Fort Braden School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fort Braden School

15100 BLOUNTSTOWN HWY, Tallahassee, FL 32310

https://www.leonschools.net/ftbraden

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 primary mission of Fort Braden School is to encourage students to become succeful lifelong learners. For this to occur, the administration, staff, parents, students and community recognize the importance of intellectual, physical and emotional growth and development. Through our efforts, students are encouraged to develop independence and an individual identity while displaying cooperation, respect and responsbility for the greater community. Therefore, we are committed to providing a safe, healthy, nurturing and affirming environment that values high academic standards, inspires life-long learning, encourages leadership development, and instills a sense of respect for self and others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every child who comes to Fort Braden can be guaranteed an appropriate, comprehensive and caring education. Our goal is to provide our children with the tools necessary to become lifelong learners and seek their visions for success in a global 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
Lanter, Todd	Principal	Mr. Lanter is responsible for overseeing the process to ensure the laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. He works to intentionally shape our school vision for academic and behavioral success for all students.
Salvo, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Ms. Salvo is responsible for assisting the principal in the implementation of the process of laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. She works also to intentionally shape our school vision for academic and behavioral success for all students.
Wallace, Darren	Assistant Principal	Mr. Wallace is responsible for assisting the principal in the implementation of the process of laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. He works also to intentionally shape our school vision for academic and behavioral success for all students.
Gautney, Christopher	Dean	Mr. Gautney generally assists the principal and assistant principals in fulfilling his/her chief responsibility of promoting the educational success and safety of each student in the school. He also assists the administration with discipline matters (e.g., in-school detention, OFI) and serves as Testing Coordinator and TEC Representative.
Bennett, Katie	Other	Ms. Bennett is our math coach and participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to the implementation of effective math strategies. Ms. Bennett also serves as our Parent Engagement Coordinator - responsible for planning parent engagement nights and providing resources for our families on a vareity of topics to help parents help their child to be successful in school and members of our community.
Sayed, Sabrina	Reading Coach	Ms. Sayed is our reading coach and participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading strategies.
Sharrett, Kaitlynn	Other	Ms. Sharrett is our Positive Behavior Support Coordinator. She assists in collecting disciplinary data and creating a campus-wide program to reward positive behaviors.
Moberly, June	School Counselor	Ms. Moberly is one of our counselors. She is also responsible for providing a comprehensive school counseling program that is preventative in design, developmental in implementation, and supports students in the areas of

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		academic achievement, career and college planning, and personal and social development.

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 leadership team collaborated in analyzing and breaking down data to determine areas for improvement. We identified resources which include staffing (interventionists), scheduling, district developers and intervention programs to implement to support our goals. Focus groups of teachers, instructional coaches, and staff met to discuss scheduling, data collection and analysis timeline, and materials to use to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Parents, businesses and community members were provided opportunities at Orientation, Open House, SAC/PTO meetings, and via open forum email to provide their input in our SIP.

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))

To regularly montior implementation of the SIP, student's will participate in five progress monitoring testing opportunities throughout the school year, approximately every 6-8 weeks. Within the first three weeks of school, students will participate in either STAR Reading and Math, or FAST Reading and Math, in addition to distrtict-created baseline assessments for Algebra, Biology, Civics, 5th Grade Science and 8th Grade Science. After each progress monitoring assessment, either using STAR, FAST, or district-created assessments, the school leadership team will analyze and break down the data to track growth and areas which need focus. Five data chat meetings are scheduled shortly after each test session to include the school leadership team, interventionists, and teachers by grade level or subject area, and district developers. Data chat meetings will identify action steps, targeted students, materials, and instructional strategies to implement which are identified to support that area of improvement. At each data chat meeting, we will discuss how to pivot our instruction and resources to support our students. Students facing a greater achievement gap have been identified and scheduled for intensive interventions using a push-in, pull-out, and/or intensive class model, depending on the student's level of support needed.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: C 2018-19: C 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	18	27	28	30	23	22	28	38	29	243
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	18	13	10	25	28	20	127
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	28	30	20	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	30	41	21	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	17	10	47

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	1	2	6	5	17	26	33	29	119

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	2	3	2	10	0	0	2	4	2	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5

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	30	30	26	13	27	23	28	36	38	251
One or more suspensions	5	5	3	6	14	10	13	13	25	94
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	32	30	26	40	29	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	34	45	24	29	21	180
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	11	29	23	19	20	19	25	15	163
	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	3	9	11	13	24	21	22	35	32	170

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3

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	30	30	26	13	27	23	28	36	38	251
One or more suspensions	5	5	3	6	14	10	13	13	25	94
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	32	30	26	40	29	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	34	45	24	29	21	180
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	11	29	23	19	20	19	25	15	163
	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	3	9	11	13	24	21	22	35	32	170

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	17
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3

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*	29	45	53	35	46	55	32		
ELA Learning Gains				48			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			32		
Math Achievement*	39	44	55	36	40	42	37		
Math Learning Gains				48			39		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			37		
Science Achievement*	23	39	52	31	43	54	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	55	68	48	52	59	23		
Middle School Acceleration	71	55	70	63	42	51	62		
Graduation Rate		52	74		39	50			
College and Career Acceleration		23	53		48	70			
ELP Progress	64	56	55	54	65	70	31		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	19	Yes	4	1
ELL	26	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	19	Yes	4	1
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	45			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	3	
HSP	42			
MUL	34	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	45			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	29			39			23	59	71			64
SWD	15			20			9	29			5	
ELL	16			30			0				5	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			27			11				3	
HSP	25			40			12	56			6	66
MUL	48			45							3	
PAC												
WHT	32			40			33	55	60		6	
FRL	28			35			20	57	75		7	65

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	35	48	41	36	48	46	31	48	63			54
SWD	17	36	32	25	48	56	16	30				
ELL	18	34	25	21	37	35	17	47				54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	54	73	16	37	38	25					
HSP	34	49	36	32	37	42	28	42	67			52
MUL	40	27		33	38		30					
PAC												
WHT	38	47	34	44	60	50	35	50	50			
FRL	33	46	45	32	47	48	31	43	67			55

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	32	35	32	37	39	37	47	23	62			31
SWD	14	20	22	25	31	32	25					
ELL	22	35	33	26	42		25					31
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	21		15	32		25	0				
HSP	33	43	44	39	49	43	47	21	67			31
MUL	39	42		33								
PAC												
WHT	33	32	29	40	36	31	49	28	60			
FRL	29	35	33	32	37	38	44	25	48			20

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	28%	55%	-27%	54%	-26%
07	2023 - Spring	31%	49%	-18%	47%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	25%	49%	-24%	47%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	57%	-21%	58%	-22%
06	2023 - Spring	23%	48%	-25%	47%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	52%	-24%	50%	-22%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	51%	-17%	48%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	57%	-25%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	29%	58%	-29%	61%	-32%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	55%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	52%	-22%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	8%	38%	-30%	44%	-36%
05	2023 - Spring	20%	50%	-30%	51%	-31%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	58%	29%	50%	37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	65%	14%	63%	16%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	72%	-15%	66%	-9%

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.

Our overall Science Achievement is our lowest performance category. Over the span of the last three years, Science Achievement was 43% in 2019, 47% in 2021 and now reporting as 31% for 2022. This is a 16% point drop from the previous year achievement.This can be contributed to adding the Biology 1 course offering, which changed the demographic of student in 8th Grade Science, while still remaining in the reporting category as a whole. ELA Achievement for SWD, BLK, and MUL students showed growth, increasing 3%, 3% and 1% respectively. SWD are 17% proficient in ELA, BLK are 24% proficient, and MUL are 40% proficient. ELL students showed a 4% decline in ELA achievement from last year, dropping from 22% to 18%. Math Achievement for ELL dropped 5% from 26% proficent to 21%. For SWD and MUL students, Math achievement remained the same from last year at 25% and 33% proficient, respectively. BLK students showed 1% increase in their Math achievement proficiency from 15% to 16%. Student attendance and discipline contribute to these performance scores as both results in time students missing instructional time in the classroom. In addition, teacher turnover was a contributing factor.

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

Our Science Achievement category showed the greatest decline dropping 16% points from 47% to 31%. Our ELL subgroup demonstrated the greatest declines across subgroups. Their Math Achievement dropped 5%, from 26% to 21%. Their ELA Achievement dropped from 22% to 18%, a total decline of 4%. In Science Achievement, there was a 22% drop, from 47% to 22%. Student attendance and discipline contribute to this performance score as both results in time students missing instructional time in the classroom. In addition, teacher turnover was a contributing factor.

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.

Our data components which have the greatest gap when compared to the state averages are Math, Science, and Civics. Our math component is 36% compared to the state average of 56%, which is a 20% point gap. Science and Civics both have an 18% point gap, with Science earning approximately 31% compared to the state's 49% proficiency rate and Civics earning 48% compared to the state's 66%. While we still have a significant gap in Civics when comparing to the state, our 48% proficiency rate is a 25% point increase from the previous school year. Our SWD, ELL, BLK and MUL subgroups are earning proficiency ratings lower than our school average - demonstrating an even bigger learning gap from the state average for Math, ELA, Science and Civics Achievement for those subgroups.

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

The areas which showed the most improvement are SLP progress, increasing 23% points from 31% to 54% and our Learning Gains for ELA Achievement, increasing 12% points. The addition of a reading instructional coach helped support our students and teachers in ELA Achievement.

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

One area of concern regarding the data from the EWS review is the number of retained students. Under the umbrella of that category, there is a concern for the number of students earning course failures in ELA and Math. There was an increase of 8 students retained this school year, from 17 students the previous year to 25 students.

Another area of concern is the number of suspension students received, which increased from 94

suspensions to 174 suspensions. This is a concern as suspensions result in time away from the classroom where students should receive instruction.

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

One of our top priorities is behavior and classroom management - creating a positive school and clasroom environment. We will be focusing on classroom management strategies to reduce the number of referrals to limit the number of suspensions and time away from the classroom. We will also be focusing on a PBIS program to increase positive behaviors through a recognition system.

Science Achievement will be another priority as it showed the greatest decline and is only 31% proficient overall. We will be focusing on common planning, using available resources and pacing guides and monitoring benchmark data.

ELA and Math Achievement will continue to be a focus. Although there was a 3% increase last year from 32% to 35% proficient in ELA Achievement, this is still 11% points away from the 2019 reporting year where we were 44% proficient. There was 1% decrease from last year in Math Achievement, and an overall 17% decrease from the 2019 reporting year.

Our SWD, ELL, BLK and MUL will be another focus. These ESSA Subgroups are below 41% on the Federal Percent Points Index. Our SWD are 33% for 3 consecutive years. Our ELL is 32% for one year. Our BLK is 38% for 3 consecutive years. Our MUL is 34% for one year.

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 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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. When school is a fun, engaging and enjoyable place to be - students and staff want to be there and want to give it their all. It takes a team effort to ensure all students succeed and it is critical there is a positive environment and trusted culture for everyone to flourish in their roles. To help provide a systematic approach to collecting data and rewarding students regarding student positive behaviors, we will focus on creating and implementing a comprehensive PBIS program.

Last year, there were 243 students who were absent 10% or more of the school year which is a 3% increase in the number of students from the previous year. This is still a substantial amount of students missing 10% or more school days per year. Additionally, we increased the number of students who received one or more suspensions from 94 to 127 students, which is a 35% increase from the previous year. Students receiving course failures in Math and ELA increased from last year as well. Math failures increased from 7 to 9, increasing by 2. ELA course failures increased freom 6 to 8, increasing by 2. Ensuring there is an established positive environment and culture will decrease suspensions, increase attendance and increase time spent in the classroom receiveing instruction, and therefore decrease the number of course failures.

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

We wish to see a 5% decrease in the number of students receiving one or more suspensions and a 5% decrease in the number of students absent 10% or more throughout the school year. We wish to see the number of secondary students earning course failures in ELA or Math to be 5 students or less by the end of the school year.

