

Nassau County School District

Callahan Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Callahan Elementary School

449618 US HIGHWAY 301, Callahan, FL 32011

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our District mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Callahan Elementary is dedicated to maximizing individual potential and developing life-long learners who will be contributing members in a global society. We commit to a comprehensive system of support to assure this outcome.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: The vision of Callahan Elementary School is to guarantee a safe, nurturing, learning environment, where respect, pride, and success are achieved by all. Whatever it takes!

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
Johnson, Melissa	Principal	Principal
Collins, Kristy	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Thrift, Katherine	Reading Coach	Reading Coach
Manning, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher
Taylor, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	1st grade teacher

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.

CES School Advisory Council (SAC) is a team of stakeholders who are: people representing various segments of the community that include parents, teachers, students, administrators, support staff, and interested community members. The purpose of the SAC is to assist in the preparation, development, and evaluation of the results of the School Improvement Plan and to assist the administration with the annual school budget. Our SAC is composed of the principal and an "appropriately balanced" number of

stakeholders that are representative of our CES community. Our school improvement is a data-driven decision-making process. Our SAC reviews relevant data (which sometimes involves more than just test scores), identifies problem areas, develops improvement strategies, monitors their implementation, evaluates the outcomes and then begins the process over with the next round of data that is available at mid-year and end-of-year.

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 is regularly monitored through observation of strategies being implemented, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders, and correlating the achievements or lack of achievements to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This is done through grade level data meetings, individual teacher data chats, student data chats, faculty meetings, and SAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan is revised through analyzing areas of concern and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus.

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-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	12%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	44	32	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	

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	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	18	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	9	54	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	43	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	

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	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	9	54	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	43	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	

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	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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*	68	69	53	65	69	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				68			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			55		
Math Achievement*	81	77	59	84	53	50	84		
Math Learning Gains				80			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			71		
Science Achievement*	76	69	54	70	81	59	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					65	52			
Graduation Rate					70	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		50	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	70			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	63			

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	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	71			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	63			

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	68			81			76					
SWD	36			57			46				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			55							2	
HSP	57			83							2	
MUL	90			80			82				3	
PAC												
WHT	68			81			76				4	
FRL	59			73			65				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	65	68	55	84	80	74	70					
SWD	39	58	52	68	76	70	11					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			50								
HSP	66	67		72	80							
MUL	60	82		70	73							
PAC												
WHT	66	68	56	86	81	73	70					
FRL	55	61	51	76	73	70	54					

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	72	74	55	84	84	71	77					
SWD	44	50	41	59	64	47	48					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60			60								
HSP	89			83								
MUL	65			74								
PAC												
WHT	72	75	58	85	85	74	77					
FRL	63	69	50	76	78	67	69					

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.

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.

Callahan Intermediate, our feeder pattern's 22-23 FAST data indicates that their lowest performing area was 3rd grade ELA at 67% proficient. Also, CIS identified SWD subgroup scored at 46% proficient in ELA. Some contributing factors to the lowest performance are: new standards, new curriculum, and new testing platform.

2022-2023 FAST PM3 Data for Callahan Elementary School:

ELA - Kindergarten 87%, First 94%, Second 86%

Math- Kindergarten 77%, First 97%, Second 90%

Contributing Factors- new curriculum

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

After reviewing the Needs Assessment/Data Review for Callahan Intermediate School, the data components with the greatest decline were in ELA.

Third grade ELA proficiency was 67%. Students with disabilities (SWD) 46%.

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.

Callahan Intermediate School ELA, Math, and Science data is consistently higher than the state averages. The overall school proficiency data for ELA-70%, Math-81%, and Science-75%.

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

Callahan Intermediate math data is consistently higher than ELA data across grade levels. The Math data for 22-23 FAST PM3 across grade levels were: 3rd grade-73%, 4th grade-82%, 5th grade-89% compared to our ELA data for 22-23 FAST PM3 across grade levels: 3rd grade-67%, 4th grade-77%, 5th grade-71%.

Looking at Callahan Elementary School data:

2022-2023 ELA data should significant increases from PM2 to PM3

Kindergarten 76% to 87%

1st Grade 86% to 94%

2nd grade 77% to 86%

Math

Kindergarten 66% to 77%

1st grade 96% to 97%

2nd grade 83% to 90%

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

Attendance is an area of concern in all grade levels
107 students are below 90% attendance rate .
ELA - 42 students were identified with as having deficits in reading.
25 students were retained in grade K-2.

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

Callahan Elementary has identified three priorities for the 23-24 school year.

1. Increase student attendance.
2. Increase ELA proficiency rate K-2.
3. Targeted interventions for identified subgroups- CES- Kindergarten retainees, CIS- identified groups SWD and African Americans.

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.

Feeder pattern, CIS identified ELA data as their lowest data component. ELA data for 22-23 FAST PM3 across grade levels: 3rd grade-67%, 4th grade-77%, 5th grade-71%. Our school wide proficiency was 70%.

In reviewing our 22-23 data, CIS identified two sub group areas of focus: SWD in grades 3-5 demonstrated a proficiency rate of 46% and our African American students in grade 3-5 was 62%.

Callahan Elementary

In comparison to other K-2 schools in the district CES, performed lower (87%) in Kindergarten. BOY progress monitoring scores for FAST ELA: K- 54% 1st- 80% 2nd- 70%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Callahan Intermediate has the following goal :

By the end of the year our FAST PM3 ELA proficiency data will increase from 70% in 22/23 to 73% in 23/24.

SWD subgroup, by the end of the year our FAST PM3 ELA proficiency data will increase from 46% to 50%.

African American subgroup, by the end of the year our FAST PM3 ELA proficiency data will increase from 62% to 65%.

Callahan Elementary increase ELA proficiency rate from 22/23 to 23/24:

Kindergarten from 87% to 90%

1st grade from 94% to 97%

2nd grade from 86% to 90%

Early warning system indicated that 21% of students that were identified as having a reading deficiency are SWD. Our goal is to decrease the number of SWD students that are identified on the early warning system with reading deficiency from 21% to 18%.

28% of African American students in grade K-2 have been identified as having a reading deficiency. Our goal is decrease this number from 28% to 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be progress monitored three times a year using FAST Assessment.

Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and/or the Literacy Coach will progress monitor using the following resources:

Phonics screeners, Differentiated Reading Instructions, Next Steps.

Data is reviewed by teachers weekly in their grade level PLCs. The Literacy coach and Administration provide teachers a data review and instructional planning session. Administration meets with the School Literacy Team, Leadership Team to discuss school wide data, and grade level data. Grade level teams meet weekly to discuss school wide data, grade level data, and individual teacher data. Grade levels review MTSS data weekly and update data and strategies as needed. Students in identified subgroups-

SWD/African American will be monitored with the assistance of the Reading Coach with our in-school intervention program and the use of after school tutoring with those that can attend.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Johnson (johnsonme@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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.)

K-2 students received daily small group differentiated phonics instruction and standards-based remedial core curriculum instruction as part of their 90-minute reading block. The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program, Lexia, and Sonday System are also used to provide Tier 3 interventions.

Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)-(strong evidence-per Evidence for ESSA)
Sonday System program aligns with the IES Practice Guided recommendations. (Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 5th grade.)

Other:

After school tutoring is provided for students who demonstrate a reading deficiency.

Preferential scheduling with our students with disabilities and African American subgroups.

Decreased the percentage of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Provided professional development for teachers in the following area:

Behavior Management, Specially Designed Instruction, Data-driven instruction

Practice Profiles- Explicit and Scaffolded Instruction

Gradual Release Method

In-school intervention program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of small group instruction is to address learning deficits. When students are placed in small groups of 2 to 6 and provided direct instructional support, student success increases.

The use of the Differentiated Instruction Intervention program provides educators effective intervention resources and strategies that allow students to apply each concept in increasingly challenging situations to build accuracy, automaticity, and fluency within the five reading components.

By using the Sonday System to target crucial foundational skills to students who are exhibiting extreme deficits in phonics and phonemic awareness

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. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS
3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need.
4. Intervention Time - utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards

5. Incorporating a more direct use of the Gradual Release Model in small group instruction, explicit instruction and scaffolded instruction.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonme@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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.

Our current data reveals that we have 17% not attending 90% of the time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

CES would like to decrease the number of students not attending school 90% of the time by 3%.

Monitoring:

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

Students ADA from Focus will be reviewed monthly at Threat assessment meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Collins (collinskr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Parent communication will be used to bring awareness of attendance policy and to implement student incentives, as well as classroom regarding attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is evident that parent/student communication and incentives are needed to express the importance of attendance and the correlation to student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Meet monthly to discuss students not meeting 90% attendance target.
2. Classroom who have perfect attendance are recognized daily on the news and bulletin.
3. Provide perfect attendance rewards at the end of the nine weeks.
4. Check in check out with AP for students who are absent for more than two consecutives days without teachers knowledge or more than 2 days in a week.
5. Home visits with the principal and school resource officer
6. Communication logs of parent contact with teacher and AP.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonme@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

CES School Advisory Council (SAC) is a team of stakeholders who are: people representing various segments of the community that include parents, teachers, students, administrators, support staff, and interested community members. The purpose of the SAC is to assist in the preparation, development, and evaluation of the results of the School Improvement Plan and to assist the administration with the annual school budget and school improvement funds. Our SAC is composed of the principal and an “appropriately balanced” number of stakeholders that are representative of our CES community. Our school improvement is a data-driven decision-making process. Our SAC reviews relevant data (which sometimes involves more than just test scores), identifies problem areas, develops improvement strategies, approves and manages school improvement funds to ensure implementation of identified strategies, monitors the implementation of identified strategies, evaluates the outcomes and then begins the process over with the next round of data that is available at mid-year and end-of-year.

