

School Board of Levy County

Chiefland 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

<http://www.levy12.org/schools>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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 staff, parents and community will work together to ensure the success of all students while cultivating their dreams for tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everybody is Somebody

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
Webber, Amy	Principal	As the instructional leader of the school, Mrs. Webber provides guidance and support in ensuring that quality instruction is delivered. Informal and formal observations are conducted in an effort to support teachers and students in this task. Conversations concerning instructional practices and student data take place regularly. The principal also oversees campus wide events where all stakeholders are given an opportunity to participate and provide input and feedback.
Hoover, Kelley	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is direct support and assistance to the Principal and joins in providing guidance and support to all stakeholders. She participated in conducting informal and formal observations to support teachers and students in this task. She participates in conversations concerning instructional practices and student data and provides support as needed. She also provides support with the schoolwide PBIS program and assists teachers with strategies for behavior management.
McDilda, Melissa	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor provides support for the school wide PBIS program when needed. She coordinates and schedules all meetings for ESE students and will provide support to our ESE teachers. She provides guidance for resources related to guidance and mental health services and referrals for these services. She coordinates and facilitates Section 504 plans, and serves as LEA for IEP and 504 meetings. She serves as a resource to support families in need at various times throughout the school year. In addition, she assists with the ESOL coordinator in supporting ELL students for our school, providing support to all stakeholders.
Warren, Bonnie	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach provides support to all teachers concerning all ELA curriculum and resources. She also provides support to teachers as needed for research based instructional strategies and best practices for teaching all components of reading. She serves as a key participant in discussing school wide and individual student data. She provides professional development for teachers throughout the year and observes and provides feedback to teachers as needed as well as make a plan for teachers to observe other teachers in an effort to help them grow professionally. The reading coach also models highly effective instructional strategies for new and veteran teachers as needed.
Snyder, Megan	Math Coach	The Math Coach provides support to all teachers concerning all math curriculum and resources. She also provides support to teachers as needed for research based instructional strategies and best practices for teaching math. She serves as a key participant in discussing school wide and individual student data. She provides professional development for teachers throughout the year and observes and provides feedback to teachers as needed as well as make a plan for teachers to observe other teachers in an effort to help them grow professionally. The math coach also models highly effective instructional strategies for new and veteran teachers as needed. She serves as the AVID site coordinator as well.

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.

Chiefland Elementary School utilizes a School Advisory Council to involve stakeholders in the SIP development process. Members of this council include those from the school leadership team, teachers and staff, parents, and local businesses or community members. The School Advisory Council is provided our SIP goals and the data used to create them, and provides feedback that is used to make any necessary revisions.

A data point that we used to identify ESSA support and improvement was the 2021-22 Federal Percent of Points Index, which showed our lowest subgroups to be African Americans, Students with Disabilities (SWD), and English Language Learners (ELLs).

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))

Data will be reviewed on a consistent basis. Within the first 6 weeks of school, the school leadership team will meet with teachers for data chats to review diagnostic data and begin planning for interventions. After that, regularly scheduled Problem Solving Team (PST) meetings will be held to continue monitoring data and make changes to instruction and interventions as needed. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions. Any actions that need editing or adding to the plan will take place if data warrants it.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
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	31	24	29	23	23	16	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	13	13	1	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	13	1	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	30	20	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	37	27	0	0	0	90
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	39	43	21	0	0	0	103
	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	0	69	73	54	0	0	0	196

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	9	13	7	7	2	1	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	26	55	52	35	33	27	0	0	0	228
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	9	13	3	8	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	6	5	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	16	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	21	27	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	9	23	13	24	0	0	0	69
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	10	10	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	16	2	13	4	0	0	0	0	45
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	26	55	52	35	33	27	0	0	0	228
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	9	13	3	8	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	6	5	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	16	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	21	27	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	9	23	13	24	0	0	0	69
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	10	10	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	16	2	13	4	0	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	47	48	53	52	50	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				48			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			73		
Math Achievement*	44	52	59	48	49	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				50			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			65		
Science Achievement*	50	41	54	48	52	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					51	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					42	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	48	59	30			73		

