

Leon County Schools

# Raa Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>16</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>29</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>29</b> |

## Raa Middle School

401 W THARPE ST, Tallahassee, FL 32303

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

It is the mission of Augusta Raa Arts Magnet Middle School to provide an educational setting designed to prepare students to be successful lifelong learners. Through curricula and extracurricular activities, each student will have the opportunity to be active participants in the learning process and engage in activities that allow them to explore their individual interests.

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

It is the vision of Augusta Raa Arts Magnet Middle School to prepare all students to achieve in academics and the arts through inspiring investments in leadership and service.

### 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   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Scott, Marcus      | Principal           | As principal, Dr. Scott oversees the the daily operations of Raa Middle School. He manages the leadership team to ensure excellence and accountability to achieve school goals. |
| Browning, Kiffani  | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal (Gr. 8)<br>Oversees ELA/ESE and Guidance Departments  |
| Lynch, Kelly       | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal (Gr. 6)<br>Oversees Math and Social Studies Departments<br>Manager of Discipline and PBIS (School-Wide)   |
| Crouch, Logan      | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal (Gr. 7)<br>Oversees Science Department  |
| White, Cathy       | Dean                | Assist the Assistant Principal with Discipline<br>Oversees ICT and Industry Level Certifications<br>Co-Manager of PBIS (School-Wide)  |
| Williams, Hope     | School Counselor    | Guidance Department Chair   |
| Parker, Alma       | Teacher, K-12       | ELA/ESE Department Chair<br>Coaches Intensive Reading/Civics Teachers   |
| Aylward, Katharine | Teacher, K-12       | Arts Department Chair<br>Mentor for Beginning Teachers  |
| Ackerman, Shawn    | Teacher, K-12       | Social Studies Department Chair   |
| Lofton, Dabra      | Teacher, K-12       | Science Department Chair  |
| Preatto, Dorces    | Math Coach          | Math Coach/Department Chair   |
| Alford, Stacy      | Teacher, K-12       | Team Leader (Gr. 6)   |
| Robinson, Portia   | School Counselor    | Referral Coordinator<br>Manages MTSS Team<br>Team Leader (Gr. 7)  |

**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 development of the RMS School Improvement Plan was a collaborative process which included the input of the following stakeholders: School leadership team, faculty/staff, parents, and students. Faculty/Staff members were able to view school data to determine areas of focus and establish goals for the year. School leadership teams worked together to ensure adequate progress monitoring measures were in place. Parents and students complete surveys and questionnaires to provide feedback on our current academic processes and community involvement.

**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 includes the implementation of common planning and assessment to monitor student growth and achievement. After each assessment, data will be reviewed to determine next steps in developing students' skills to meet proficiency in our areas of focus. We will consistently progress monitor for evidence of success or improvement on at least a quarterly basis, collaborate, and make adjustments as necessary.

**Demographic Data**

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 74%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 79%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT) |



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C                                |
|   | 2019-20: C                                |
|   | 2018-19: C                                |
|   | 2017-18: B                                |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>  |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>  |   |

## Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |    |    |     | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7  | 8  |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98  | 69 | 67 | 234 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67  | 50 | 40 | 157 |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 16 | 3  | 20  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 7  | 0  | 7   |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 72 | 85 | 264 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 71 | 88 | 298 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45  | 22 | 22 | 89  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |    |    |     | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7  | 8  |     |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 69 | 63 | 235 |       |

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     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8     |

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

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |    |    |     | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7  | 8  |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 37 | 26 | 111 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 0  | 0  | 2   |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 37 | 9  | 48  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 13 | 5  | 18  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94  | 72 | 75 | 241 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 93 | 92 | 346 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 2  | 7  | 11  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 48 | 20 | 103   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 13    |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |    |    |     | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7  | 8  |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 37 | 26 | 111 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 0  | 0  | 2   |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 37 | 9  | 48  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 13 | 5  | 18  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94  | 72 | 75 | 241 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 93 | 92 | 346 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 2  | 7  | 11  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 48 | 20 | 103   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 13    |