The SIP is regularly monitored through observation of strategies being implemented, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders, and correlating the achievements or lack of achievements to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This is done through grade level data meetings, individual teacher data chats, student data chats, faculty meetings, and SAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan is revised through analyzing areas of concern and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

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?

N/A

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**

N/A

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.

Callahan Elementary School analyzes subgroup achievement data to develop our Title I Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and School Improvement Plan (SIP). Both plans are discussed, evaluated, and voted on at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Our Title I CNA outlines how we plan to fund 1.) student needs (e.g., supplies, paraprofessionals, technology programs), 2.) parent and family engagement needs (e.g., parent nights, parent communication), 3.) curriculum development needs (e.g., data chats, planning days), and 4.) professional development needs (e.g., teacher walkthroughs, B.E.S.T. standards and Benchmark training). The CNA must be developed with participation from individuals that carry out school-wide program plans including teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. Our CNA is available upon request. A paper copy of our SIP is available in our front office and a digital copy can be viewed on our school's website. Both the paper copy and digital copy are referenced on our

monthly school calendars, so that all school stakeholders are aware of the various methods of dissemination. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

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))

Callahan Elementary School continually strives to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. To achieve our goal in fulfilling our school's mission for parent and family engagement, we follow a process that starts at our spring School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. At this meeting, we evaluate the results of our current year's Title I Parent Survey and school-level Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Topics of discussion include flexible parent nights and meetings, progress monitoring of students, parent communication, barriers to parent involvement, and professional development to effectively train our staff on bridging the gap between school and home. Additionally, we reflect on parents' survey results indicating if they feel valued, respected, and welcomed at our school. The information gleaned at this meeting, along with insight gathered from weekly collaboration meetings, leadership team meetings, faculty meetings, and parent teacher meetings gives us a comprehensive look into our school's ability to build positive relationships with our school stakeholders. If an area of focus does not meet our level of expectations, we set goals and establish priorities for the upcoming school year and reassess them in the spring. Callahan Elementary School PFEP is available on our school website and in our front office. Our monthly calendars and newsletters state where this plan can be accessed. Our district PFEP is available on our Nassau County School District website. The Title I Handbook-Desk Reference is disseminated to all families at the start of each school year, and it outlines how to access the district PFEP. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

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)

Title 1 funds used to hire additional personnel to assist in the classroom with small group ELA and Math instruction and provide academic remediation. Technology programs such as Lexia Core and IXL are utilized to strengthen students' phonics, phonemic awareness and comprehension skills. School-wide tutoring and intervention programs are also in place to provide additional intervention and remediation.

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))

Callahan Elementary School-Wide Program Plan is developed with participation from teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. We work with our Title I department and Food Service department to determine our school's free and reduced lunch count, which dictates our Title I allocation. Callahan Elementary School and the Title I department work closely with other federal programs, including Title II and Title III to pinpoint staff development opportunities and to improve the achievement of our ELL student population. We collaborate with Head Start programs to effectively transition our preschool children to kindergarten. We work with our Director of Intervention Prevention, and Safety Services to

ensure interventions are in place for our homeless students, foster care students, and neglected and delinquent students. We collaborate with our ESE department to provide specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of our students.

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))

The district utilizes the tiered process to provide support to students in need of school-based mental health services and specialized support services in order to help them to access the educational environment. In addition, if a student is experiencing an acute crisis, the mental health provider which is typically the school social worker can connect with the student through a system of care process to determine what supports, if any, may be needed either in or out of the school environment.

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))

N/A

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).

The district utilizes the MTSS approach to prevent and address problem behavior. With PBIS, the school teams provide preventative support. If this is not sufficient, the school based problem solving team will convene to determine additional intervention supports. If these supports need to be ongoing and continuous or significantly differ in intensity and duration from what can be provided solely through general education resources to make or maintain sufficient progress, then the team will consider the need for services via IDEA (e.g., consider need for a psychoeducational evaluation, monitor the need for specialized instruction, etc.).

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))

District level PD includes:

Rethinking Behavior/Flip It

Power Struggles

Explicit/Scaffolded Instruction

Specially Designed Instruction

School Wide:

Explicit Instruction

Data Digging

Scaffolding Instruction

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))

Nassau County School District works in collaboration with other early childhood education agencies to ensure a smooth transition to our local school programs. (ie. Head Start, Child Find)

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: 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