

Leon County Schools

Pineview 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	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pineview Elementary School

2230 LAKE BRADFORD RD, Tallahassee, FL 32310

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

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.

Our mission is to collaborate with parents and students to motivate and develop positive relationships in order to formulate an exciting learning environment. The ultimate goal is to empower our students to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our aim is to produce life-long learners who will become caring and productive citizens who function successfully in a changing-global community. At Pineview, we are seeking to inspire a love for learning that will permeate throughout the school and the community.

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
Conner, Carmen	Principal	To provide leadership, direction, and coordination within the school.
McKhan, Oronde	Assistant Principal	To assist Principal Conner with leadership, direction, and coordination within the school.
Mello, Rebecca	Other	Mrs. Mello will assess, prevent, diagnose, treat speech language, social and cognitive communication to our 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.

Stakeholder involvement is paramount to the success of our school. The administrators and the stakeholders at Pineview are on one accord with the School Improvement Plan. The stakeholder was involved with setting the goals throughout formulating this plan.

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 SIP will be monitored every nine weeks for all of our students and not only for students with the greatest achievement gap. If the current plan is not working, we will pivot and make the necessary changes to interventions and/or the curriculum.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F
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	2	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	9	
One or more suspensions	0	1	8	4	7	8	0	0	0	28	
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	17	12	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	8	0	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	9	19	18	13	8	0	0	0	83	

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	2	0	5	2	6	9	0	0	0	24

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	3	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	27	12	16	13	13	20	0	0	0	101	
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	1	0	9	0	0	0	17	
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	20	17	18	0	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	10	18	0	0	0	40	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	7	5	20	5	15	0	0	0	55	

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	3	7	5	20	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	15
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	27	12	16	13	13	20	0	0	0	101	
One or more suspensions	2	4	1	1	0	9	0	0	0	17	
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	20	17	18	0	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	10	18	0	0	0	40	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	7	5	20	5	15	0	0	0	55	

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	3	7	5	20	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	15
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*	38	54	53	35	57	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				58			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				77			36		
Math Achievement*	51	56	59	55	47	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				75			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			25		
Science Achievement*	31	52	54	37	57	59	19		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	202
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
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	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	37	Yes	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	55			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	65			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	62			

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	38			51			31					50
SWD	34			31							2	
ELL											1	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			48			26				4	
HSP	50			58							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	37			48			33				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	35	58	77	55	75	74	37					
SWD	32	60	73	42	76	73	31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	32	54	75	54	74	73	31					
HSP	60			70								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	37	61	80	57	79	88	34					

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	32	36	36	33	25	25	19					
SWD	20	31		21	35		23					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	27	36	28	19	20	15					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	30	36	36	31	23	31	19					

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	43%	55%	-12%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	28%	52%	-24%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	28%	50%	-22%	51%	-23%

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.

The data showed that our students under performed in Science this past school year. Our Science score decreased by 6%. The contributing factor to last year's Science scores is the lack of prior knowledge. As a school, we have to do a better job in teaching Science.

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

The data showed that our students had the greatest decline in Science this past school year. Our Science score decreased by 6%. The contributing factor to last year's Science scores is the lack of prior knowledge. As a school, we have to do a better job in teaching Science.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA proficiency scores. The contributing factors to this need for improvement is absenteeism. On Mondays and Fridays, we are experiencing about 40-50 students being absent.

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

The data component improved the most was ELA proficiency ELA improved by 9%. The administrators provided the teachers with all of the resources (Professional development, co-teaching, one on one coaching and bi-weekly data reviews) they needed, and they felt supported. Administrators also had an open-door policy that allowed teachers to have constant communication and feedback following walkthroughs, daily instruction, informal, and formal walkthroughs.

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

The first potential concern would be the percentage of students that are below 90%. The second potential area of concern would be students who earned Level 1's on last year's Progress Monitoring assessment.

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

1. Safety 4. Lower suspension rate
2. Cultural and Moral 5. Improving test scores in all area.
3. Attendance

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 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.

On the 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment, 44% of our students were proficient.

SWD- 26%

ELL- 43%

BLK- 33

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome we hope to achieve is 45%. We hope to achieve our proficiency score by implementing the core curriculum with fidelity and provide the necessary interventions to assist all of our students who need it.

The measurable outcome we hope to achieve with our subgroups are...

SWD- 27%

ELL- 50%

BLK- 35%

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly check-ins and bi-weekly data review meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Conner (connerc@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 are being strategic on how we are targeting our students. We have provided baseline assessments from STAR Reading and Lexia Based on the results, we are providing some of our fragile learners with small group interventions. Some of the interventions we are using, but are not limited to are: Amira, Bridge the Gap, Lindamood Bell, Read 180, and Reading Mastery

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is all students are not on the same level academically. Therefore, we are providing a multitude of interventions that have been researched to assist the students with their deficiencies in ELA.

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. Monitoring Data
2. Analyzing Data
3. Receiving Intensive Intervention from an adult based off of data
4. Additional Minutes
5. Smaller Intervention Groups

Person Responsible: Carmen Conner (connerc@leonschools.net)

By When: This will be monitored through classroom observations and walkthroughs. The monitoring will be weekly and bi-weekly.

