

Leon County Schools

Roberts 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Roberts Elementary School

5777 PIMLICO DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Roberts Elementary School family will foster a safe, nurturing environment where students reach their fullest potential and become productive, responsible students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McFarland, Kim	Principal	Mrs. McFarland, as the Principal, provides leadership as it pertains to the use of data-based decision-making. She ensures that the mission and vision of the school is supported and endorsed.
Shelton-Martin, Arcia	Assistant Principal	Dr. Shelton-Martin provides leadership as it pertains to the use of data-based decision-making. She ensures that the mission and vision of the school is supported and endorsed.
Barton , Abby	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Lunsford, Shayla	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Sanford, Shannan	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Bosarge, Jillian	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Trierweiler, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.
Tomlinson, Dana	Teacher, ESE	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Ava	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lee serves as the Math Coach. She provides targeted instruction to Tier 3 students. Additionally, she provides support in the area of mathematics to instructional faculty members.
Vinson, Kim	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Vinson serves as the Reading Coach. She provides targeted instruction to Tier 3 students. Additionally, she provides support in the area of reading to instructional faculty members.
Manu, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Manu serves as the Reading Interventionist. She provides targeted instruction to Tier 3 students. Additionally, she provides support in the area of reading to instructional faculty members.
Meredith, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders are responsible for the dissemination of information to their team teachers from the school administrative team. Team leaders also present concerns to the administrative team from their grade level team teachers. Most importantly, team leaders help to build the capacity of their team teachers to deliver high-quality, effective instruction.

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 draft School Improvement Plan is available to all stakeholders for review. Additionally, the SIP is reviewed and approved by the School Advisory Council (SAC). The SAC membership is comprised of teachers, school staff, parents, guardians and business leaders.

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 School Advisory Council will review the SIP goals and progress during scheduled meetings. Additionally, the will be reviewed during team leaders meetings and data team meetings. The plan will be revised, as necessary, based on the data.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	22	15	21	10	24	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	6	4	5	5	11	0	0	0	31
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	7	9	13	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	3	2	11	0	0	0	19

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	4	5	3	7	2	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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	25	18	22	22	34	17	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	5	2	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	12	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	20	19	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	6	0	9	8	15	0	0	0	44	

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	1	2	1	4	6	6	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	2	3	1	0	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	25	18	22	22	34	17	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	5	2	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	12	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	20	19	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	6	0	9	8	15	0	0	0	44	

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	1	2	1	4	6	6	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	2	3	1	0	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*	71	54	53	75	57	56	78		
ELA Learning Gains				65			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			50		
Math Achievement*	70	56	59	77	47	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				67			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	69	52	54	68	57	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		52	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	282
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	58			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	44			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	78			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	48			

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	71			70			69					
SWD	37			38			33				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			33			18				4	
HSP	57			70							3	
MUL	76			68			64				3	
PAC												
WHT	78			77			80				4	
FRL	48			45			39				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	75	65	43	77	67	48	68					
SWD	42	48	34	44	52	23	28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	50	36	43	59	50	40					
HSP	87	71		87	71		73					
MUL	64	52	36	72	67		40					
PAC												
WHT	80	68	45	82	67	36	75					
FRL	55	49	32	56	58	50	38					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	78	58	50	77	54	41	73					
SWD	33	36	40	48	36		42					
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52	40		38	20		53					
HSP	90			85								
MUL	65			74								
PAC												
WHT	84	63	67	84	63	60	79					
FRL	51	44		42	25		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
05	2023 - Spring	71%	55%	16%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	57%	20%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	50%	20%	51%	19%

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 area with the lowest rate of proficiency for the 2022-2023 school year was science proficiency at 69%. However, the area with the largest decrease was math proficiency. The math proficiency rate decreased from 77% to 73% from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. During the 2022-2023 school term, the B.E.S.T. standards were utilized for assessment purposes. However, the curriculum provided was aligned to the former math standards. As a result, the curriculum was supplemented to ensure that the standards were covered.

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

Overall, the greatest decline was in the area of math. In the 2021-2022 school year, the overall math proficiency rate was 77%. However, during the 2022-2023 school year, the overall math proficiency rate decreased to 73%. The B.E.S.T. math standards were adopted and used for the assessment provided to students. However, the curriculum was aligned to the previous standards. As a result, the curriculum was supplemented to ensure the standards were covered. Additionally, the increased rate of absenteeism experienced during the 2022-2023 school year significantly impacted the proficiency rate.