** 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	235
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	15	Yes	2	2
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	2	2
HSP	45			
MUL	50			
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	49			
FRL	43			

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	1	1
ELL	23	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	50			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	44			

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	47			44			50					50
SWD	14			22			12				4	
ELL											1	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			12							3	
HSP	38			43							3	54

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	50			50							3	
PAC												
WHT	50			48			51				4	
FRL	42			40			43				5	54

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	48	48	48	50	46	48					30
SWD	24	26	18	30	33	22	33					
ELL	23			15								30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	37	30	11	39	50	25					
HSP	46	69		33	50							
MUL	65	54		39	38							
PAC												
WHT	54	47	54	56	52	45	51					
FRL	46	46	50	41	48	49	40					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	51	64	73	54	58	65	48					73
SWD	23	50	58	33	41	54	47					
ELL	30			80								73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	65		32	53		38					
HSP	50			65								
MUL	71			50								
PAC												
WHT	52	63	74	57	59	65	49					

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	46	65	75	49	56	67	46					73

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	52%	49%	3%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	50%	-6%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	61%	-19%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	53%	7%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	42%	7%	51%	-2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our iReady data. Contributing factors include new teachers (to the school and to the profession), lack of student buy-in with iReady, and the overall amount of testing. FAST scores are significantly higher than iReady, which could be a result of the importance of state assessments to teachers and students, and/or that they are administered first.

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

Kindergarten reading and first grade math both declined 10 points on iReady D3 (EOY view). Math could be attributed to new math standards and curriculum. First grade also had 4 (out of 7) teachers with less than 2 years of teaching experience and one who was new to the grade level. Kindergarten had a brand new teacher with no teaching experience, and three of the remaining four teachers with 3 or less years of teaching experience.

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.

When compared to the state average, the data component with the biggest gap is fourth grade. 2022-2023 FAST scores for 4th grade ELA was 51% compared to 58% average at the state level. In math, 4th grade scores were 53% compared to 61% average at the state level. 4th grade was a new team and didn't collaboratively plan on a regular basis. This grade level also had a lot of behavioral issues that took away from instruction.

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

Kindergarten math went from 5% proficient on iReady Math on D1 to 71% proficient on D3. To assist in this area, we implemented a new action of being very explicit with testing instructions, which proved to be successful.

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

After reflecting on EWS data, two potential areas of concern are attendance and referrals, specifically in grades K-2.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are increasing proficiency in ELA, increasing proficiency in Math, minimizing referral events in K-2, and improving attendance in K-2.

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.

Looking at all data points, we determined ELA proficiency as an area of need. Specifically, K-5 is below 50% proficient on iReady. Our most concerning subgroups are: ELL, SWD, and African American. According to iReady, our ELL subgroup is performing at 57% proficient in K-2 and 18% proficient in 3-5. SWD are performing at 53% proficient in K-2 and 41% in 3-5. African Americans are performing at 33% proficient in K-2 and 17% proficient in 3-5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Chiefland Elementary will increase overall proficiency in ELA in all grades from 49% to 53%, and will increase proficiency from 33% to 37% for our K-2 African American students and 17% to 21% for our 3-5 African American students, as evidenced by PM3 on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will be analyzing data using iReady and FAST on a regular basis during monthly data chats and PST meetings with teachers to discuss instructional strategies, like explicit instruction, that will have a positive impact on student achievement, including student usage, pass rates, and diagnostic scores from all three diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Webber (amy.webber@levy12.org)

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.)