We also wish to see 60% of all students earn a reward through the PBIS program by the end of the school year.

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

We will monitor this outcome weekly, monthly, quarterly and semesterly. Suspension data and attendance data are collected through FOCUS reports. PBIS points and recognitions are collected using Class Dojo - an outside classroom behavior point tracker program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Lanter (lantert@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 implementing a PBIS program which focuses on rewarding and acknowledging positive behaviors rather than focusing on discipline and negative behaviors. Students can earn Pioneer Points in multiple categories, such as being prepared and remaining on task. Points are converted to dollars and students can purchase items from the school spirit store.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing evidence-based practices within a PBIS framework, schools support their students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes, and use data to make informed decisions that improve the way things work for everyone.

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.

Establish and maintain a CSAP/Attendance monitoring plan, including the MTSS Team and School Social Worker

Person Responsible: Darren Wallace (wallaced@leonschools.net)

By When: All year

Establish and maintain a progressive disciplinary plan, focusing on classroom management strategies. Monitor behavioral trend data including the MTSS Team and School Social Worker

Person Responsible: Darren Wallace (wallaced@leonschools.net)

By When: All year

Establish a PBIS program, rewarding and recognitizing positive behaviors

Person Responsible: Darren Wallace (wallaced@leonschools.net)

By When: All year

Create a monthly assembly schedule for secondary students to participate in positive environment and relationship building instruction and activities - to foster positive behaviors year round.

Person Responsible: Todd Lanter (lantert@leonschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Create a school-wide theme of GAME ON! (Goals, Achievement, Mindset, Effort) to engage teachers, students, staff and the community in team building opportunities and competitions to increase student achievement and staff morale.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: all year

#2. 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.

As a school (grades 3-8), 65% of Fort Braden students are level 1 or level 2 students with 35% of students being proficient according to state data. This is a 3% increase from the previous year.

Our SWD subgroup of students are 17% proficient, which is an increase of 3% points from the previous year. Our ELL subgroup is 18% proficient, which is a 4% decrease from the previous year. Our Black subgroup of students are 24% proficient, which is a 3% increase from the previous year. Our Multi-racial subgroup of students are 40%, which is a 1% increase from the previous year.

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

The goal at Fort Braden School is that 40% of all matched standard curriculum students who meet the attendance requirement will show proficiency on the 2023-34 on the FAST ELA PM3. This would take approximately 35 students increasing from a level 2 to a level 3.

The goal for our SWD is 19% showing proficiency, ELL 20% proficiency, Black students 26% and multi-racial students at 42%.

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

The Fort Braden ELA teachers will meet with admin every 6-8 weeks to go over data, update focus calendar to monitor pacing, and create plans in order to monitor/accelerate student progress. The school will use STAR and/or FAST assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction for student growth. We will administer the STAR or FAST assessment every 6 weeks to have a new data point to analyze and track student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Salvo (salvor@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 intervene using strategic scheduling for teachers. This will include for common planning periods as well as full-day planning days which will provide time to collaborate and discuss student data, instructional strategies, strands and benchmarks to focus on, etc and attend professional developments. District developers will attend bi-monthly data review meetings as well as full day planning days in order to provide expert support in selecting instructional strategies and materials to pivot our instruction based on our progress monitoring data.

Depending on the grade level - we will use UFLI, Lexia, Savvas, Language Live and Study Sync as resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It takes time to have proper discussions and align resources to support student success. Using strategic scheduling, teachers have a daily opportunity to collaborate and review their data and instructional practices. Bi-monthly data review meetings with admin and district developers will give opportunity to review strands, benchmarks, and instructional materials to align our interventions with our needs.

We will use the mentioned programs based on Leon County School's Reading Decision Tree resource list, which provides us with evidence based resources and intervention strategies.

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.

