

Leon County Schools

# Hawks Rise Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>22</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

## Hawks Rise Elementary School

205 MEADOW RIDGE DR, Tallahassee, FL 32312

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

### 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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 at Hawks Rise Elementary School is to help each student develop into a lifelong learner who is inspired with productive creativity, equipped with the skills of a critical thinker, problem solver and decision maker, and prepared to be a responsible citizen. This will be accomplished through the cooperative efforts of the entire community (students, parents, school and partners) as we work together to provide a nurturing, safe, secure learning environment where respect for others is celebrated, and our students achieve success through their diverse and individual talents.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision at Hawks Rise is to guide students to realize their full potential, academically, emotionally, and socially.

### 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  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Martin, Terri   | Principal           | The principal and the assistant principal ensure teachers are trained on curriculum, including intervention program materials, and on research-based strategies. The administration also conduct informal and formal observations to identify areas of need and to find role models for other teachers. Also, the administration has oversight in ensuring that pacing and planning are on target for students to show achievement. Finally, administration ensures that data is being monitored and that informal and formal assessments are being disaggregated in order to find strengths and weaknesses. These strengths and weaknesses will be used to guide instruction on an ongoing basis. |
| Caines, Dionne  | Assistant Principal | The principal and the assistant principal ensure teachers are trained on curriculum, including intervention program materials, and on research-based strategies. The administration also conduct informal and formal observations to identify areas of need and to find role models for other teachers. Also, the administration has oversight in ensuring that pacing and planning are on target for students to show achievement. Finally, administration ensures that data is being monitored and that informal and formal assessments are being disaggregated in order to find strengths and weaknesses. These strengths and weaknesses will be used to guide instruction on an ongoing basis. |
| Rudd, Elizabeth | Reading Coach       | The Reading Coach will ensure that teachers and staff receive training on ELA curricula and will ensure teachers have materials needed for instruction and intervention. Along with other members of the Leadership Team, the Reading Coach will review data to determine the needs of the students and will inform parents/guardians of the students' levels and needs.   |

### 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 will review FAST data and share with teachers, staff, and the School Advisory Council. Together, the stakeholders will create goals based on the school data being sure to review the needs of students in our subgroups. The School Advisory Council will vote to approve the 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))

School Improvement Plan committee members for ELA and Math will meet monthly to review data and to review the school's progress toward reaching the goals. The committee chairs will meet with the Leadership Team to discuss the progress and to make plans for instructional revisions for specific students or subgroups. Teachers will meet with the Leadership Team to discuss Progress Monitoring data and to make changes in instruction. as needed.

### Demographic Data

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 44%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 24%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>2017-18: A  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

### 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   | 10          | 13 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 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 |    |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 8  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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           | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

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

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |    | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 6           | 5 | 4 | 3 | 8  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |       |

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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   | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 6           | 5 | 4 | 3 | 8  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |       |

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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*                | 79     | 54       | 53    | 81     | 57       | 56    | 83     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 69     |          |       | 71     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 53     |          |       | 58     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 78     | 56       | 59    | 79     | 47       | 50    | 83     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 68     |          |       | 65     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 51     |          |       | 47     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 82     | 52       | 54    | 75     | 57       | 59    | 80     |          |       |
| 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           | 82   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 326  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 4    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 68   |

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 476 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 44                                     |                           |  |  |
| ELL                  | 83                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  | 95                                     |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 55                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                  | 64                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                  | 63                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 85                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 57                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 39                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| ELL                  | 88                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  | 94                                     |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 47                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                  | 67                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL                  | 63                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 69                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 48                                     |                           |  |  |

**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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 79              |               |                    | 78               |                |                     | 82              |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| SWD              | 46              |               |                    | 39               |                |                     | 30              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| ELL              | 73              |               |                    | 93               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 2                              |                     |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              | 91              |               |                    | 96               |                |                     | 96              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| BLK              | 56              |               |                    | 56               |                |                     | 53              |                |                  |                          | 3                              |                     |
| HSP              | 68              |               |                    | 59               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 2                              |                     |
| MUL              | 69              |               |                    | 65               |                |                     | 54              |                |                  |                          | 3                              |                     |
| PAC              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| WHT              | 83              |               |                    | 81               |                |                     | 88              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| FRL              | 54              |               |                    | 49               |                |                     | 65              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 81              | 69            | 53                 | 79               | 68             | 51                  | 75              |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| SWD              | 41              | 40            | 28                 | 42               | 43             | 39                  | 39              |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ELL              | 76              | 100           |                    | 82               | 92             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              | 92              | 86            |                    | 95               | 97             |                     | 100             |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK  | 59       | 52     | 38          | 52        | 56      | 44           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 75       | 67     |             | 63        | 60      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 68       | 47     |             | 76        | 59      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 85       | 71     | 57          | 82        | 65      | 43           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 58       | 63     | 47          | 52        | 40      | 32           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 83       | 71     | 58          | 83        | 65      | 47           | 80       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 49       | 47     |             | 59        | 40      |              | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 67       |        |             | 87        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 90       | 53     |             | 97        | 76      |              | 83       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 63       | 60     |             | 51        | 33      |              | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 73       |        |             | 82        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 81       |        |             | 85        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 85       | 76     | 76          | 86        | 73      | 59           | 87       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 60     |             | 61        | 50      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

### 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 | 86%    | 55%      | 31%                        | 54%   | 32%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 76%    | 57%      | 19%                        | 58%   | 18%                     |

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 83%    | 52%      | 31%                        | 50%   | 33%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 86%    | 57%      | 29%                        | 59%   | 27%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 75%    | 58%      | 17%                        | 61%   | 14%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 84%    | 52%      | 32%                        | 55%   | 29%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 84%    | 50%      | 34%                        | 51%   | 33%                     |

### 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 Students with Disabilities subgroup has historically shown the lowest performance in the school. We notice that the data shows a decrease in the number of students scoring level 3 or above as students move from 3rd to 4th to 5th grades. As the complexity of the standards increases, the students in this subgroup have difficulty keeping pace with expectations.

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

The SWD subgroup data from the prior year shows 41% at level 3 or higher for ELA and 42% at level 3 or higher in Math. Calculating the current year's data, it shows that the SWD subgroup scored 51% of students at level 3 or higher in ELA and 41% at level 3 or higher in math so there was a slight drop in math for this sub group.

**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.**

The school's data of students scoring a level 3 or above for ELA, Math, and Science are higher than the state data. The area that has the smallest gap between the school and the state is 4th grade math. 75% of our students in 4th grade scored a level 3 or higher in math and 61% of the 4th grade students statewide scored a level 3 or higher which is a 14% difference With all other areas showing the school

scoring between 19% and 33% higher than the state, this indicates that we need to review our current 5th grade math data to determine how more students can score a level 3 or above.

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

The 5th grade science scores increased from 75% of the students scoring level 3 or higher in 21-22 to 82% of the students scoring level 3 or higher. We attribute this to strong science instruction in all grade levels, as well as a focus on reading and vocabulary instruction.

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

Attendance continues to be a concern for a small number of students. Many of the students with attendance below 90% score lower on FAST than students who have better attendance.

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

1. Increasing achievement scores for our Students with Disabilities subgroup.
2. Focusing on intervention instruction for our level 1 and level 2 students.
- 3, Continuing to offer enrichment instruction for our Level 3-5 students.

**Area of Focus**

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



**#1. 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.

There is a need for more focused intervention instruction for our students with disabilities to close gaps and to increase mastery of grade level standards. Students in this subgroup scored 39% on the Federal Index on the 2021-22 state assessment indicating a need for improvement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

50% of the students in the SWD subgroup will score a level 3 or above in reading as measured by the FAST assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress monitoring through the state progress monitoring assessment, Lexia, STAR, and iReady.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Terri Martin (martint@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.)

Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading class and math class to ensure student needs are being met.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted, evidence-based instruction will allow teachers to track student progress toward standards mastery and will be used to create intervention lessons to assist with mastery.

**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 2 - Moderate 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. Gather data to determine student need
2. The admin team will work with teachers to create an intervention plan for SWD.
3. Progress monitor regularly, meet to discuss the data, and determine the path of instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Terri Martin (martint@leonschools.net)

**By When:** From Sept. 2023 through May, 2024

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the past school year, four teachers left the profession during the middle of the school year, and we had several teachers who left the school at the end of the school year for other various reasons such as job transfers out of town or family circumstances. For this year we have thirteen new instructional staff members out of 57 total.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

95% of the instructional staff, 54 out of 57 teachers, will remain on staff for the upcoming school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

The principal will meet with teachers individually and in small groups throughout the year to discuss the needs of the faculty.

A survey will be sent quarterly to determine needs so that support can be given.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Terri Martin (martint@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.)

The administration team and grade chairs will work to immerse teachers in the school culture and to offer professional development to help them grow.

Monthly meetings will be held to offer support to the new teachers and to increase professional collaboration.

Teacher leaders will work closely with the new faculty members to guide them as they learn the way of work at the school and will offer professional development opportunities to improve instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that two factors related to a teacher's decision to stay at a school leadership support and opportunities for professional collaboration and growth.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our data indicates a wide range of academic abilities in our student population. This shows a need for differentiated instruction that will assist our struggling readers and will challenge our students who are working on or above grade level.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

80% of students in 3rd grade will score a level 3 or above in ELA on the end of the year FAST state assessment.

85% of students in 4th grade will score a level 3 or above in ELA on the end of the year FAST state assessment.

80% of students in 5th grade will score a level 3 or above in ELA on the end of the year FAST state assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress Monitoring will occur using state progress monitoring, STAR, and Lexia.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Elizabeth Rudd (rudde@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.)

Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted, evidence-based instruction will allow teachers to track student progress toward standards mastery and will be used to create intervention lessons to assist with mastery.

**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 2 - Moderate 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. Gather data to determine student needs
2. Work with teachers to group students for differentiated instruction.
3. Progress monitor to determine if students are making growth or if new instructional strategies are needed.

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Rudd (rudde@leonschools.net)

**By When:** May, 2023

**#4. 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.

Our data indicates a wide range of academic abilities in our student population. This shows a need for differentiated instruction that will assist our students working below grade level and will challenge our students who are working on or above grade level.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

83% of students in 3rd grade will score a level 3 or above in Math on the end of the year FAST state assessment.

88% of students in 4th grade will score a level 3 or above in Math on the end of the year FAST state assessment.

80% of students in 5th grade will score a level 3 or above in Math on the end of the year FAST state assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress Monitoring will occur using state progress monitoring, STAR, and iReady/Waggles.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Terri Martin (martint@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.)

Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted, evidence-based instruction will allow teachers to track student progress toward standards mastery and will be used to create intervention lessons to assist with mastery.

**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 2 - Moderate 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. Gather data to determine student needs
2. Work with teachers to group students for differentiated instruction.
3. Progress monitor to determine if students are making growth or if new instructional strategies are needed.

**Person Responsible:** Dionne Caines (cainesd@leonschools.net)

**By When:** May, 2023

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

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

The School Advisory Council will meet to plan, discuss, and approve the School Improvement Plan. The Committee will allocate resources that will assist the school in reaching our goals.