**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*                | 46     | 52       | 49    | 52     | 53       | 50    | 51     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 53     |          |       | 53     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 36     |          |       | 43     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 47     | 58       | 56    | 47     | 34       | 36    | 43     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 51     |          |       | 37     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 44     |          |       | 29     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 39     | 51       | 49    | 47     | 55       | 53    | 34     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 69     | 75       | 68    | 65     | 61       | 58    | 67     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 83     | 67       | 73    | 74     | 47       | 49    | 66     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 51       | 49    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        | 76       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 42       | 40    |        | 73       | 76    |        |          |       |

\* 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           | 57   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 284  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 98   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 52   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 469  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 9    |
| 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                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 44                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 79                              |                    |   |   |

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL                  | 45                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 37                                     | Yes                       | 3  |  |
| ELL                  | 63                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  | 78                                     |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 43                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                  | 57                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                  | 53                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 65                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 45                                     |                           |  |  |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

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

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 46              |               |                    | 47               |                |                     | 39              | 69             | 83               |                          |                                |                     |
| SWD              | 21              |               |                    | 25               |                |                     | 16              | 29             | 75               |                          | 5                              |                     |
| ELL              | 50              |               |                    | 50               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 2                              |                     |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| BLK              | 33              |               |                    | 33               |                |                     | 22              | 56             | 78               |                          | 5                              |                     |
| HSP              | 44              |               |                    | 53               |                |                     | 35              | 88             | 80               |                          | 5                              |                     |
| MUL              | 58              |               |                    | 54               |                |                     | 41              | 71             |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |

## 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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT       | 70       |        |             | 74        |         |              | 73       | 90      | 87        |                   | 5                   |              |
| FRL       | 35       |        |             | 34        |         |              | 24       | 59      | 74        |                   | 5                   |              |

## 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 | 52       | 53     | 36          | 47        | 51      | 44           | 47       | 65      | 74        |                   |                     |              |
| SWD          | 20       | 36     | 28          | 22        | 39      | 29           | 25       | 37      | 100       |                   |                     |              |
| ELL          | 58       | 72     |             | 53        | 68      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN          | 62       | 64     |             | 85        | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK          | 38       | 45     | 38          | 32        | 42      | 40           | 31       | 57      | 65        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP          | 57       | 59     | 38          | 53        | 60      | 62           | 48       | 69      | 67        |                   |                     |              |
| MUL          | 62       | 49     | 20          | 49        | 59      | 59           | 65       | 45      | 71        |                   |                     |              |
| PAC          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT          | 77       | 67     | 33          | 72        | 60      | 37           | 74       | 85      | 83        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL          | 39       | 47     | 39          | 32        | 47      | 43           | 37       | 57      | 66        |                   |                     |              |

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups    | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 51       | 53     | 43          | 43        | 37      | 29           | 34       | 67      | 66        |                   |                     |              |
| SWD          | 21       | 37     | 37          | 21        | 29      | 24           | 23       | 25      | 57        |                   |                     |              |
| ELL          | 44       | 69     |             | 56        | 31      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK          | 41       | 46     | 40          | 30        | 27      | 25           | 20       | 58      | 55        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP          | 44       | 56     | 63          | 42        | 34      | 55           | 28       | 64      | 60        |                   |                     |              |
| MUL          | 52       | 53     | 40          | 44        | 39      | 27           | 33       | 78      | 62        |                   |                     |              |
| PAC          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT          | 70       | 67     | 48          | 65        | 57      | 42           | 58       | 85      | 73        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL          | 38       | 46     | 46          | 29        | 26      | 24           | 26       | 59      | 57        |                   |                     |              |

**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 |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 42%    | 49%      | -7%                        | 47%   | -5%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 45%    | 49%      | -4%                        | 47%   | -2%                     |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 48%      | -7%                        | 47%   | -6%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 48%    | 55%      | -7%                        | 54%   | -6%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 44%    | 51%      | -7%                        | 48%   | -4%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 49%      | -8%                        | 55%   | -14%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 27%    | 38%      | -11%                       | 44%   | -17%                    |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 99%    | 58%      | 41%                        | 50%   | 49%                     |

| GEOMETRY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade    | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A      | 2023 - Spring | 96%    | 58%      | 38%                        | 48%   | 48%                     |

| BIOLOGY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 98%    | 65%      | 33%                        | 63%   | 35%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 67%    | 72%      | -5%                        | 66%   | 1%                      |

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The lowest performance component was 8th Grade Science (40%), a 7% decrease from the previous year. Barriers to student achievement are mental health matters and student absenteeism -- correlated factors that ultimately lead to copious loss of instructional time.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline is ELA/Reading. Across all grade levels, ELA decreased by 3-10 percentage points. Mental health continues to be a major contributing factor for both teachers and students. Student absences contribute to missing a lot instructional time; teacher attendance can disrupt instruction and pacing.

