

Leon County Schools

Chaires 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	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

<http://www.leonschools.net/chaire>

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.

Our mission is to focus instruction on developing the whole child. We are committed to providing opportunities designed to meet individual needs and ensure that every child experiences success, academically, emotionally, and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide students with a caring and supportive learning environment that allows each child to reach their full potential through quality instruction and experiences. Chaires Elementary is a community-based school and together we can make a difference in the lives of our students.

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
Holmes, Richard	Principal	<p>Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensure implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support TTI and communicates with the outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI. Selects one teacher from each grade level to provide information about core instruction, data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure the implementation of Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction and support. Selects one ESE teacher to provide information about intervention instruction, participate in student data collection, and collaborate with general education teachers.</p>
Sperling, Brooks	Assistant Principal	<p>Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensure implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support TTI and communicates with the outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI. Selects one teacher from each grade level to provide information about core instruction, data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure the implementation of Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction and support. Selects one ESE teacher to provide information about intervention instruction, participate in student data collection, and collaborate with general education teachers.</p>
Harp, Myra	Reading Coach	<p>Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assist with the design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective strategies.</p>

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.

Stakeholders are involved through a School Advisory Council. The School Advisory Council assists in setting goals and priorities for the school year. The council participates in the development of the plan, goals and objectives, and in developing appropriate measures to ensure adequate progress. The efforts of the School Advisory Council serve to impact student achievement.

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 School Improvement Plan will be monitored in several ways including, but not limited to, disaggregation of beginning, middle, and end of year State Progress Monitoring assessments; monthly meetings with grade levels to discuss students' progress and needs; monthly meetings with grade levels and interventionists to focus on the needs of vulnerable subgroups; and the monitoring of progress through site-based instructional technology. Additionally, the School Advisory Council will meet in the middle and towards the end of the school year to review progress on annual goals.

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	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	2	7	5	7	7	12	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	14
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

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	2	4	0	0	0	6

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	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	6	18	10	10	11	19	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	19
Course failure in 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	2	7	15	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	11	14	0	0	0	29
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	1	1	0	3	5	13	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	6	18	10	10	11	19	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	19
Course failure in 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	2	7	15	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	11	14	0	0	0	29
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	1	1	0	3	5	13	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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*	54	54	53	58	57	56	62		
ELA Learning Gains				56			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			40		
Math Achievement*	58	56	59	64	47	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				70			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			47		
Science Achievement*	59	52	54	57	57	59	58		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
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	46			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	61			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	68			

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%
FRL	42			

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	73			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	44			

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	54			58			59					
SWD	33			33			70				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			32			29				4	
HSP	53			68							2	
MUL	44			61							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	62			68			76				4	
FRL	39			44			38				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	58	56	42	64	70	63	57					
SWD	36	38	29	32	52	43	28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	40	35	32	59	59	36					
HSP				73								
MUL	54			57								
PAC												
WHT	73	65		79	75		67					
FRL	38	43	30	46	60	48	41					

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	62	44	40	53	58	47	58					
SWD	28	20		33	50		28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	43		28	45		33					
HSP	57			57								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	47		71	69		78					
FRL	47	32		36	52		48					

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	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	51%	7%

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 was the lowest component with 59% proficiency. This was, however, up two percentage points from the previous year. For the last four years science proficiency has averaged in the upper fifties. Moving forward, we are really hoping to see science proficiency move into the sixties. We believe that increases in reading proficiency are a contributing factor to increase in science proficiency.

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

Math proficiency went from 64% in the 21-22 school year to approximately 62% this past school year. The drop in proficiency can, in part, be attributed to low 3rd grade proficiency. 3rd grade proficiency was at 51% as compared to 4th grade at 68% and 5th grade at 66% proficiency. A contributing factor to this could be that teachers were teaching a new set of state standards but still using the past textbooks and having to make adaptations. Additionally, we've observed that learning gaps in math post-Covid are having more of an impact than in other curriculum areas.

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.

3rd grade math was eight percentage points below the state average and, as previously mentioned, we believe this could be due in part to new standards and post-Covid learning gaps.

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

Both ELA and Science went up two percentage points. Teachers were fully implementing the new ELA standards and had received a good amount of professional development on the Science of Reading. Additionally, schoolwide incentives for students were offered quarterly for achievements in reading. The correlation between reading and science scores has been observed in the past and it is possible that the gains in reading positively impacted the gains in science.

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

Absenteeism is an area of concern as students must be present and on time to experience gains in learning. This year we've instituted a more defined process for monitoring students with attendance issues and will check in with teachers monthly to ensure we are seeing an improvement in attendance.

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

1. Our current 4th graders are the group of students who performed poorly on the math assessment last year. Ensuring that this group experiences learning gains and an increase in the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency is a priority.
2. Our kindergarten through second grade teachers are implementing UFLI Foundations, an explicit and systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading. A successful implementation of this program could have positive effects on our 3rd-5th grade proficiency as we move forward.
3. We observed, last year, how positively our students responded to recognitions tied to their academic achievements and wish to continue and expand upon this.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Math was the one area that we saw decline last year and we want to focus on ensuring that we can increase the number of students demonstrating proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our proficiency was 64% during the 2021-2022 school year and we would like to see our students return to that number or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Student classroom assessment and progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students' progress. We are utilizing a math intervention teacher this year to assist with the ongoing progress monitoring and to provide interventions in areas of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Holmes (holmesr@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.)

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using evidence-based pedagogy to deliver instruction is very impactful on learning. By ensuring that students are being taught the standards and monitoring their ability, teachers are able to meet students where they are and move them accordingly.

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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.

2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Since the 2019 school year we have been seeing consistent improvement in each reporting area. Coming back from the Covid years students have needed a lot of reassurance and positivity to encourage them to persevere through the challenges presented by remote learning and other factors that impacted their achievement. Continuing to celebrate their academic achievements is important to all stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are hopeful that our trend of increasing our percentages in each reporting area will continue.

Monitoring:

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

Student classroom assessment and progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students' progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Holmes (holmesr@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.)

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using evidence-based pedagogy to deliver instruction is very impactful on learning. By ensuring that students are being taught the standards and monitoring their ability, teachers are able to meet students where they are and move them accordingly.

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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.

2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Continue to recognize student achievement through events like recognition on the morning news, quarterly student achievement ceremonies, celebrations to reward academic milestones, and utilize a Student Recognition and Discipline Committee to monitor the efficacy of our efforts and implement new ideas as needed.

Person Responsible: Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

By When:

#3. 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 performed below the Federal Index threshold of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency for ELA was 38% in the 2022 school year and 32% in math. We would like to see and increase of at least 2% in both areas.

Monitoring:

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

Student classroom assessments and progress monitoring data will be reviewed to identify areas in need of reteach and/or remediation. Students will receive instructional support and ESE support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Holmes (holmesr@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.)

Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.

4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

By When: