

Leon County Schools

Kate Sullivan Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	30
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kate Sullivan Elementary School

927 MICCOSUKEE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32308

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Kate Sullivan Elementary is to prepare students to become responsible, respectful independent learners equipped with the critical thinking skills necessary to compete in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kate Sullivan will be an engaging, safe, respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lawson, Julie	Principal	Coordinates administrative oversight and plans all phases of instructional leadership to Kate Sullivan. Develops standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises procedures, budgets expenses, hires and evaluates staff and oversees facilities.
Moore, Leslie	Assistant Principal	Supports all efforts of the principal, develops schoolwide schedules (master, lunch, duty, etc) coordinates state standardized testing, works alongside the student recognition and discipline committee, assists the paraprofessional and custodial staff members, provides instructional feedback for teachers, assists with coordinating schoolwide events (i.e. orientation and open house), and attends monthly leadership and faculty meetings.
Owen, Christie	Math Coach	Leads Curriculum Planning Team projects and teacher meetings, provides support for the unpacking of core content standards and programs, provides coaching and mentoring to all teachers, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and analysis, works with small groups of targeted students, works with district coaches to ensure that all instructional needs of teachers are met, and participates in monthly leadership and faculty meetings.
Railey, Toylene	School Counselor	Leads the school as Referral Coordinator ensuring the timely occurrence of meetings and compliance with federal mandates for the MTSS process. Serves as the 504 and ESOL Coordinator and is a member of the Suicide/Threat Assessment Team to ensure the safety of all students on campus. Provides small group or individual sessions for students who benefit from more in-depth social support.
Maloney, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Maloney serves as our fourth grade team leader. Team leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Allbritton, Ashley	Other	Works as an intervention specialist to support the growth and success of students. Works alongside the Literacy and Math Coaches to design, execute and assess individual 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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stoev, Necole	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Stoev serves as our first grade team leader. Team leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Williams, Haley	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Williams (Harrell) serves as our second grade team leader. Team leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Wetherington, April	Instructional Coach	Leads Curriculum Planning Team projects and teacher meetings, provides support for the unpacking of core content standards and programs, provides coaching and mentoring to all teachers, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and analysis, coordinates schoolwide reading interventions, plans/provides professional development and school improvement plan implementation process, works with district coaches to ensure that all instructional needs of teachers are met, and works with small groups of targeted students.
Lockhart, Kenisha	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Lockhart serves as our third grade team leader. Team leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Westfall-Crouch, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Westfall-Crouch serves as our Special Area team leader. Team leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Robertson, Takisha	Other	Works as an intervention specialist to support the growth and success of students. Works alongside the Literacy and Math Coaches to design, execute and assess individual 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.

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 Kate Sullivan Leadership team initiates the School Improvement Plan and the school data to determine areas of improvement and success. After these areas are identified, the Kate Sullivan leadership team develops plans for improvement in identified areas. After the development of the School Improvement Plan, the School Advisory Committee convenes and discusses the proposed plan.

Members of the School Advisory Committee include:

Linda Strickland (parent)

Katie Kone (parent)

Fredricka and Marc Wilson (Parents)

Ryan Lawson (Business Partner)

Alex Whitlock (Business Partner)

School Advisory Committee members provide feedback about the proposed plan and offer suggestions to amend the plan if needed. Once the Committee agrees to the School Improvement Plan, the plan is voted on and formalized.

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))

Monitoring of the School Improvement Plan will occur quarterly after progress monitoring data has been collected. The leadership team will review the goals and collaboratively develop strategies to continue success or develop modifications to support students. Instructional coaches will hold monthly curriculum meetings to identify strategies and practices to support students to ensure the closure of achievement gaps. When needed, the leadership team will create additional goals and action plans to further support mastery of grade level standards for all students.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	67%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	24	20	22	17	22	0	0	0	110	
One or more suspensions	0	11	10	11	21	10	0	0	0	63	
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	4	27	28	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	24	0	0	0	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	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	5	1	5	13	14	0	0	0	38

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	8	3	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	12	11	14	8	10	8	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	3	25	18	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	25	26	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	14
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	12	11	14	8	10	8	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	3	25	18	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	25	26	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	14
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*	53	54	53	56	57	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				54			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			14		
Math Achievement*	54	56	59	54	47	50	48		
Math Learning Gains				56			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			32		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	67	52	54	56	57	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	4	
ELL	75			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	73			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	42			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	53			54			67					75
SWD	33			34			36				4	
ELL											1	75
AMI												
ASN	68			68							2	
BLK	35			36			39				4	
HSP	70			70							3	
MUL	52			44							3	
PAC												
WHT	72			72			90				4	
FRL	42			41			41				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	56	54	38	54	56	38	56					
SWD	38	39	14	35	52	33	32					
ELL	30			40								
AMI												
ASN	67			67								
BLK	41	48	32	37	43	37	40					
HSP	52	53		54	59		45					
MUL	54	57		50	50							
PAC												
WHT	72	59		73	70		74					
FRL	41	49	44	38	56	46	37					

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	59	37	14	48	44	32	40					
SWD	36			24	30							
ELL	30			40								

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
AMI												
ASN	67			83								
BLK	45	23	19	30	49	41	21					
HSP	73			50								
MUL	50			33								
PAC												
WHT	75	53		68	42		65					
FRL	39	12	13	27	29	38	11					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	58%	5%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	51%	17%

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.

Third grade ELA showed the lowest performance at 49% proficiency according to FAST data. There were several factors that contributed to the low performance. Two classes began the year with substitutes while looking for a qualified teacher to fill the positions. 6 of the 7 third grade team members were new to Kate Sullivan, two of them being first year teachers. Perhaps, however, the biggest contributing factor for this group of students was the pandemic. These students were in kindergarten when the schools were shuttered in March and many of these students attended school virtually during their first-grade school year.

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

Third grade Math showed the greatest decline in proficiency from the 2022-2023 school year according to FAST data. There were several factors that contributed to the low performance. Two classes began the year with substitutes while looking for a qualified teacher to fill the positions. 6 of the 7 third grade team members were new to Kate Sullivan, two of them being first year teachers. Perhaps, however, the biggest contributing factor for this group of students was the pandemic. These students were in kindergarten when the schools were shuttered in March and many of these students attended school virtually during their first-grade school year.

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.

Third grade math showed the greatest gap between Kate Sullivan students and the state average for math proficiency. There were several factors that contributed to the low performance. Two classes began the year with substitutes while looking for a qualified teacher to fill the positions. 6 of the 7 third grade team members were new to Kate Sullivan, two of them being first year teachers. Perhaps, however, the biggest contributing factor for this group of students was the pandemic. These students were in kindergarten when the schools were shuttered in March and many of these students attended school virtually during their first-grade school year.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 68 percent of students were proficient on the NGSS Science Assessment. This was an increase of 12 percentage points from the 2021-2022 school year. Since the 2020-2021 school year, the NGSS Science Assessment scores have increased 27 percentage points.

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

Attendance is an area that could show improvement in the 2023-2024 school year. The 2022-2023 school year EWS data shows that 3rd grade students attended school at a lower frequency than students in 4th grade. This could contribute to lower proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

1. Instructional Practices relating to ELA
2. Instructional Practices relating to Math
3. Positive Culture and Environment relating to Discipline

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Math learning gains among all students and within our lowest 25% is an area of critical need. The challenges of the past two school years have increased the need to focus on learning gains for all students. Additionally, a focus on this area will capture the learning needs of two of our sub groups (SWD and ELLs) that are performing below the federal index threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The three-year average for the lowest 25% in learning gains for math is 42%. We would like to see our learning gains in this area meet our performance in the 2023-2024 school year of 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored using state and district wide progress monitoring assessments as well as classroom assessments aligned to state standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Using evidence-based curriculum materials and intervention materials students will receive high impact, standards-aligned whole group instruction and differentiated small group instruction 3-5 per week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person Responsible: Christie Owen (owenc2@leonschools.net)

By When: September 11, 2023

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using Learning Progressions as a guide.

Person Responsible: Christie Owen (owenc2@leonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.

Person Responsible: Christie Owen (owenc2@leonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.

Person Responsible: Christie Owen (owenc2@leonschools.net)

By When: September 18, 2023

Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Christie Owen (owenc2@leonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

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

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

Reading among all students is a area of critical need. The challenge of the past few years have increased the need to focus on learning gains for all students. Additionally, a focus on this area will capture the learning needs of two of our sub groups (SWD and ELLs) that are performing below the federal index threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2021-2022 school year 53% of all students showed learning gains in ELA and we would like to see our students maintain or exceed this in the 2023-2024 school year.

In 2022, 14% of students with disabilities, who were also in the lowest 25th percentile showed learning gains. In the 2023-2024 school year, we would like to see 30% of students in this subgroup to show learning gains.

In 2022, 32% of black students in the lowest 25 percentile showed learning gains on the state assessment. In the 2023-2024 school year, we would like to see 45% of students in this subgroup to show learning gains.

In 2022, 30% of ELL students showed proficiency on the state assessment. In the 2023-2024 school year, we would like to see 40 percent of students in the subgroup to show proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring assessments will be used to monitor for improvement in this area in addition to regularly administered classroom assessments aligned to the state standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Using evidence-based curriculum materials and intervention materials students will receive high impact, standards-aligned whole group instruction and differentiated small group instruction 3-5 per week. This year we are using evidenced based -materials and being intentional with the assignment of interventions for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students thrive in small group learning that is targeted at their individual level. This allows students to strategically target areas of weakness, fill those gaps, and rejoin their classmates quickly without missing key concepts needed to be successful in the future.

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.

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

Person Responsible: April Wetherington (wetheringtonm@leonschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Person Responsible: April Wetherington (wetheringtonm@leonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.

Person Responsible: April Wetherington (wetheringtonm@leonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.