Create a master schedule with common planning periods. Create a schedule for data meetings every other month including teachers, admin staff and district developers, Create a schedule to collect data using progress monitoring tools such as STAR and FAST. Create a schedule for common planning days using substitute teachers.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: Before the start of the school year

Analyze data at the student level and subject area level every other month to identify strands and benchmarks which need the most attention, and to identify students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 support.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: every 6-8 weeks, within one week from data collection

Collaborate with district developers and teachers to identify instructional approaches and materials to use to support our areas of improvement. Use common planning time to discuss how to implement the strategies and use the materials. Use common planning time to develop explicit and systematic lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: During common planning periods, common planning days, or at data review meeting days. Lesson plans are due weekly.

Attend professional developments regarding state standards, instructional materials, classroom management, SWD, ESOL, or any other training.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: During common planning periods, common planning days with sub coverage, faculty meetings, data review meetings, or as needed.

#3. 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.

As a school (grades 3-8), 64% of Fort Braden students are level 1 or level 2 students with 36% of students being proficient according to FAST data. A little more than half of students are more than a year behind in math level according to STAR data. This is a 1% decrease from the previous year.

Our SWD subgroup of students are 25% proficient in math, which is a decrease in 6% points from the previous year. Our ELL subgroup is 21% proficient in math, which is a 21% decrease from the previous year. Our Black subgroup of students are 16% proficient in math, which is a 1% increase from the previous year. Lastly, our Multi-racial subgroup of students are 33% proficient in math, which is the same percentage from the previous year.

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

The goal at Fort Braden School is that 41% of all matched standard curriculum students who meet the attendance requirement will show proficiency on the 2023-34 on the FAST Math PM3 and/or Algebra EOC. This would take approximately 30 students increasing from a level 2 to a level 3.

The goal for our SWD is 27% showing proficiency, ELL 23% proficiency, Black students 18% and multi-racial students at 35%.

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

The Fort Braden Math teachers will meet with admin every 6 weeks to go over data, update focus calendar to monitor pacing, and create plans in order to monitor/accelerate student progress. Students will participate in the STAR and/or FAST assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction for student growth every 6 weeks. We will include district developers and our school's intervention team to monitor student data and plan instructional strategies and materials which align us to reaching our goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Salvo (salvor@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 intervene using strategic scheduling for teachers. This will include for common planning periods as well as full-day planning days which will provide time to collaborate and discuss student data, instructional strategies, strands and benchmarks to focus on, etc and attend professional developments. District developers will attend bi-monthly data review meetings as well as full day planning days in order to provide expert support in selecting instructional strategies and materials to pivot our instruction based on our progress monitoring data.

We will use Waggle as an intervention program which tailors lessons to student's baseline data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It takes time to have proper discussions and align resources to support student success. Using strategic scheduling, teachers have a daily opportunity to collaborate and review their data and instructional

practices. Bi-monthly data review meetings with admin and district developers will give opportunity to review strands, benchmarks, and instructional materials to align our interventions with our needs.

Waggle is part of the district adopted math curriculum which provides differentiated lessons based on student's baseline data.

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.

Create a master schedule with common planning periods. Create a schedule for data meetings every other month including teachers, admin staff and district developers, Create a schedule to collect data using progress monitoring tools such as STAR and FAST. Create a schedule for common planning days using substitute teachers.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: The start of the school year

Analyze data at the student level and subject area level every other month to identify strands and benchmarks which need the most attention, and to identify students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 support.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: Within a week after each round of data collection.

Collaborate with district developers and teachers to identify instructional approaches and materials to use to support our areas of improvement. Use common planning time to discuss how to implement the strategies and use the materials. Use common planning time to develop explicit and systematic lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: At each meeting every other months and during common planning time, plus lesson plans due weekly

Attend professional developments regarding state standards, instructional materials, classroom management, SWD, ESOL, or any other training.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: During common planning periods, common planning days, monthly faculty meetings, data review meetings, or as needed.

#4. 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.

As a school (grades 3-8), 69% of Fort Braden students are level 1 or level 2 students with 31% of students being proficient according to state data. This is a 16% decrease from the previous year.

Our SWD subgroup of students are 16% proficient, which is a decrease in 9% points from the previous year. Our ELL subgroup is 17% proficient, which is a 8% decrease from the previous year. Our Black subgroup of students are 25% proficient, which is the same percentage from the previous year. Our Multi-racial subgroup of students are 30%, which does not have data in the category for the previous year.

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

The goal at Fort Braden School is that 36% of all matched standard curriculum students who meet the attendance requirement will show proficiency on the 2023-34 on the 5th and 8th Grade Science State Assessment or Biology EOC. This would take approximately 40 students increasing from a level 2 to a level 3.

The goal for our SWD is 18% showing proficiency, ELL 19% proficiency, Black students 26% and multi-racial students at 32%.

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

We will use district-created progress monitoring assessments, which include baseline, midterm, and end of year assessments plus a question bank aligned to each standard.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Salvo (salvor@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 intervene using strategic scheduling for teachers. This will include for common planning periods as well as full-day planning days which will provide time to collaborate and discuss student data, instructional strategies, strands and benchmarks to focus on, etc and attend professional developments. District developers will attend bi-monthly data review meetings as well as full day planning days in order to provide expert support in selecting instructional strategies and materials to pivot our instruction based on our progress monitoring data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It takes time to have proper discussions and align resources to support student success. Using strategic scheduliing, teachers have a daily opportunity to collaborate and review their data and instructional practices. Every 6-8 weeks data review meetings with admin and district developers will give opportunity to review strands, benchmarks, and instructional materials to align our interventions with our needs.

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. |

Create a master schedule with common planning periods. Create a schedule for data meetings every other month including teachers, admin staff and district developers, Create a schedule to collect data using progress monitoring tools such as STAR and FAST. Create a schedule for common planning days using substitute teachers.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: Before the start of school

Analyze data at the student level and subject area level every other month to identify strands and benchmarks which need the most attention, and to identify students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 support.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: every 6-8 weeks, within a week from data collection date

Collaborate with district developers and teachers to identify instructional approaches and materials to use to support our areas of improvement. Use common planning time to discuss how to implement the strategies and use the materials. Use common planning time to develop explicit and systematic lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: At each meeting every other months and during common planning time, plus lesson plans due weekly

Attend professional developments regarding state standards, instructional materials, classroom management, SWD, ESOL, or any other training.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Salvo (salvor@leonschools.net)

By When: Monthly faculty meetings, common planning periods, common planning days with subs, or as needed

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).

In order to determine how to allocate our school improvement funding, an analysis of school wide data occurred. This data analysis included state testing results, attendance, discipline, ESE, ELL and other relevant information. Areas of improvement were identified based on the data review which included Science Achievement, ELA Achievement, ELL Achievement, SWD Achievement, Black Achievement and Multicultural Achievement, and attendance and discipline. We collaborated with teachers, instructional coaches, district developers and outside agencies such as FDLRS and FSU COE to identify instructional materials and supplemental materials. We planned action steps to montior data, reviewing the data, and pivoting our focus based on the data. We have scheduled support with instructional coaches and district developers to target the success of all students, particularly the subgroups showing the biggest achievement gaps. Based on discussions, we also aligned our strongest teachers and intervention support staff to our groups of students who need the most support. We will utilize school improvment funding to have common planning time to

discuss data, instructional strategies, and interventions for students as well as attend professional development opportunities.

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

For Kindergarten students - 47% scored a Level 1 or Level 2 on the end of year administration of the STAR.
For 1st grade students - 72% of students scored a Level 1 or Level 2 on the end of year administration of the STAR. For 2nd grade students - 56% scored a Level 1 or Level 2 on the end of year administration of the STAR.

It is critical students gain early literacy skills prior to 3rd grade when expectations change to reading for comprehension. Students need a strong foundation in phonics and phonemic awareness before leaving 2nd grade. With almost half of our KG and 2nd grade students and two-thirds of our 1st grade students lacking those foundational skills as based on STAR assessment scores, it is critical we give this area our attention.

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

For 3rd grade - 71% of student scored below a Level 3 on the FAST PM3. This was a decrease of 2% from the previous school year. For 4th grade - 64% of students scored below a Level 3 on the FAST PM3. This was the same percentage from the previous school year. For 5th grade - 72% of students scored below a Level 3 on the FAST PM3, which was a 9% decrease from the previous school year.

This is an area of critical need because students are learning reading for comprehension in Grades 3-5. We have decreased or remained the same in this reporting category. These percentages are higher than our K-2 percentages, which means we are not bridging the learning gap from K-2 and instead increasing the spread. While we know our 3-5 are missing skills based on our K-2 data, we must show growth for these grade levels in ELA prior to students reaching middle school.

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

For KG - we would like to see at least 50% of students earn a Level 3 or higher on the end of year state testing in STAR Early Literacy.

For 1st grade and 2nd grade, we would like to see a 5% increase in students scoring Level 3 or higher for each grade on their respective end of year STAR assessment. Last year we ended with 53% of KG students earning a Level 3 or higher, therefore we would like to see 58% of 1st graders end the year this year a Level 3 or higher. Last year we ended with 28% of 1st grade students earning a Level 3 or higher, therefore we would like to see 33% of 2nd grade students earn a Level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We would like to see a 5% increase for each grade level.

Last year we ended with 44% of 2nd graders scoring a Level 3 or above, therefore we would like to see 49% of this year's 3rd graders score a Level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3. Last year we ended with 29% of 3rd graders scoring a Level 3 or higher, therefore we would like to see 34% of this year's 4th graders earn a Level 3 or higher. Last year's 4th graders ended with 36% scoring a Level 3 or higher, therefore we would like to see 41% of this year's 5th grade students earn a Level 3 or higher. Last year's 5th graders ended the year with 28% of students earning a Level 3 or higher, therefore we would like to see 33% of this year's 6th graders earn a Level 3 or higher.

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.

We have established Pionner Data Planning days every 6 weeks. All K-5 students will participate in the STAR Reading or Early Literacy assessment every 6 weeks to have a new data point. We we look at STAR data over time, attendance data, discipline data, teacher gradebook data, and FAST data as applicable for 3-5 grade. Grade level teams will come together with administration, instructional coaches and district developers to analyze our most recent data. We will identify strands and benchmarks we need to target as well as instructional materials and strategies to implement to target those strands and benchmarks. We will also look at data on the student level to determine placements in Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions or potential referral to the Problem Solving Team. With the support of district developers being the experts in instructional materials and strategies, we will be able to focus our efforts on benchmarks we need to support using evidence based strategies and materials.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Salvo, Rebecca, salvor@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?

For K-2, we will be utilizing the UFLI Foundations curriculum to focus on phonics and phonemic awareness. UFLI is from the University of Florida's Literacy Institute and has research to support it's instructional strategies as demonstrating growth in students missing foundational skills in phonics and phonemic awareness. UFLI coordinates efforts for student literacy and teacher development. We will use Savvas myView for building vocabulary and reading comprehension.

For 3rd grade, we will implement a walk-to-read model, where students are grouped by ability for their Reading block. We have targeted our most effective teachers to work with our lowest achieving students.

For 3rd - 5th grade, we will use Savvas and Savvas Intervention lessons for curriculum and intervention.

We will also use Lexia for grades K-5 as a means of Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions.

Additionally, we have a Reading Interventionist and Reading Coach dedicated to K-5. The Reading Coach will monitor data and identify students who are in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional support. Our Reading Interventionist will push in to classrooms and/or pull out small groups of students who need targeted instruction. Our Reading Coach, with the help of adminstration and district developers, will also support our classroom teachers with their instructional strategies and selecting materials to target on specific benchmarks we have targeted through our data analysis.

All programs and instructional practices mentioned above were selected from our district's Reading Decision Tree and our district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan. All instructional materials and resources mentioned aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

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?

UFLI is an effective evidence-based practice targeting phonics and phonemic awareness. Savvas is an evidence-based Tier 1 instructional resource which also includes intervention lessons for Tier 2 and Tier 3 and focuses on vocabulary and comprehesion. Lexia is also an evidence-based instrutional resource which focuses on literacy.

Having a person dedicated to analyzing data and supporting teacher instruction, our Reading Coach, and having a person dedicated to providing interventions, our Reading Interventionist, is also an effective evidence-based practice. The description of roles and responsiblities for these two positions have been outlined by the district's curriculum and instructional developers.

These programs were selected based on the district's Reading Decision Tree and the district's Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan, which aligns to the B.E.S.T. Standards.

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
We will collect and montior STAR data K-5 every 6 weeks, as well as FAST data three times a year for grades 3-5.	Salvo, Rebecca, salvor@leonschools.net
We will analyze data every 6 weeks with teachers, administration, literacy coach, reading interventionist, district developers and MTSS team members. We will determine benchmarks and strands which need our focus. We will identify effective evidence-based instrucitonal strategies and materials to target those strands and benchmarks.	Salvo, Rebecca, salvor@leonschools.net
We will identify students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions, and/or referral to the MTSS team.	Salvo, Rebecca, salvor@leonschools.net
We will provide on-going professional development in regards to B.E,S.T. Standards and our curriculum materials, such as UFLI, Savvas, and Lexia from our Reading Coach, Assistant Principal of Curriculum, and District Developers.	Salvo, Rebecca, salvor@leonschools.net
We will host parent engagement opportunities to learn literacy strategies to support learning at home.	Bennett, Katie, bennettk@leonschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Feedback regarding setting the SIP will be available at Open House, Orientation, our first PTO/SAC meeting as well as virtually. Faculty, parents, students, and any stakeholder are welcome to submit feedback towards the development of our SIP at any of those events or via email - a draft of the SIP will be available on our website. Progress of the SIP will be reviewed quarterly at PTO/SAC meetings and at faculty meetings, as well as posted on our school's website. Additionally, these posts are available to students, parents, teachers, and any other staff member using our Canvas Homeroom page. An email on listserv will annouce the dates regarding the window to submit feedback in developing the SIP as well as the dates for PTO/SAC meetings.

www.leonschools.net/ftbraden

These posts are easily translated into Spanish or other languages.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school's Family Engagement Plan is available at www.leonschools.net/ftbraden

Fort Braden School, FBS PTO and Parent Liaison will collaborate with administration, support staff, and teachers in the development of activities designed to train parents to support their children's academic achievement. Fort Braden School will have a parent liason that will communicate with parents to increase parent involvement by 20% in each homeroom class. Our parent involvement activities allow us to build connections outside of the normal school hours. Research shows that students are more successful learners when parents read and are engaged with their students. Fort Braden will provide take home books, grade level content and standard information, and learning activities for all students both parent engagement events. Those topics will include: reading support, time managment, study habits, ESOL, STEAM, breaking down FAST/STAR data, mental health, etc.

One way we plan to build positive relationships with parents and our school community is through our social media page. We will be highlighting all the engaging instructional activities our student's participate in in their classrooms, as well as the fun activities we celebrate around campus.

We will foster an open door policy and be available to meet with parents and community stakeholders at any time. We will welcome parents to schedule parent conferences to build relationships with their classroom teachers. We will encourage parents and community stakeholders to volunteer.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We will collect progress monitoring data approximately every 6-8 weeks. We will analyze this data to identify strands and benchmarks students are struggling with to focus our instruction. We will collaborate as grade level teams and subject area teams to focus on developing explicit and systematic ways to provide instruction to support our student needs. We will call upon district developers and resources from FSU COE/FDLRS to identify instructional strategies and supplemental resources we can use to support student success. We will schedule common planning periods for secondary Math, ELA and Science teachers - and secure substitute teachers for full day common planning for all grades and subject areas. These planning opportuniies will be critical in allowing time for teachers to digest the progress monitoring data breakdown, and identify and become familiar with instructional strategies/materials to use to support student needs based on the data.
Additionally, we will be implementing an ESE Inclusion module to provide more support for instruction within the classroom instead of in a separated environment.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Fort Braden offers an industry certification in Agriculture as well as twelve different digital tools opportunities to students 4th - 8th grade. This is an opportunity for students to earn career and technical certifications while they are still in elementary and middle school - these certifications translate immediately into the workforce.

Fort Braden also offers a New Horizon's program which offers services through Disc Village ranging from substance abuse, anxiety to time management and study skills.