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 state average has not been released at the time of the SIP submission.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was science proficiency. The science proficiency rate increased from 68% in the 2021-2022 school year to 69% in the 2022-2023 school year. During the 2022-2023 school year, the rigor of science instruction in grades 3 and 4 was increased. The science assessment measures benchmarks covered in grades 3-5. All students in these grade levels will take beginning, middle and end of the year assessments this school term and this data will be utilized to drive instruction. In prior years, students that receive additional services, such as gifted or ESE resource, missed science instruction. However, the master schedule for this year was adjusted to ensure that students are not missing science instruction. Additionally, we maintained the team of three teachers in fifth grade with one dedicated science teacher for each team and continue to provide a STEAM class for all students during their special area rotation.

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

An analysis of the Early Warning System data reveals the following areas of concern: attendance and suspensions. The rate of absenteeism and suspensions increased during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The highest priorities for the 2023-2024 school year are ranked below:

1. decrease the rate of absenteeism

2. decrease the rate of suspension
3. increase math proficiency by 5%
4. increase science proficiency by 5%

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

The early warning system data reveals that 31 students received one or more suspension during the 2022-2023 school term. A positive school culture has a positive correlation to decreased referrals and higher student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to reduce the number of students with one or more suspensions by more than 33% from 31 to 20 or less during the 2023-2024 school term.

Monitoring:

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

The focus area will be monitored by accessing FOCUS discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@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.)

A school-wide character skills program will be implemented via the House System.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The house system provides all students with a smaller community within larger community on our school campus. By creating micro-communities, we are helping students to form relationships with their peers and teachers that they may not otherwise have an opportunity to connect with during the school day. Additionally, the house system provides students with a place to belong, opportunities to collaborate with their peers, leadership opportunities and a sense of tradition.

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.

House System Presentation for all faculty members and students.

Person Responsible: Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

By When: August 18, 2023.

Quarterly house meetings for all students.

Person Responsible: Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

By When: May 2024.

Sorting ceremonies for new students.

Person Responsible: Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

By When: September 30, 2023.

#2. 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.

The federal index score for students with disabilities was 39. As a result of this area scoring below 40, it is identified as a target area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to improve the achievement of students with disabilities in all areas by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by FAST progress monitoring data and Unify science progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@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.)

Research-based intervention materials will be utilized by instructional coaches to provide targeted support to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that differentiated learning strategies have a positive correlation with student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Student data analysis and review with classroom instructors.

Person Responsible: Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Interventions provided by the reading coach, math coach and reading interventionist.

Person Responsible: Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#3. 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.

A review of our assessment data from previous years revealed that the area of math is an opportunity of improvement for our school. Our goal is to increase the math proficiency rate from 73% to 78%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to achieve a 5% increase in the area of math on the FAST Math Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored by beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of the year district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@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.)

High quality instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in math classes to ensure that the needs of the students are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

High quality instruction implemented with fidelity is shown to have a positive correlation on student outcomes.

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.

Math baseline, mid-year and end of year assessment administered in accordance with the FAST testing calendar.

Person Responsible: Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Student data analysis and review with classroom instructors.

Person Responsible: Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Teachers participating in hands-on summer professional development offerings on the new mathematics curriculum.

Person Responsible: Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

By When: August 2023.

#4. 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.

A review of our assessment data from previous years revealed that the area of science is an opportunity of improvement for our school. Our goal is to increase the math proficiency rate from 69% to 74%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to achieve a 5% increase in the area of science on the Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored by beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of the year district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@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.)

High quality instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in science classes to ensure that the needs of the students are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

High quality instruction implemented with fidelity is shown to have a positive correlation on student outcomes.

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.

Science baseline, mid-year and end of year assessment administered in accordance with the FAST testing calendar for all students in grades 3-5.

Person Responsible: Arecia Shelton-Martin (shelton-martina@leonschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Master schedule revised to ensure students are not pulled out during science instruction for interventions and resource classes.

Person Responsible: Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

By When: August 2023.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

At this time, SIP funds have not been allocated to Roberts Elementary School.

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

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to 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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes