# J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood

### 2400 ORANGE AVE E, Tallahassee, FL 32311

### https://www.leonschools.net/conley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of J. Michael Conley Elementary is to work in partnership with the community and parents/ families to create a strong foundation that meets the individual needs of students, developing leadership skills with an emphasis on service, kindness, and compassion.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

J. Michael Conley Elementary School @ SouthWood is a place where students achieve their maximum potential academically, socially, physically, and emotionally.

## 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 |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Threadgill, Ben | Principal | The principal serves as the instructional leader and engages in collaborative decision-making with the school leadership team. Together with the team, he establishes and communicates instructional goals for school success. Additionally, he creates and supports an environment of high expectations for teaching and learning. |
| Williams, Ava | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal serves to support the principal in the development, implementation, supervision and evaluation of a comprehensive school-based program. The goal is to have a program of educational and student services designed to increase student achievement. |
| Webb, Sharon | Reading Coach | The reading coach will provide coaching services in reading and literacy instruction. She will lead professional development, model instructional strategies and techniques, and engage in collaborative lesson planning with teachers. Additionally, the she will help to ensure academic decisions are data driven, evidence-base and appropriate for students and teachers to increase achievement. |
| Weitzel, Linda | Instructional Media | The Instructional Media Specialist fosters a welcoming and flexible environment so that the media center is an essential part of the learning community. She develops and maintains resources appropriate to the curriculum, the learners, and instructional strategies of the school. More specifically the media specialist provides lessons in the use of information/literacy skills, respect for intellectual property, digital citizenship, the use of print and non-print resources, research techniques, and conducts activities to provide integrated curriculum and technology-rich literacy experiences for all. Additionally, the media specialist establishes procedures for selection, acquisition, circulation, resource sharing of resources in all formats. Most importantly the Media Specialist promotes a love of reading and lifelong learning as a foundational skill for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment. |
| Abbott, Christa | Teacher, ESE | The ESE Representative and Speech-Language Pathologists use a wide variety of assessments, materials, and techniques for remediation of skills. They perform and participate in staffing's to complete the placement process for Exceptional Student Education/ESE, (i.e., IEPs and develop IEP goals based on the student's present levels of performance). School Improvement Plan duties include consulting with ESE team members and general education teachers to provide additional strategies and interventions to support MTSS and the implementation of IEP/504 accommodations according to State and Federal regulations. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Glenn, Kim | Curriculum Resource Teacher | This Resource Teacher serves as an Interventionalist and Instructional Coach in the area of reading interventions. She works along with the Reading Coach to design, execute and assess individualized student plans based on various factors such as student needs and resources. Goals include ensuring academic decisions are data driven and planning appropriate supports for students and teachers to increase achievement. Efforts are also coordinated with the MTSS Team to put proper interventions in place to help students acquire mastery of grade level standards. |
| Smith, Mis'Shaylanqua | Curriculum Resource Teacher | This Resource Teacher serves as an Interventionalist and Instructional Coach in the area of math interventions. She works along with the Leadership Team to design, execute and assess individualized student plans based on various factors such as student needs and resources. Goals include ensuring academic decisions are data-driven and planning appropriate support for students and teachers to increase achievement. Efforts are also coordinated with the MTSS Team to plan and implement proper interventions to help students acquire mastery of grade-level standards. |
| Lynn, Jeneen | SAC Member | This SAC member serves as the Lead for the Conley School Improvement Plan. In addition to facilitating the creation of the plan and managing quarterly meetings for monitoring and progress checks, she also serves as the MTSS Coordinator for the school. She is responsible for organizing and facilitating planned meetings to ensure educational services and resources are aligned with individual student needs. |
| Bailey, Carol | Instructional Media | The Instructional Media Specialist fosters a welcoming and flexible environment so that the media center is an essential part of the learning community. She develops and maintains resources appropriate to the curriculum, the learners, and instructional strategies of the school. More specifically the media specialist provides lessons in the use of information/literacy skills, respect for intellectual property, digital citizenship, the use of print and non-print resources, research techniques, and conducts activities to provide integrated curriculum and technology-rich literacy experiences for all. Additionally, the media specialist establishes procedures for selection, acquisition, circulation, resource sharing of resources in all formats. Most importantly the Media Specialist promotes a love of reading and lifelong learning as a foundational skill for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment. |

**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 process we use to involve stakeholders is centered around planning and engagement. It includes ongoing communication, listening and collaboration. Stakeholders are engaged in clear communication, meetings, and opportunities for collaboration. Their input is used to set measurable goals, process problems, and plan for improvement.

**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))

We set specific dates to review and monitor our SIP on a regular basis for effective implementation and impact. The review dates are aligned with the short-term and long-term goals outlined in the SIP. A comprehensive analysis is conducted during each of these meetings. The meetings are set as a quarterly review. In addition, a tracking system is developed to assess where we stand as related to the measurable goals. Progress towards the goals are tracked to monitor and control the process. This approach allows us to make adjustments to plans if our achievement towards goals are far off the expected mark. The purpose is to remain aware of where we stand with regard to key elements that effect our goals for all students, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. A system for reviewing plans, coordinating services and outcomes will work to help us monitor and control goals and student outcomes. If an element in the plan is not working as expected, changes will be made when necessary. The SIP will be considered a fluid plan that can be tweaked and updated as our students and their needs change. The plan will be revised and updated as necessary, basing future projections on past performance.

| Demographic Data |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 |  |
| **2023-24 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 76% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 77% |
| **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) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) |

| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | 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)* |
|---|---|
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C<br><br>2019-20: C<br><br>2018-19: C<br><br>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 | 25 | 24 | 19 | 20 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| 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 | 1 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

**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 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 32 | 20 | 29 | 29 | 11 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 20 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 29 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 23 | 11 | 29 | 49 | 8 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |

**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 | 12 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 32 | 20 | 29 | 29 | 11 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 20 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 29 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 23 | 11 | 29 | 49 | 8 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |

**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 | 12 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

# II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 40 | 54 | 53 | 48 | 57 | 56 | 51 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 59 | | | 55 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42 | | | 57 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 41 | 56 | 59 | 45 | 47 | 50 | 44 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 39 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40 | | | 21 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 54 | 52 | 54 | 32 | 57 | 59 | 38 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 60 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 47 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 32 | 52 | 59 | 41 | | | 55 | | |

*\* 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](https://www.floridacims.org).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 209 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 363 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 21 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 2 | |
| HSP | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 53 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| WHT | 54 | | | |
| FRL | 31 | Yes | 3 | 1 |

| 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 | 32 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 48 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | |
| BLK | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 43 | | | |
| MUL | 59 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | Yes | 2 | |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 40 | | | 41 | | | 54 | | | | | 32 |
| SWD | 21 | | | 23 | | | 27 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 40 | | | 36 | | | | | | | 3 | 32 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | | | 75 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 35 | | | 42 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 36 | | | 19 | | | | | | | 4 | 38 |

### 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MUL | 47 | | | 59 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | | | 49 | | | 80 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 29 | | | 30 | | | 47 | | | | 5 | 20 |

### 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 48 | 59 | 42 | 45 | 56 | 40 | 32 | | | | | 41 |
| SWD | 22 | 46 | 36 | 21 | 46 | 35 | 18 | | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 60 | | 48 | 60 | | 40 | | | | | 41 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 78 | 85 | | 83 | 85 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 49 | 40 | 37 | 48 | 37 | 20 | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 62 | | 26 | 33 | | | | | | | 47 |
| MUL | 57 | 53 | | 57 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 74 | | 58 | 67 | | 60 | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 54 | 46 | 30 | 47 | 42 | 18 | | | | | |