Our district overall has placed a focus on Explicit Instruction, which will be very beneficial in making sure that our Tier 1 instruction is strengthened, limiting the number of students that require Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports. We will run a block of intervention time with fidelity, 3 out of 5 days a week, that utilizes evidence-based instructional strategies specified in our decision tree. This block of time will be focused on our students identified as Tier 3, with teachers planning to meet with their Tier 2 students in their ELA block. Examples include Sadlier Vocabulary Workshop, From Phonics to Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, and Leveled Literacy Intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a district, we have been evaluating our Tier 1 instruction and feel that based on the number of students that require Tier 2 and Tier 3 support, we need to strengthen that area. Due to our high needs for additional support, Intervention was also an identified area in need of improvement. During intervention time we will target specific student needs which will help us reach our student achievement goal. We are using programs like Leveled Literacy Intervention as it is designed to help struggling readers achieve grade-level competency.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Beginning of the year data chats will take place, followed by Problem Solving Team Meetings every month to discuss student achievement levels through iReady diagnostic 1 as well as any other data deemed appropriate to help determine specific intervention materials, assist teachers with curriculum implementation, and modeling in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Bonnie Warren (bonnie.warren@levyk12.org)

By When: By the end of the first quarter of the 2023-2024 school year.

Admin will follow up on implementation of curriculum by completing classroom walk throughs.

Person Responsible: Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

All teachers participated in professional learning that focused on explicit instruction, with the purpose of increasing their expertise and growing teacher leaders. Administration will create a campus team to conduct Learning Walks to spend blocks of time in classrooms, observing how explicit instruction is being implemented and collecting global data to determine what future professional learning opportunities are needed.

Person Responsible: Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)

By When: By the end of the first semester of the 2023-2024 school year.

#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.

Looking at all data points, we determined Math proficiency as an area of need. Specifically, K-5 is below 50% proficient on iReady. According to iReady, our ELL subgroup is performing at 54% proficient in K-2 and 8% proficient in 3-5. SWD are performing at 39% proficient in K-2 and 22% in 3-5. African Americans are performing at 46% proficient in K-2 and 10% proficient in 3-5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Chiefland Elementary will increase overall proficiency in Math in all grades from 49% to 53%, and will increase proficiency from 46% to 50% for our K-2 African American students and 10% to 14% for our 3-5 African American students, as evidenced by PM3 on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will be analyzing data using iReady and FAST on a regular basis during monthly data chats and PST meetings with teachers to discuss instructional strategies, like explicit instruction, that will have a positive impact on student achievement, including student usage, pass rates, and diagnostic scores from all three diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)

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.)

Math teachers will use the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning standards as outlined in the Florida's B.E.S.T. math standards to provide effective instruction and facilitate applicable knowledge in our students. The MTRs are designed for all tiers of instruction and are designed to support students by delivering systematic instruction, mathematical language, and representations that will assist in making content concrete and ultimately meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTR standards promote deeper learning through clear language so all stakeholders can easily understand them. This strategy was selected through the Florida Department of Education's B.E.S.T. standards that were implemented last year. The MTRs are designed for all tiers of instruction and are designed to support students by delivering systematic instruction, mathematical language, and representations that will assist in making content concrete and ultimately meet the needs of all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 3 - Promising 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 coach will ensure MTRs are being utilized with fidelity, assist teachers with curriculum implementation, and will model in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Megan Snyder (megan.snyder@levyk12.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Administration will follow up on implementation of curriculum by completing classroom walk throughs and checking lesson plans.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

All teachers participated in professional learning that focused on explicit instruction, with the purpose of increasing their expertise and growing teacher leaders. Administration will create a campus team to conduct Learning Walks to spend blocks of time in classrooms, observing how explicit instruction is being implemented and collecting global data to determine what future professional learning opportunities are needed.

Person Responsible: Amy Webber (amy.webber@levyk12.org)

By When: By the end of the first semester of the 2023-2024 school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Attendance data from the 2022-2023 school year showed that 23% of our K-5 student population were absent for 10% or more of the school year. When broken down by grade level, Kindergarten had the most absences with 31 students having less than 90% of instructional time. Fifth grade had the least absences with 16 students having less than 90% of instructional time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Chiefland Elementary School will decrease the number of students who are absent 10% or more of the school year overall by 3 percentage points, from 23% of K-5 students to 20% of K-5 students.