#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.

On the 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment, 55% of our students were proficient.

SWD- 37%

ELL- %43

BLK- 48%

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome we hope to achieve is 56%. We hope to achieve our proficiency goal by implementing the core curriculum with fidelity and provide the necessary interventions to assist all of our students who need it.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly check-ins and bi-weekly data review meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Conner (connerc@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 are being strategic on how we are targeting our students. We have provided baseline assessments from STAR Math. Based on the results, we are providing some of our fragile learners with small group interventions. Some of the interventions we are using i-Ready, Acaletics, and Standards Based Assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is all students are not on the same level academically. Therefore, we are providing a multitude of interventions that have been researched to assist the students with their deficiencies in Math.

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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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 not an ATSI or TSI school. However, I would like to address how many students were suspended this past school year. We had 28 students who received one or more suspensions based off of EWS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable out come we hope to achieve is 10 or less students being suspended.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored throughout the school year using our schoolwide behavior system.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Oronde McKhan (mckhano@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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we are able to achieve the measurable outcome, we should be able to receive our goal of becoming an A school. If students are inside of the classroom without causing a disturbance to others, every students can learn without any disruptions.

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).

My school is not on the CSI, TSI, and ATSI list.

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

77% of our kindergarteners went to first grade proficient.

67% of our first graders were proficient going into second grade.

59% of our students were proficient going into third grade.

Therefore, 56% of our current first and second graders are not proficient. Those students will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. For Tier 2 interventions, those first graders will receive Hardman and Lexia Skill Builders. For Tier 3 first graders, those particular students will receive Hardman and Lindamood Bell.

The 41% of our rising third graders will receive Bridge the Gap, Reading Mastery, Amira, and Lindamood Bell for Tier 2 interventions and for Tier 3, those students will use Read 180, Amira, Bridge the Gap, Lindamood Bell, and Reading Mastery. With interventions in place, the students will receive exactly what they need in order for them to be successful.

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

41% of third, fourth, and fifth graders were proficient on Progress Monitoring 3. Therefore, 59% of those students were not proficient. The students who were proficient will receive Tier 1 Interventions and the students who were not proficient will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. For Tier 2 interventions, third, fourth, and fifth grade students will use Amira, Bridge the Gap, Lindamood Bell, and Reading Mastery. For Tier 3 interventions, the third, fourth, and fifth grade students will use Read 180, Amira, Bridge the Gap, Lindamood Bell, and Reading Mastery. With those aforementioned interventions in place, all 59% of the students who were not proficient will get exactly what they are lacking in Reading/ELA.

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

The measurable outcome we hope to achieve is 80% of our kindergarteners, first, and second grade are proficient when they are promoted to the next grade. We hope to achieve our proficiency score by implementing the core curriculum with fidelity and provide the necessary interventions to assist all of our students who need it.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcome we hope to achieve is 55% of our third, fourth, and fifth grade are proficient on Progress monitoring 3 in ELA/Reading. We hope to achieve our proficiency score by implementing the core curriculum with fidelity and provide the necessary interventions to assist all of our students who need it.

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 schools area of focus will be monitored by having formal and informal observations and walkthroughs. The ongoing monitoring will last all year. The focus will be monitored by STAR, STAR Early Literacy, Progress Monitoring assessments, unit assessments, benchmark checklists, and Lexia. The area of focus will be monitored through weekly check-ins and biweekly meetings.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Conner, Carmen, connerc@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?

K-2- The evidence-based programs we use are UFLI, SAVVAS, Heggerty, Lexia, Story Champs, Magnetix, and Hardman.

3-5- The evidence-based programs we use are Amira, Bridge the Gap, Magnetic, SAVVAS, Top Score, Lindamood Bell, Reading Mastery, and Lexia.

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 rationale for selecting these programs are because they focus on the needs of the students..

Therefore, we are providing a multitude of interventions that have been researched to assist the students with their deficiencies 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
Literacy Coach- Our Literacy Coach will plan, teach, and evaluate instruction for students having difficulties with reading. She will will also provide Professional Development.	
.Literacy Leadership- The Literacy Leadership team will consist of Admins, Literacy Coach, and teacher leaders at the school. The Literacy Leadership team will analyze the data on a continuous basis and drive what direction our school goes in based on the data.	Conner, Carmen, connerc@leonschools.net
Analyzing Data- Break down the data with you teachers so that we all can see if the interventions are working.	Conner, Carmen, connerc@leonschools.net

Receiving Intensive Intervention from an adult based on their data.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

Our stakeholders are provided this information on our school website and our principal conveys the SIP in various after school programs/activities that are held for anyone in the community and parents.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by establishing an open line of communication such as emails, social media platforms, and sending home announcements when a program or meeting is held.

-We will also host events during and after school for the community and parents to be involved.

-We also introduced a mentor program where members of the community can come on campus and eat lunch with a student once a month if they pass the background check.

-We will keep our parents informed on their child's progress through conferences and the student portal.

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

The school plans to strengthen the academic program at school by...

- closely monitoring the instruction of all teachers.
- providing interventions to our fragile learners
- providing students with enriched activities that will challenge them

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

N/A