### 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 | 51 | 55 | 57 | 44 | 39 | 21 | 38 | | | | | 55 |
| SWD | 15 | 50 | 54 | 23 | 31 | 20 | 9 | | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | | | 52 | 40 | | 18 | | | | | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 43 | 27 | 31 | 28 | 19 | 30 | | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | 50 |
| MUL | 50 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 72 | | 56 | 44 | | 47 | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| FRL | 31 | 47 | 45 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 32 | | | | | |

**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 | 50% | 55% | -5% | 54% | -4% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 57% | -18% | 58% | -19% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 52% | -14% | 50% | -12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 57% | -22% | 59% | -24% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 58% | -13% | 61% | -16% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 52% | -1% | 55% | -4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 50% | 2% | 51% | 1% |

## 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.**

For Math, student proficiency is a challenge. Based on the 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring (PM3) data, the area that performed the lowest was Grade 3 FAST Mathematics, with 64% of students scoring below a level 3. When comparing the PM3 math data with the other grade levels, the following was observed: 4th grade had 55% of students scoring below a level 3 and 5th grade had 48% of students scoring below a level 3. One pattern that is helping us to identify needs is the fact that our students in all grade levels as a whole are performing low in math. A clear trend that is evident across all subgroups is students are lacking concepts in knowledge of the basic math facts. They have not achieved automaticity of their facts, a common benchmark that demonstrates the ability to recall facts quickly. This skill is essential for students to master and tremendously impacts their future in mathematics.

As a solution, more opportunities for students to practice recalling the facts will be provided. Additionally, more concrete and hands-on modeling and practice will be incorporated. This will helps students to visualize the concepts and make connections between the different facts.

A clear trend that has emerged is with our subgroups, students with disabilities, Black/American Students and economically disadvantaged students. Since 2019, the students with disabilities' subgroup which is 32% has not risen to the level required by ESSA, which is 41% proficiency in ELA and Math. In 2021, our African American subgroup had 39% percent proficiency and economically disadvantaged at 39%.

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

Our greatest decline was fourth grade reading proficiency. In 2022, Compared to PM1 to PM3 students scoring level remained the same. The state average was 23%.

Interventions was not implemented with fidelity and monitored closely for progress.

**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 data component with the greatest gap was ELA. There was a 23 point difference from the state. Many of our students in grades 3rd through 5th are missing the foundational components of reading. In addition to lacking phonics skills, knowledge of phonemic awareness, and decoding, students are also defiant in the areas of background knowledge and vocabulary. As a result of these deficiencies, by the time they are in the intermediate grades, students struggle with reading to learn/comprehension and therefore have challenges with the mastery of standards and their grade level standards.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the learning gains in ELA and Math. FSA 2021-2022 ELA Learning gains were 59% and FSA 2021-2022 Math Learning Gains were 56%.

New actions taken in this area that contributed to academic improvement were increased focus, support, professional development, and programs that provided educational support. Strategic staff development to enhance teacher knowledge in the area of Math and data usage as well as sufficiently scheduled and effectively used time for instruction. We also changed how we provided interventions to students to ensure every student's needs were being met.

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

Two areas of concern are Suspension and Attendance below 90%. In 2018 there were only 78 students that were below the 90% in attendance, and only 7 students that were suspended. In 2019, Attendance below 90% was 107 students and 87 students had suspensions. These two pose a huge concern.

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

1. Increase to a minimum of 50 percent of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in all grade levels on the FAST Progress Monitoring ELA assessment.
2. Build a strong reading foundation in grades K-2
3. Additional focus and support to students in our lowest quartile for ELA and Math OR a focus on points and gains (inches before feet) ...Demonstration of learning gains in ELA and Mathematics
4. Specific and targeted support to meet teacher and student needs (MTSS support)
5. Positive Culture and Environment with a focus on teacher retention

increased accountability and focus on data driven systems to move student achievement

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

## #1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher 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.

Building a positive school culture and establishing a healthy environment for all stakeholders at Conley Elementary is very important for faculty members, students, and school growth. Positive school culture is one main key to our success. We believe in the saying that "If you create a great place to work, great work takes place." The following strategies are used to help build a positive culture at our school:
1. Strong Leadership with an established vision to include clear expectations and priorities
2. Collaboration which involves asking questions and soliciting input from stakeholders
3. Communication
4. Encouragement, Support, and Celebrations
5. Relationships

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

The school's plan to measure the outcome by establishing a PBIS team, promote Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), curriculum (reading and math) afterschool events.

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

The area will be monitored by attending meetings and receiving feedback from faculty, staff, parents and community partners.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@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.)

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based, tiered framework for supporting students' behavioral, academic, social, emotional, and mental health. When implemented with fidelity, PBIS improves social emotional competence, academic success, and school climate. It also improves teacher health and wellbeing. It is a way to create positive, predictable, equitable and safe learning environments where everyone thrives.

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

PBIS is not a curriculum you purchase or something you learn during a one-day professional development training. It is an ongoing commitment to supporting students, educators, and families through systems change. When you implement PBIS well, students experience improved behavioral, social, emotional, and academic outcomes; schools and programs reduce their use of exclusionary discipline practices and improve their overall climate.

### 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.

Team will meet with district PBIS staff on the following days: Day 1 will take place on Wed., September 20, 2023, Day 2 will take place on Friday, October 20, 2023, and Day 3 will take place on Tuesday, November 28, 2023.

**Person Responsible:** Jeneen Lynn (lynnj@leonschools.net)

**By When:** May 2024

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

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

Our students with disabilities are below the federal index of 41%, and have been so for one year. Currently they are at 39% and their target is 41%

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

Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our Black/African American students to 50% proficiency in math and reading.

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

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, Savvas and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, Savvas and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups.

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

Our desire is to engage all students at high levels of thinking that will produce deeper understanding. Teachers will plan together and focus on high yield strategies that target differentiation and intervention.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

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

No

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

1. Identify students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to a have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards on the FAST progress monitoring and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop

appropriate and impactful instruction.

5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

**Person Responsible:** Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

**By When:** May 2024

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

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

An area of focus is to increase the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) performing at the proficiency level on the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA and Math. The goal is to increase the percentage above 41%. To help meet this goal, Conley has developed a support system for academic interventions aligned to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities. An intervention plan has been devised to provide targeted support to students. The plan will prescribe interventions to help students acquire academic standards, and ensure they are engaged in both ongoing progress monitoring and annual assessments
This area was identified as a critical need based on subgroup data for students with disabilities that show a percentage of proficiency below 41% in the previous school year.
Goals for Students with Disabilities:
1. Ensure targeted interventions are received to meet individual student needs
2. Engage in ongoing progress monitoring and ensure participation in Baseline Assessments as well as Annual State Assessments
3. Set individual student goals based on needs and standards
Evidence-based action steps will be taken to achieve the goals including hiring an intervention coach, providing additional support for group size reduction, planning for targeted curriculum for intervention support, providing guidance on differentiation, the use of assessments and instructional rigor as well as conducting observations to provide support and guidance on improvement.

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

At least 51% of our students with disabilities will make a learning gain on the 2022 FAST Progress Monitoring 2.

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

The area of focus will be monitored with the use of iReady Math, STAR Reading / STAR Math, and Lexia. In
addition, to monthly data meetings, ongoing progress monitoring, classroom and intervention group assessments, and feedback/support from administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

The area of focus will be monitored with the use of iReady Math, STAR Reading / STAR Math, and Lexia. In
addition, to monthly data meetings, ongoing progress monitoring, classroom and intervention group assessments, and feedback/support from administration.

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

Evidence-based action steps will be taken to achieve the goals including hiring an intervention coach, providing additional support for group size reduction, planning for targeted curriculum for intervention support, providing guidance on differentiation, the use of assessments and instructional rigor as well as conducting observations to provide support and guidance on improvement.

**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.

Targeting planning between ESE and Regular Education Teachers Ongoing discussions about data and its implications for instruction. In addition, professional development on effective usage of data administrators and coaches will monitor the implementation of curriculum and effective instructional strategies, observations in classrooms with feedback provided by the administrative team, and provide support through an instructional coach and intervention specialist.