Monitoring:

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

There are attendance procedures in place to address concerns, which includes teachers making contact after 3 absences, Mrs. Hoover making contact after 5 absences, and a meeting being scheduled after 9 absences. Mrs. Hoover will pull attendance reports weekly and report to teachers the students with attendance concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelley Hoover (kelley.hoover@levyk12.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We have tiered system of addressing attendance. Our teachers are the first level of support, and reach out to parents/guardians when a student has missed 3 days of school. Administration is our second level of support, making contact with families after 5 absences and scheduling meetings after 9 absences to discuss the effects of absences and possible solutions. Our district's truancy officer is the third level of support, visiting families at their homes and scheduling attendance meetings with the local circuit court.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We began implementing these strategies last year and saw an improvement in attendance. In the 2022-2023 school year, 40% of the K-5 population missed 10% or more of instruction, and in the 2022-2023 school year, only 23% of the K-5 population missed 10% or more of instruction.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Mrs. Hoover will pull weekly attendance reports to identify students with attendance concerns that needed to be addressed by their teacher, by administration, or by the district truancy officer. Every month, students with perfect attendance will be called up to the office, recognized on the morning announcements, and choose one of 4 reward options.

Person Responsible: Kelley Hoover (kelley.hoover@levyk12.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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 the end of each quarter, we review our schoolwide data and determine the needs of the school based on how students perform. We use this data to determine the research based supplemental materials needed to support our students. We also have regular meetings with our School Advisory Council, which includes parents, teachers, community members etc to discuss school based data like student achievement and attendance. At this meeting we get feedback and suggestions from all stakeholders. We also have monthly "lead" team meetings where we take feedback concerning these areas from all staff members. Funding is allocated based on student enrollment through staffing allocation meetings, Federal funds for our school with Title One is used to supplement core instruction and programs based on student need which is analyzed through an activities chart and comprehensive needs assessment.

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

n/a

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

In the 22-23 school year, Chiefland Elementary School had an average of 51% of students in grades 3-5 test below proficiency on the FAST ELA assessment. When broken down by grade level, 56% of 3rd grade students, 49% of 4th grade students, and 48% of 5th grade students tested below proficiency.

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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In the 2023-2024 school year, Chiefland Elementary School will increase ELA proficiency in grades 3 through 5 by ten percentage points as evidenced by the FAST ELA assessment from 47% to 57%.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The leadership team will be analyzing data using iReady and FAST on a regular basis during monthly data chats and PST meetings with teachers to discuss instructional strategies, like explicit instruction, that will have a positive impact on student achievement, including student usage, pass rates, and diagnostic scores from all three diagnostics.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Webber, Amy, amy.webber@levyk12.org

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?

As a team, we have decided that we will be focusing on explicit instruction at every tier of instruction in addition to monitoring our intervention practices more closely. During our data chats and meetings with teachers we will be identifying struggling readers, and utilizing the components of the MTSS framework to identify students struggling academically. Explicit instruction has a strong evidence rating when implemented with fidelity in classroom instruction.

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?

MTSS is an evidence based program that has promising results. The process is to screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year, provide time for differentiated reading instruction for all students based on assessments of students’ current reading level, provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening. Additionally, we will monitor the progress of tier 2 students at least once a month. We will provide intensive instruction regularly that promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in tier 2 small group instruction.

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
<p>Literacy Leadership -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet regularly with our lead team to discuss Tier 1 instruction and needs. Our lead team consists of a teacher from each grade level, admin, guidance counselor, and intervention teacher. 2. Continue to meet regularly for Data chats and PST meetings that will address student needs. We will utilize the MTSS process to screen and identify struggling students and provide appropriate support. 	
<p>Literacy Coaching -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading coach will review our data on a regular basis and will support teachers with supporting students. She will assist in identifying needs of students and problem solve with teachers. 2. The Reading Coach will model for teachers as needed to make sure that instruction is delivered effectively and will provide Professional Development monthly and individually as needed. 	<p>Webber, Amy, amy.webber@levyk12.org</p>
<p>Assessment -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students are assessed regularly on grade level standards. The data from these assessments is used to determine further needs and guide instruction. 2. Students receiving additional support will be assessed more frequently as indicated in the MTSS process. <p>Professional Learning-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This will be provided as needed during data chats and PSTs. 2. Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and or intervention teacher provides monthly PD. 3. All instructional staff will receive professional learning on explicit instruction with reinforced follow up from coaches. 	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

