W T Moore Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

W T Moore Elementary School

1706 DEMPSEY MAYO RD, Tallahassee, FL 32308

https://www.leonschools.net/moore

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

We prepare students to meet the challenges of world citizenship by cultivating confident, engaged, courteous, self-motivated, and service-minded learners through meaningful planning, collaboration and the involvement of all stakeholders.

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
Anderson, Kerri	Principal	The Principal ensures that both the vision and mission of the school are communicated to all stakeholders and provides school wide leadership. The Principal provides support to teachers and staff by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations, and feedback. The Principal works with all stakeholders to provide a positive learning environment that fulfills the academic goals of the school.
DeCardenas, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal provides school wide leadership, coordinates collaborative planning efforts, and facilitates progress monitoring and professional development. The Assistant Principal works intricately with the Principal and Instructional Coach to help make decisions that impact the school community and student achievement.
Rees, Ashley	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides instructional support to classroom teachers in order to ensure rigorous standards based instruction is occurring. The Instructional Coach works closely with the leadership team to disaggregate and disseminate data.

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 SAC gives approval for the SIP as noted in the meeting minutes. Additionally it is posted on the school website for all community members, families and stakeholders to review. Social media is also used. Teachers and teacher committees also provide input throughout the process.

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

The SIP will be updated throughout the year through the feedback process. Teachers, committees, families, and stakeholders will provide feedback regarding the effectivesness of the plan. We will also use data to ensure we are increasing achievement. The plan will be revised accordingly to ensure continuous improvement.

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	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	8	13	8	13	17	13	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	3	5	8	0	0	0	26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	23	0	0	0	32
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	0	1	0	8	14	0	0	0	23

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	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	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	12	17	14	17	27	26	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	0	4	0	3	5	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	25	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	30	32	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	9	16	24	12	19	0	0	0	95
Retained Current Year	7	6	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	16

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	6	3	4	10	13	18	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	6	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	12	17	14	17	27	26	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	0	4	0	3	5	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	25	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	30	32	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	9	16	24	12	19	0	0	0	95
Retained Current Year	7	6	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	16

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	6	3	4	10	13	18	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	6	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	16
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*	58	54	53	57	57	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				58			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			68		
Math Achievement*	51	56	59	53	47	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				46			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27			21		
Science Achievement*	41	52	54	45	57	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	27	52	59	67			36		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	26	Yes	3	2
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	36	Yes	2	
HSP	43			
MUL	47			
PAC				

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%
WHT	74			
FRL	30	Yes	2	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	50			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	36	Yes	1	

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	58			51			41					27
SWD	24			32			27				4	
ELL	50			44							3	27
AMI												
ASN	92			85							2	
BLK	42			29			20				4	
HSP	48			48			33				3	

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
MUL	64			48			30				3	
PAC												
WHT	76			78			71				4	
FRL	36			29			20				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	57	58	47	53	46	27	45					67
SWD	27	37	33	22	30	25	14					
ELL	48	54		57	54							67
AMI												
ASN	77	80		92	100							
BLK	41	55	44	37	31	23	31					
HSP	57	59		35	50							
MUL	73	67		61	53							
PAC												
WHT	71	57		71	53		57					
FRL	40	56	48	32	26	19	30					

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	61	68	68	50	43	21	51					36
SWD	33	46		26	21		21					
ELL	44			38								36
AMI												
ASN	69			77								
BLK	46	68	67	32	33	8	31					
HSP	52			45								
MUL	75			75								
PAC												
WHT	76	73		65	59		68					

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
FRL	39	65		27	24		30					

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. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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	54%	55%	-1%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	52%	8%	50%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	61%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	51%	-12%

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.

Our Science scores had the lowest performance at 39% proficiency.

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

Science showed decline, with proficiency dropping from 45% to 39% proficient. Overall there was less fidelity on science instruction and hands on learning.

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 two areas with the greatest gaps compared to the state averages were: Math 4th Grade, Math 5th Grade and Science. The state average for Math 4th Grade was 61% compared to WT Moore's 4th Grade average which was 57%. The state average for Math 5th Grade was 55% compared to WT Moore's 5th Grade average which was 39%. The state average for Science was 51% compared to WT Moore's which was 39%. Learning loss during Covid, lack of number sense, and change in math standards all contributed to the gap.

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

Our Reading showed the most improvement. We were at 57% proficiency in 2022 to 61% in 2023. Teachers and instructional coaches worked to increase standards based instruction, small group teaching, and intensive targeted reading interventions. Progress monitoring happened bi-weekly in a concerted effort with teachers, instructional coaches, and administration to ensure fidelity to quality instruction and research based learning strategies.

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

An ongoing concern is attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase Science proficiency.
2. Maintain or increase Reading proficiency from previous year.
3. Increase Math proficiency.
4. Increase attendance.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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

African American Students fell below 41% in Math and ELA in 21-22 and is an ongoing concern.

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

We expect to have our African American Students reaching an achievement level of 50% on FAST Math and Reading.

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

This goal will be monitored using weekly classroom assessments and quarterly district progress monitoring assessments. The data from these assessments with be reviewed and our weekly PLC meetings to revise and redirect our Math and ELA instruction throughout the course of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@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.)

Provide assistance with planning Math and ELA instruction from district level curriculum coordinators and the Instructioanl Coach. Implementation of UFLI and BEST standards with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This year we have new teachers on all grade level teams. These teachers will require additional training and constant guidance in order to meet the needs of their students as we work towards this goal.
In addition, we will do monthly PD follow up regarding standards implementation.

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.