**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.**

Our SWD were at 37%. This was largely due to student absenteeism. Absenteeism contributes to the loss of instructional time, which can be debilitating for SWDs, who may require additional time and preparation for daily learning. In addition to student absenteeism, mental health barriers, and the lack of access to resources and supplemental materials to support student learning continue to be areas of concern for this population.

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

The most improvement was in Math (6-8). There was a 3 - 10% increase in all grade levels. This is largely due to hiring highly-effective teachers, incorporating IXL for fluency, coaching/mentoring for new teachers, and building mental math skills.

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



Our areas of concern are the large number of students who are L1 in ELA and Math, which correlates with student absenteeism, which is also an area of focus.

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

Targeting learning gains for our lowest 25% in ELA/Reading

Targeting learning gains for our lowest 25% in Math

Increasing Science scores by 10%.

Increasing Civics pass rate to 80%.

### **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.

This area of focus was chosen based on ELA proficiency data from the 2022-23 FAST PM3 assessment scores. The assessment results were that 44% of our students were a level of 3 or above school-wide. This was an 8 percentage point decrease in proficiency from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based on data points, new teacher mentoring program, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to English Language Arts.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase student proficiency in ELA to 50%; a 6 percentage point increase from the previous year (44%).

**Monitoring:**

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

We will utilize the state progress monitoring assessments (PM1, PM2) and Language Live to use data to drive instructional decision making. We will also use common assessments within teacher teams to track and review data on standards comprehension.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alma Parker (brownal@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.)

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Literacy Night Events for Parents
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase in Explicit Vocabulary Instruction within Context
- Student Data Tracking Sheets / Charts
- Novel Studies and Advanced Enrichment Activities
- Poetry Series and Increased Public Speaking opportunities for students
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Language Live Reading Program for Reading Interventions
- STAR Benchmark Testing for Level 1 and Level 2 Students
- Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Common assessments on skills/standards
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Strategic Instructional Model (SIM) Training for Learning Strategies
- Increased Parental Involvement
- Common Planning to discuss data

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of reading lessons
- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages
- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text
- Keyboarding skills
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas – Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
- Knowledge and Ideas – Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions
- Integration of passages (dual passages)
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret information within the text
- Lack of engagement for Digital Academy students due to inconsistent learning environments

### **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.

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target English Language Arts strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- Common assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Novel study Assessments
- Language Live Reading Program
- Instructional Coaching for ELA and non-ELA Teachers

**Person Responsible:** Alma Parker (brownal@leonschools.net)

**By When:** On-Going/May 2024.

**#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.

This area of focus was chosen based on Math proficiency data from the 2022-23 FAST PM3 assessment scores. The assessment results indicated the following were a level of 3 or above: 6th grade (48%); 7th Grade (45%); and 8th grade (41%). This was a 10 and 14 percentage point increase respectively from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based upon data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase math proficiency in each grade level as follows: 6th Grade (55%); 7th Grade (50%); and 8th Grade (50%). This means an increase in 2 percentage points; 5 percentage points; and 9 percentage points respectively.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will increase critical thinking skills through the use of problem solving strategies. A Math Coach in a teacher position has been implemented to help teachers with common planning and assessments, as well as to assist new teachers with instructional best practices.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dorces Preatto (preattod@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.)