Chiefland Elementary disseminates the SIP and SWD to stakeholders in a variety of ways. We use Facebook and Remind to send information out digitally, through social media posts and text messages. This information is also shared at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, where stakeholders provide feedback regarding the SIP for improvements and are provided with updates regarding the progress being made toward the SIP goals. The SIP is made publicly available via levyk12.org.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment in several ways. One way is the implementation of our school wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports framework. Our gifted teacher, along with the admin team (Principal, Assistant Principal, counselor), oversees the program. Through this framework, teachers are able to provide incentives to students and positive behavior referrals. Staff sends positive postcards to families and families are able to participate in celebrating students that receive student of the month. In addition, grade levels host a social each month allowing opportunities for faculty and staff members to engage in fellowship and nurture relationships. Staff shout outs can be written for any staff member that highlights any positive action, characteristic, etc. Our Parent-Teacher Organization hosts events often for students and staff. Parent involvement nights are offered quarterly inviting families to come on campus with students for academic and casual events. Volunteers are encouraged on campus to assist teachers and help with students. We are also an AVID school and address positive culture through the framework by using the Coaching and Certification Instrument. The schools' Family Engagement Plan can be accessed at www.levy12.org.

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

To strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time and provide an enriched curriculum, teachers collaboratively plan every week, looking at standards, curriculum and supplemental resources to best meet the needs of all students. As a school we collaboratively plan one time a month so that the leadership team is available for any instructional needs and grade-level teams can vertically plan to assist with interventions. Additionally, Diagnostic 1 Data Chats and subsequent Problem-Solving Team (PST) meetings are scheduled with each teacher to address concerns and be proactive with instruction and intervention. We also utilize a teacher unit to pull gifted and highly talented students during the day for enrichment.

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

This plan is developed in coordination with other federal programs, like Title II for professional learning, Title III for ELL support, and McKinney Vento for students experiencing homelessness. Local agencies, such as the Levy County Prevention Coalition and the Levy County Schools Foundation, offer additional academic support and financial resources.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

As a school we collaboratively plan one time a month so that the leadership team is available to answer any questions and to provide support, academic or otherwise, as it relates to the success of students. During our regularly scheduled data chats and Problem-Solving Team (PST) we address any student concerns and make a plan to intervene as soon as possible. Group and individual counseling is available through our school counselor in addition to individual counseling being offered by two part-time mental health counselors at the school. We also have a partnership with the Levy County Prevention Coalition to provide an instructor for a class on campus that administers curriculum involving instruction on social-emotional behavior, drug prevention, bullying, and more.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Not applicable

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We are a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school. We have a school-wide plan to promote positive behavior across our campus. We provide incentives across the school for following the school-wide expectations and intervene when we have students that need additional support. During our regularly scheduled data chats and Problem-Solving Team (PST) we address any student concerns and make a plan to intervene as soon as possible. District behavior specialists are available to problem-solve and implement supports in regards to student behavior.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

As a school we collaboratively plan once per month, in addition to grade level weekly planning. During our monthly planning, our entire staff plans in the same room so that admin, coach team, and intervention teacher are available to answer any questions and to provide support, academic or otherwise, as it relates to the success of students. Our regularly scheduled data chats and Problem-Solving Team (PST) meetings provide an opportunity to suggest appropriate resources for teachers to use during instruction and train them on using the resources if necessary. Additionally, once a month, we meet with all teachers for any professional development needed. We utilize several strategies to recruit and retain teachers, including the opportunities for mentors at the school and district level, Professional Learning Certification Program (PLCP) to assist with moving from a temporary to a professional certificate, and coaching cycles with our math and/or reading coach.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our VPK teachers are included in our systems at the school, and participate in regular staff and planning days. VPK data from the state progress monitoring tool is also analyzed and used to make current and future instructional decisions. As a school, we partner with our VPK teachers as well as local daycares to determine the needs of upcoming kindergarten students. We also assess them prior to transitioning to kindergarten in an effort to provide appropriate levels of support.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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.

No