**Person Responsible:** Ben Threadgill (threadgillb@leonschools.net)

**By When:** May 2024

**#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

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

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

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

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

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

No

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

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

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

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

Our economically disadvantaged students are below the federal index of 41%, and have been so for two consecutive years. Currently they are at 39% and their target is 41%

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

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, STAR and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups.

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

By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students with disabilities and provide the required intensive interventions necessary for academic gains. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based coaches will provide the opportunities for teachers to have
the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains and proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

Our desire is to engage our economically disadvantaged students at high levels of thinking that will produce deeper understanding. Teachers will plan together and focus on high yield strategies that target differentiation and intervention.

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

To promote academic success in students from economically disadvantaged households effectively, it is crucial to find the developmental pathways through which family economic circumstances affect children's academic outcomes. Some of these pathways, such as executive function, may be more amenable to intervention than others

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

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

No

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

1. Identify students at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to a have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards on the FAST progress monitoring and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:**

## 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 improvement funds will be utilize by providing teachers with professional development opportunities with positive behavior systems, attendance interventions, MTSS processes and procedures, Kagan cooperative learning structures, and instructional learning walks. The areas if concern are students with disabilities, economically disadvantages, and African American.

## 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

According to 2022-2023 STAR data, results showed in kindergarten 23% of the students are below grade-level benchmarks in ELA, first grade 43% of the are below grade-level benchmarks in ELA, and in second grade 56% of the students are below grade-level benchmarks in ELA.

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

According to 2022-2023 FSA school data, in third grade 61% did not show proficiency in ELA, fourth grade 61% of the students did not show proficiency, and in fifth grade 50% did not show proficiency.

**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

Increase reading proficiency in Grades K-2 as measured by the STAR (FAST) data
Monitoring. At least 50% of our students with disabilities will make a learning gain.
Kindergarten STAR Early Literacy - end of the year assessment 78%
1st Grade STAR Early Literacy - end of the year assessment 74%
2nd Grade STAR Early Literacy - end of year assessment 45%

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase proficiency in Grades 3, 4, and 5 as measured by the FAST and STAR. With a focus on fourth grade proficiency level increase of at least 50%.

## Monitoring

### Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Area of Focus will be monitored using progress monitoring data through STAR, Savvas, and FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments, as well as formative and summative assessments. In addition, support will be provided on the use of evidence-based strategies to improve student achievement outcomes. Guidance from the MTSS team on specific students identified as in need of extra support to meet standards or grade level expectations will also help to make decisions and guide instructions. The implementation of the use of curriculums and computer-based instructional tools with fidelity will be monitored. Reports and data provided from these resources will also be used. Monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held to include data analysis and planning of instructional implications for students.

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

Threadgill, Ben, threadgillb@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?

ESE teachers are working closely with the regular education teachers to meet the needs of the students. Lesson Plans are targeted for deficient areas. New instructional personnel have been hired to meet the needs of the students. Evidence-Based Practices included:
Intervention Block
Literacy team ( reading coach and intervention specialists)
Professional Development with Best Standards, New ELA Curriculum, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, Lexia (focusing on phonics and phonemic awareness). Including New Teacher Book Study - Mindset/ The New Psychology of Success
Monthly data meeting
Teacher Modeling/Co-Teaching
Common Planning Time

**Rationale:**
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The monitoring of program usage and data analysis will lead to discussions, planning, and further improvement of instructional practices for teachers. As a result, students will have an enriched environment which will lead to effective classroom engagement and increased learning. The identified need is for fourth grade to show proficiency on state assessments by 50%. The resources/practices and programs such as science-based reading interventions is focused on student's area of deficiency in ELA.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Targeting planning between ESE and Regular Education Teachers as well as Monthly Meetings with ESE staff to review data and alter plans. In addition, weekly team meetings to provide literacy coaching and professional development with the BEST standards and intensive interventions. | Threadgill, Ben, threadgillb@leonschools.net |