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Additional use of higher order thinking questions based upon Webb's Depth of Knowledge
- Use of ALEKS Math Program school-wide for mastery of 2 curriculum aligned skills per week
- Use of small groups for mastery
- Use of enrichment and review activities from Go Math Curriculum
- Before/ after-school tutorials
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase use of Word Problems and literacy/vocabulary strategies
- Celebration of student success/foster a growth mindset for students grappling with challenging content
- Frequent assessments and opportunities to re-assess same skills for mastery
- EOC Saturday School Sessions
- Professional Learning Communities to analyze student data and plan instructional strategies
- Incorporate Universal Design for Learning
- Increased Parental Involvement Strategies

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Students lack of prior knowledge
- Number Sense learning gaps

- Rigor of Math lessons
- Students lack of math fluency
- Student Motivation/Interest through increase in fluency of basic math fundamentals
- Need for additional Intervention Supports
- Expressions and Equations – Solving real-life math problems using equations
- Geometric Concepts – Angles, Area, Surface Area and Volume
- Familiarity with online testing platform and online testing strategies
- Students Taking multiple math classes due to missing quality points (PLATO)
- Standards-aligned formative assessments
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret word problems and multi-step procedures

#### **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.

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Math strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- FOCUS grades and comments/Progress alerts for parents
- Review teacher lesson plans for instructional strategies to engage all learners
- Go Math and ALEKS data reports
- Standards-based assessments by module or quarter
- Student-teacher progress monitoring discussions

**Person Responsible:** Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

**By When:** On-Going/ May 2024

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****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.

As one of our top five lowest performing areas in the previous school year it is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based upon data points, and revision of processes will help to refine and improve student performance in science.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

60% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level three or higher on the State Science Assessment. While 100% of Biology students taking the EOC Assessment will score a 3 or higher. This will be a 10 and 2 percentage point increase from the previous school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will use the District Progress Monitoring Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dabra Lofton (loftond@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.)

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Increased attention to the scientific process
- Vertical team meetings
- Purchase of additional sets of science resources
- Additional incorporation of science labs and literacy strategies
- Use of real world science experiments
- Hands-on inquiry based lessons
- Use of instructional computer software and Pearson Textbooks resources
- Increased use of informational text and reading comprehension strategies
- Teacher training in science teaching and learning
- Test retake to help show mastery of curriculum
- Before school tutorials
- Science Field trips and Saturday Sessions
- Increased Parental Involvement

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Gaps in scientific knowledge
- Moderate understanding of scientific process
- Vocabulary and word recognition
- Rigor of Science Lessons
- Life Science
- Nature of Science Concepts
- Reading comprehension Skills

- Inability to make connections with abstract content (graphs, charts, variable identification, data analysis)

### **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.

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Science strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- County tests: baseline, mid-year, end-of-year exams
- Progress reports
- Performance Matters/ Unify
- Chapter/unit tests
- Standards Based Assessments

**Person Responsible:** Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

**By When:** On-Going/May 2024

**#4. 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.

Based on previous school data related to academic performance, attendance, discipline, and other EWS, there is a need for additional attention to be given to designing programs to meet the psycho-social, emotional, and economic needs of our student population.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Maintain a safe and orderly school environment by integrating a schoolwide discipline plan through assemblies, incentives, and visual reinforcement of the schoolwide behavior expectations throughout the campus. Reduce number of referrals for minority students and reduce number of students with multiple referrals and/or suspensions. Increase the percentage of students with attendance rates above 90%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The MTSS team, Grade Level Team Leaders, and Discipline team will meet monthly to monitor referrals and talk about student needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kelly Lynch (lynchk@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.)

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcomes:

- Guidance, parents and student conferences
- Full-time dean of students
- PBIS Committee Chair
- School-wide PBIS Committee
- Increase signage around campus with behavior expectations
- Faculty/staff mentor program for students needing additional support
- Initiate attendance incentives and recognition each 9 weeks
- Hiring of School Safety Monitor
- Institute mentoring program for targeted students
- School PBIS Committee will continue to meet monthly to discuss and plan school-wide initiatives.
- Continue to disaggregate data by subgroups, times of day, pre-existing conditions, etc in order to fine tune intervention strategies and programs being used.
- Increased Parental Involvement

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Teacher professional development needed
- Consistent implementation of PBIS goals/incentives is needed
- Reinforces that are based on student interest
- Use of Common language with adults and students
- School-wide discipline data



- School-wide attendance data
- Early Warning System Data

#### **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.

Administrators will work to monitor the training provided throughout the year and implementation of target Discipline/Attendance/PBIS. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- Monthly meetings with PBIS team to review discipline data
- Set behavior goals with mentors and monitor progress
- Regular review of behavior guidelines with students and teachers to ensure appropriate practices are being followed
- Develop behavior contracts for students needing additional support
- Quarterly review of behavior data (trends/implement changes)
- Behavior expectation assemblies will be used to educate our students and staff on social issues and conflict resolution
- Daily attendance checks and Compulsive attendance assessments will be conducted to intervene with students missing more than 10 days in a month or 15 days within a semester
- Perfect Attendance Incentives
- Leaders In Training group will meet monthly to increase student awareness of leadership and career readiness

**Person Responsible:** Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

**By When:** On-Going/May 2024

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies****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.

This area of focus was chosen based on Social Studies proficiency data from the 2022-23 Civics assessment scores. The assessment results were that 67% of our students were a level of 3 or above school-wide. This was a 2 percentage point increase from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing, communication based on data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to reading strategies through Social Studies content.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

80% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Social Studies EOC Assessment. This will be an increase in proficiency by 13 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will use the District Progress Monitoring Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shawn Ackerman (ackermans@leonschoos.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.)

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Progress Monitoring through Baseline, Midterm, and Diagnostic assessments.
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Review (Blitz) of content material leading up to EOC assessment.
- Student Data Tracking Sheets / Charts
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Increased reading and vocabulary comprehension through content
- Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Common Planning to discuss data

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of content lesson with and emphasis on reading strategies
- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages

**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.

- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas – Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
- Knowledge and Ideas – Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions

**Person Responsible:** Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

**By When:** On-Going/May 2024

**#6. 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.

For the last three years, SWD continue to be our subgroup that does not meet the 41% Federal Percent of Points Index. For the 2021-22 year, SWDs were at 37% -- 4 percentage points from meeting this requirement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to meet the Federal Percent of Points Index at 41% -- a 4 percentage point increase from 37%.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will utilize the state progress monitoring assessments (PM1, PM2) to use data to drive instructional decision making. We will also use common assessments within teacher teams to track and review data on standards comprehension.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marcus Scott (scottma@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.)

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcomes:

- School-wide training on Best Instructional Practices for Inclusion Education
- Hiring of two additional ESE instructors
- Best Practices One Pager during faculty meetings to introduce new instructional methods to reach SWDs
- Increase small group pullouts and explicit instruction
- Continue to review weekly accommodations and supports to ensure best strategies are being utilized in classroom instruction
- Monthly PD/trainings and coaching for teachers needing additional support in classrooms
- Quarterly recognition and incentives to encourage student achievement/growth
- Institute mentoring program for targeted students
- Continue to disaggregate SWD data (times of day, pre-existing conditions, etc) in order to fine tune intervention strategies and programs being used to support student achievement

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- An increased number of SWDs in school population
- An increased number of new/beginning teachers joining school faculty
- SWDs struggling to interpret information within the text
- Student motivation/interest and absenteeism
- Refresher Strategies and Skills for veteran teachers
- Weekly/Quarterly review of current interventions to made changes as needed

**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.

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of targeted instructional strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- Weekly meetings with ESE department to review student achievement data.
- Monthly meetings with faculty to review student data and identify any trends in student success or challenges.
- Weekly walkthroughs from administration to observe and review targeted instructional practices
- Meet with MTSS team to ensure appropriate and adequate interventions are being utilized
- Teacher surveys/questionnaires and opportunity for feedback on targeted instructional practices

**Person Responsible:** Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

**By When:** On-Going/May 2024.

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

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

The school improvement budgeting process is reviewed by all stakeholders, including our faculty and staff and SAC Committee. School and student needs are reviewed and discussed during monthly SAC meetings, as well as during school leadership team meetings. Our faculty and staff complete yearly surveys to identify the needs of our students; similarly, the district provides yearly surveys to parents, students, and other external stakeholders. This data, alongside student achievement data, is used to determine the needs of our school and students. Budget presentations are done annually and used to maintain our growing CTE and magnet programs. Once the budget is agreed and voted upon, it is signed by our SAC chair and school principal.

**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: Instructional Practice: ELA                            | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                           | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                        | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies                 | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities              | \$0.00 |

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
|  | <b>Total:</b> <b>\$0.00</b> |
|--|-----------------------------|

**Budget Approval**

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

Yes