A plan is in place to collect and review Math and ELA performance data on a monthly basis. The instructional coach is facilitating data review, assistance with standards based lesson planning, and BEST training for our teachers.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)

By When: Action steps will be implemented at the beginning of the school year and will be ongoing.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

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

Our Economically Disadvantaged students fell below the ESSA target of 41% proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

We expect to have our Economically Disadvantaged students reaching an achievement level of 50% on FAST Math and ELA.

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

This goal will be monitored using weekly classroom assessments and quarterly district progress monitorin assessments. The data from these assessments will be reviewed at our weekly PLC meetings to revise and redirect our ELA and Math instruction throughout the course of the year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@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.)

Provide assistance with planning Math and ELA instruction from district level curriculum coordinators. Provide UFLI PD and monitor for the use of the BEST standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This year we have new teachers on the 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teams. These teachers will require additional training and constant guidance in order to meet the needs of their students as we work towards this goal.

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.

A plan is in place to collect and review Math and ELA performance data on a monthly basis. The instructional coach is facilitating data review, assistance with standards based lesson planning, and BEST training for our teachers.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)

By When: Action steps will be implemented at the beginning of the school year and will be ongoing.

Implement UFLI and provide additional PD.
Implement the use of the BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)

By When: Action steps will be implemented at the beginning of the school year and will be ongoing.

#3. 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.

Students with Disabilities fell below 41% in Math and ELA in 21-22. This continues to be an area of current concern.

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

We expect to have our Students with Disabilities reaching an achievement level of 50% on FAST Math and ELA.

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

This goal will be monitored using weekly classroom assessments and quarterly district progress monitoring assessments. The data from these assessments with be reviewed in our weekly PLC meetings to revise and redirect our ELA and Math instruction throughout the course of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@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.)

Provide professional development on the learning cycle and assistance with planning Math and ELA instruction for Students with Disabilities from district level curriculum coordinators. Implementation of Lexia and BEST standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This year we are starting with new teachers on many grade levels. These teachers will require additional training and constant guidance in order to meet the needs of their students as we work towards this goal. Additionally, we have new Math and ELA standards still being implemented and learned. PD will be provided for the implementation of Lexia in classrooms to address reading skills and strategies.

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.

A plan is in place to collect and review Math and ELA performance data on a monthly basis. The instructional coach is facilitating data review, assistance with standards based lesson planning, and BEST training for our teachers.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)

By When: Action steps will be implemented at the beginning of the school year and will be ongoing.

#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.

Increase faculty/staff knowledge of the Early Warning System (EWS).

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

75% of faculty/staff will increase knowledge of how the EWS impacts student learning.

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

We will monitor the area of focus during data meetings and faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerri Anderson (andersonk2@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.)

Professional learning will be used to instruct teachers on the EWS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Faculty/Staff will participate in professional development activities to about the Early Warning Systems and practices for idetifying and supporting students with two or more indicators.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Ongoing Professional Development on EWS
2. Tracking students with indicators during data meetings
3. Discussing student supports during faculty meetings.

Person Responsible: Kerri Anderson (andersonk2@leonschools.net)

By When: Action steps will be implemented at the beginning of the school year and will be ongoing.

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 administration will review school improvement funding allocations and ensure the resources are allocated based on need to the three subgroup areas idetified as critical areas of concern: Aftrican American students, students with disabilities and economically dosadvantaged students.

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

We have created a Master Schedule with blocked times for differentiated instruction during ELA , with an additional 30 minute block dedicated to interventions outside of the 90 minutes dedicated for ELA instruction. We believe the additional instructional time for ELA will allow us to focus on the individual needs of the students with a more comprehensive approach to their specific reading challenges. Additionally, the K-2 classes have a focus on phonics using new approaches through programs such as Heggerty and Savvas. This comprehensive approach is supported through two interventionist and the reading coach, as well as, the classroom teachers.

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

We have created a Master Schedule with blocked times for differentiated instruction during ELA , with an additional 30 minute block dedicated to interventions outside of the 90 minutes dedicated for ELA instruction. We believe the additional instructional time for ELA will allow us to focus on the individual needs of the students with a more comprehensive approach to their specific reading challenges. Additionally, the 3-5 classes have a focus on comprehension and writing using new approaches through programs such as Savvas and Top Score. This comprehensive approach is supported through two interventionist and the reading coach, as well as, the classroom teachers.

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

Kindergarten, First, and Second grade will be: 65% Proficient with Learning Gains at 60% on PM3 as measured by STAR.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Third, Fourth, and Fifth grade will be: 65% Proficient with Learning Gains at 60% on PM3 as measured by FAST

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.

Ongoing monitoring will take place throughout the school year with monthly data meetings using a comprehensive table that includes all measurable outcomes (ie: previous year's data, grades, progress monitoring, STAR, Lexia, UFLI, and Top Score) for students. Students not demonstrating growth will be referred
to the intervention team.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Anderson, Kerri, andersonk2@leonschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The identified programs are evidenced based and meet Florida's definition of evidenced based. Additionally,
they also align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan, as well as, the BEST
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?

The current evidence-based programs address the identified needs of our students. In the primary grades,
the core need is stronger phonemic awareness and a strong phonics curriculum. The intermediate grades
require a focus on comprehension and writing skills.

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
The Literacy Leadership will work towards their literacy coach endorsement through FSU.	Anderson, Kerri, andersonk2@leonschools.net
Teachers will attend professional development on UFLI and the foundational pieces of phonics.	Rees, Ashley, reesa@leonschools.net
Monitor PM1 and PM 2 to anlyze students gowth and instructional areas of concern.	DeCardenas, Elizabeth, decardenase@leonschools.net