2024 school year.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**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.

Our economically disadvantaged subgroup only had a 33% proficiency rate based on the data from 2021-2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our economically disadvantaged subgroup will increase in proficiency from 33% as recorded during the 2021-2022 school year to 41% on the 2023-2024 FAST test.

Monitoring:

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

Teams will meet monthly to examine and discuss the interventions that are in place and the students growth as a result of the interventions. If the response is not positive, the students interventions will be revisited and adjusted.

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.)

We will be utilizing the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support format to monitor our students growth and response to interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we closely monitor our students response to current interventions frequently, we can adjust their services being received and increase them as necessary to allow our students the intensity of intervention needed to make growth.

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 Literacy leadership team will meet monthly with the general education teachers to monitor the growth of our economically disadvantaged students and the impact their interventions are having on our students.

Person Responsible: Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the last day of each month.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The literacy leadership team will meet with the SITE committee to ensure that the funding is made available to allow for teachers to have a half day substitute in each semester to allow teachers to collaborate and plan for their students that are receiving interventions as well as accelerations. In addition, as additional funding is available, the team will determine which students require additional intensive intervention in an afterschool tutoring group.

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

Students are instructed using the Florida standards released by the Department of Education. Teachers utilize the district approved curriculum to teach the standards and complete progress monitoring to track growth of students. In addition, our teachers utilize the Early Reading Interventions (EIR) program as well as Reading Mastery to break down the skills needed to increase reading fluency which leads to an increase in reading comprehension.

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

Students are instructed using the Florida standards released by the Department of Education. Teachers utilize the district approved curriculum to teach the standards and complete progress monitoring to track growth of students.

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

In Kindergarten and 1st grade, 65% of our students showed that they would have scored the equivalent of a level 3 or above as demonstrated on the PM 3 STAR Early Literacy assessment in May 2023. Our goal is that 72% of our kindergarten and first grade students will score the equivalent of a level 3 or above on the 2023-2024 PM 3 STAR Early Literacy assessment.

In 2nd grade, 61.7% of our students showed that they would have scored the equivalent of a level 3 or above as demonstrated on the PM 3 STAR assessment in May 2023. Our goal is that 72% of our 2nd grade students will score the equivalent of a level 3 or above on the 2023-2024 PM 3 STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 3rd grade, 58% of our students scored a level 3 or above on the 2022-2023 FAST. Our goal is that 65% of our 3rd grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2023-2024 FAST.

In 4th grade, 50% of our students scored a level 3 or above. Our goal is that 63% of our 4th grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2023-2024 FAST.

In 5th grade, 42% of our students scored a level 3 or above. Our goal is that 55% of our 5th grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2023-2024 FAST.

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.

The literacy leadership team will meet with teachers at each grade level monthly. During these meetings, the team will discuss the growth of the students in each class as well as the interventions that are in place and the impact those interventions are having on students. Adjustments will be made to the student's assigned interventions based on student response to the intervention as documented on the STAR and CBM assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Berigan, Mandy, beriganm@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 teachers in grades K-5 will be utilizing the Savaas curriculum in their classroom. This curriculum is district approved and aligns with the BEST standards in the state of Florida.

Our teachers also utilize Lexia in their classrooms. The Lexia program allows students to work at their level and gain additional skills needed to improve their reading fluency and comprehension.

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?

Our teachers were involved in the selection committee when the Savaas curriculum was chosen. They chose this curriculum based on the alignment with the BEST standards as well as the additional intervention materials that are available within the curriculum.

The Lexia program is aligned to the BEST standards and provides extra practice and reteaching on certain skills that the students need to increase their fluency 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 teachers will work with the literacy team to develop and track the in class intervention groups as well as the groups of students that receive more intensive pull out interventions.	Berigan, Mandy, beriganm@leonschools.net
The literacy leadership team will meet with the teachers to monitor the usage and effectiveness of the materials being utilized in the current intervention groups. If the interventions are not assisting the students in growth, the intervention will be changed.	Mortham, Staci, morthams@leonschools.net
Our reading coach will meeting with our new teachers to ensure their understanding of the curriculum and the standards in ensure that everyone is teaching the BEST standards and tracking the students understanding and growth.	Berigan, Mandy, beriganm@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: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$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.

Yes