Person Responsible: April Wetherington (wetheringtonm@leonschools.net)

By When: September 11, 2023

Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible: April Wetherington (wetheringtonm@leonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

An increase in both minor (teacher managed) and major (office managed) incidents during the 2022-2023 school year highlighted an opportunity to revisit and revise our school-wide behavior management efforts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 376 incidents resulted in referrals. During the current school year we would like to see referrals decrease by 30%.

Monitoring:

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

The Student Recognition and Discipline committee will be meeting monthly to review discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@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 Student Recognition and Discipline committee has created a behavior flow chart and implemented a system of positive behavior and student recognition.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that rewarding positive behaviors allows students to connect their positive behaviors to the response to their behavior and therefore modify their behavior choices. Additionally, a behavior flow chart will allow for consistency in addressing student behaviors and provide for behavior interventions that supports students in order to avoid major behavior incidents that would require out-of-school suspensions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Create a Discipline Committee

Person Responsible: Leslie Moore (moorel1@leonschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

Develop a flow chart to specifically address student behaviors.

Person Responsible: Leslie Moore (moorel1@leonschools.net)

By When: August 1, 2023

Establish a reward plan to promote positive behavior.

Person Responsible: Leslie Moore (moorel1@leonschools.net)

By When: August 1, 2023

Participate in the District 3-day training with the Discipline and Reward committee leaders.

Person Responsible: Leslie Moore (moorel1@leonschools.net)

By When: November 28, 2023

Discipline and Reward Committee will meet monthly to discuss areas of concern and success.

Person Responsible: Leslie Moore (moorel1@leonschools.net)

By When: September 14, 2023

#4. 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.

According to the 2021-2022 Accountability Components by Subgroups 41% of our Black students scored at the proficient level in ELA on the state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is that 46 percent of Black students will score at the proficient level on the State's Progress Monitoring tool by PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will continue monthly beginning 8/10/23 to 5/24/2024.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@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.)

Academic Coaches will use progress monitoring data, classroom data and school data to develop a plan to support Black students who have not met the criteria for proficiency on the first Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Curriculum: To address academic deficiencies across subject areas, Kate Sullivan will purchase standards based supplemental materials aligned to the BEST standards. Supplemental materials include: Curriculum and Associates Ready Math books, Curriculum and Associates iReady toolkit, Reflex math, and Savvas Quick Reads.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective and Highly Effective teachers understanding of effective evidence-based practices is vital for supporting student achievement and closing achievement gaps. While many alternative pathway exist teachers know what content they must teach to address student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students who are not proficient on the first Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person Responsible: Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

By When: 9/11/2023

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to address academic areas to include areas of deficiencies, teaching activities, and student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

By When: 9/11/2023

#5. 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.

According to the 2021-2022 Accountability Components by Subgroups 35 percent of Students with Disabilities scored at the proficient level in ELA on the State Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 2023-2024 is that 43 percent of Students with Disabilities will score at the proficient level on the third State Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will continue monthly beginning 8/10/23 to 5/24/24.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@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.)

Academic Coaches will use progress monitoring data, classroom data and school data to develop a plan to support Students with Disabilities who have not met the criteria for proficiency on the first Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Curriculum: To address academic deficiencies across subject areas, Kate Sullivan will purchase standards based supplemental materials aligned to the BEST standards. Supplemental materials include: Curriculum and Associates Ready Math books, Curriculum and Associates iReady toolkit, Reflex math, and Savvas Quick Reads.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective and Highly Effective teachers understanding of effective evidence-based practices is vital for supporting student achievement and closing achievement gaps. While many alternative pathway exist teachers know what content they must teach to address student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students who are not proficient on the first Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person Responsible: Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

By When: 9/11/2023

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to address academic areas to include areas of deficiencies, teaching activities, and student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

By When: 9/11/2023

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

According to the 2021-2022 Accountability Components by Subgroups 30 percent of English Language Learners scored at the proficient level in ELA on the state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is that 35 percent of English Language Learners score at the proficient level on the third State's Progress Monitoring tool.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will continue monthly beginning 8/10/23 to 5/24/24.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@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.)

Academic Coaches will use progress monitoring data, classroom data and school data to develop a plan to support Black students who have not met the criteria for proficiency on the first Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Curriculum: To address academic deficiencies across subject areas, Kate Sullivan will purchase standards based supplemental materials aligned to the BEST standards. Supplemental materials include: Curriculum and Associates Ready Math books, Curriculum and Associates iReady toolkit, Reflex math, and Savvas Quick Reads.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective and Highly Effective teachers understanding of effective evidence-based practices is vital for supporting student achievement and closing achievement gaps. While many alternative pathway exist teachers know what content they must teach to address student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students who are not proficient on the first Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person Responsible: Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

By When: 9/11/23

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to address academic areas to include areas of deficiencies, teaching activities, and student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Julie Lawson (lawsonj2@leonschools.net)

By When: 9/11/2023

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).

Kate Sullivan School Advisory Council will review and approve the expenditures for School Improvement funds.