

Leon County Schools

Killearn Lakes 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

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

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.

Killearn Lakes Elementary School provides students with an equitable learning environment to create and develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Killearn Lakes will be an engaging, safe, and 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
Blair, Jenny	Principal	The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team leads the school community in communicating and implementing the school's vision. Specific responsibilities include: Financial administrator, parent and community communication, data collection and communication, staffing plan manager, lead administrator in site-based decision making.
Ricciardi, Champayne	Assistant Principal	The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. Specific responsibilities include: parent and community communication, data collection and communication, faculty and staff professional development, lead administrator in site-based decision making in absence of principal.
Crowe, Lisa	Reading Coach	Monitor student data, provide professional development to teachers, observe and provide feedback on teaching practices, provide reading interventions to students.

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.

Our School Advisory Council, made up of the school leadership team, teachers from each grade level including ESE and Special Area, school staff, parents/families, and business partners. After examining

school data from the previous 3 years, committee members collaborated to develop goals, strategies, supports, and a budget for providing those supports. The plan was then shared with the community where input was solicited. Once complete, it was voted on for approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The leadership team will meet at least monthly with every grade level to assess current data and monitor for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of our students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Should we find a need to revise our SIP, we will meet again with our School Advisory Counsel to discuss the issues and revise our plan accordingly.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	12	7	12	15	11	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	4	6	0	0	0	14	
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	0	10	10	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	6	2	15	13	10	0	0	0	47	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	11

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	14	5	15	10	13	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	5	8	2	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	6	4	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	9	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	12	0	0	0	33	
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	1	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	17
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	7	14	5	15	10	13	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	5	8	2	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	6	4	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	9	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	12	0	0	0	33
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	1	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	17
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*	72	54	53	75	57	56	78		
ELA Learning Gains				66			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			58		
Math Achievement*	70	56	59	73	47	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				55			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			38		
Science Achievement*	77	52	54	77	57	59	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		52	59						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
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	47			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	62			
HSP	67			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	55			

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	54			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	64			
HSP	57			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	63			

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	72			70			77					
SWD	54			46			41				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	76			94							2	
BLK	69			47			71				3	
HSP	65			63			65				4	
MUL	86			68							3	
PAC												
WHT	72			72			79				4	
FRL	58			44			65				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	75	66	64	73	55	44	77					
SWD	52	54	47	60	50	56	62					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	83			82								
BLK	81	81		55	40							
HSP	67	53		78	43	27	75					
MUL	75			81								
PAC												
WHT	76	65	64	73	57	44	78					
FRL	73	70	67	60	53	30	88					

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	78	69	58	73	50	38	77					
SWD	55	75	60	55	44		40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	94			94								
BLK	70	53		58	47		47					
HSP	71	55		66	36		82					
MUL	78			78								
PAC												
WHT	79	72	60	75	49	47	79					
FRL	58	45		55	38		71					

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	82%	55%	27%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	57%	17%	58%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	57%	15%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	52%	22%	55%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	51%	26%

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.

Math, specifically fourth grade math, showed the lowest performance. We believe that these students are still feeling the impact of distance learning for at least one quarter of the school year, and for some, up to two years.

Although we switched from the FSA to FAST, our math scores have maintained a declining trend from third to fourth and from fourth to fifth grades. Although learning gains could not be calculated last year because it was the first year the assessment was given, in looking at prior years FSA scores, the percent of our students making learning gains, both overall and the bottom quartile, in math went up from 2021 to 2022.

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

The math scores from the 2021 third grade students that moved to fourth grade in 2022 declined four percentile points. The 2022 third grade students that moved to fourth grade in 2023 declined seven percentile points; bear in mind that they were different assessments.

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.

We are above the state and district average in ELA, math, and science.

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

The ELA scores from the 2021 fourth grade students that moved to fifth grade in 2022 increased five percentile points. The 2022 fourth grade students that moved to fifth grade in 2023 increased eleven percentile points; bear in mind that they were different assessments. Our 5th grade classes implemented Walk and Grow during interventions.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern. Often times, families take vacation during the school year causing their children to miss multiple days of school. We require that they complete all missed assignments and keep a journal regarding the educational value of their trip, but that does not replace in person learning.

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

Our highest priority is improving our math scores at every level. Our second priority is challenging our bubble students and our high achievers.

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.

We are receiving fewer and fewer applicants when we advertise for a teaching position making it difficult for us to fill those positions and to fill them with qualified teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to fill 100% of our teacher positions with qualified teachers by the start of the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Our staffing plan and Skyward will reflect our status.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenny Blair (blairj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will use a "Grow Your Own" approach whereby we work closely with Florida State University, Florida Agriculture and Mechanical University, Tallahassee Community College, and Chiles High School to have students interested in exploring a potential career in Elementary Education as well as those already in an Elementary and/or Exceptional Education program placed at Killearn Lakes for their field experiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Not only will this allow us to foster their interest in becoming a teacher, but also provide an opportunity for them to get to know our community, our procedures, our values and how we work as a system. This will allow high school students to explore teaching as a career option prior to going to college where they are otherwise expected to choose a major with no real experiences on which to base their decision.

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.

Communication and coordination with FSU, FAMU, TCC, and CHS.

Person Responsible: Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@leonschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

#2. 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.

In looking at data trends, our math scores have declined by 17 points over the last five years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall math score will increase by at least two points on the 2023-2024 FAST math assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor growth throughout the year using FAST Progress Monitoring, iReady, and Waggle diagnostic and growth measures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@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.)

All math teachers will attend professional development specifically focused on using manipulatives to teach math concepts, then demonstrate application of the practice in their daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Manipulatives allow students to connect concrete models to abstract concepts and make meaningful math connections

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

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

Our Bottom Quartile scores increased by several points in both ELA and Math, while our overall scores went down indicating that we need to focus on strengthening our instruction for our bubble kids and higher achievers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall ELA scores will increase by at least 2% points.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our students' growth in reading using data from FAST Progress Monitoring, Lexia, and STAR Reading diagnostic and growth measures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Crowe (crowel@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will focus on differentiating reading instruction with an emphasis on stretching our average and high achievers. Grades K and 1 will not change classrooms, while grades 2-5 will "walk and read" according to their individual needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our data shows that only fifth grade has made positive gains on their overall ELA scores so when we looked at what they do differently, it was walk and read. This will be done during our "Intervention" time and will allow us to provide high-yield lessons that meet the needs of students. Since we are making gains in our Bottom Quartile scores, we need to have a way to also strengthen our average and above students.

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

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)).

Our School Advisory Council will review our proposed school improvement expenditures.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$9,399.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	3900	0481 - Killearn Lakes Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	768.0	\$2,700.00
			<i>Notes: Math Manipulative Teacher Training</i>			
	5100	140	0481 - Killearn Lakes Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	768.0	\$6,699.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for collaborative planning</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	5100	0481 - Killearn Lakes Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	768.0	\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Book sets to enhance reading stamina and challenge our readers.</i>			
Total:						\$10,399.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes