

Leon County Schools

Gretchen Everhart 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gretchen Everhart School

2750 MISSION RD, Tallahassee, FL 32304

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

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.

Gretchen Everhart School
Where Everyone is Exceptional!

Striving for quality of life,
one student,
one success at a time.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that each individual is unique, differing from all others in types of attributes and degree of endowment. Each individual should be allowed to grow and develop to his/her greatest potential intellectually, physically, socially, and emotionally.

We believe that educational programming should be designed to meet the needs of each student as an individual rather than trying to fit the student into already established programs. We believe that it is the joint responsibility of the home, school, and community to cooperatively provide the environment and experiences to enable each individual to develop his/her maximum potential..

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
Pittinger, Betsy	Professional Learning Advocate	<p>Betsy Pittinger, ESE Teacher; is the Learning Advocate (Staff Development) representative for the school and also serves on the Curriculum Committee. In her role as both staff development and curriculum committee member. She helps the school determine professional development activities and appropriate curriculum and materials that will help the school meet the instructional needs of the students and the goals of the School Improvement Plan. She serves on several state committees and helps inform the work of the school based on her knowledge of state and district initiatives.</p>
Hutchins, Zellanye		<p>Zellanye Hutchins is the SITE Facilitator, Reading Coach and also serves on the School Advisory Council for the school. She facilitates the monthly meeting of the SITE committee which is comprised of members from each department. As the SITE Facilitator and Reading Coach she assists the Principal in continual work on ongoing school improvement through the identification of needs and solutions with input from all stakeholders.</p>
Thompson, Lori	Guidance / Social Work	
Floyd-Bullen, Jane		<p>The Principal facilitates the work of the School Advisory Council and oversees the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The Principal delegates tasks to the appropriate individuals and monitors the completion of tasks. The Principal, with the help of key stakeholders determines the needs of the school, develops the School Improvement Plan, monitors and reports the progress of the school in meeting the goals. The Principal helps the school with the ongoing work of continual school improvement.</p>
Kerrison, Beverly		<p>The Assistant Principal helps assist the Principal in the facilitation of the work of the school in identifying and meeting the needs of the school through the School Improvement Plan. The Assistant Principal helps monitor the completion of tasks and is a key stakeholder. The AP helps monitor and report the progress of the school in meeting the goals and helps the school with the ongoing work of continual school improvement.</p>
Parker, Jessica		<p>Jessica Parker, the Instructional Technology Specialist, helps the school utilize the technology needed to help students make progress and to help staff best meet the needs of the school and students. The Instructional Technology Support person helps along with the technology committee and SITE to determine the ongoing needs of the school and allocates time and resources accordingly.</p>

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.

Gretchen Everhart School presents the progress on SIP goals to the school staff and School Advisory Council mid year and then at the end of the year. The progress on state assessments if tabulated and shared with teachers and SAC to help determine new targets for goals for the upcoming year. Proposed goals are shared with the school SITE Team for input, with teachers and then in a Public Hearing with parents, staff and community members. The recommendations are then shared with the SAC who then votes on the goals for the next 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 school leadership team along with school staff will monitor achievement of students on a quarterly basis. Monthly monitoring of progress also takes place during navigational meetings with departments along with the Reading Coach, AP, and Principal.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* White Students (WHT)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: UNSATISFACTORY

	2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY 2017-18: UNSATISFACTORY
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	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	5	4	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	5	4	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	3	5	4	7	4	0	24

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	3	2	4	1	1	2	5	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	6	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	6	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	4	2	4	3	2	5	6	32

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	3	1	3	1	1	2	5	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
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	0	0	3	2	4	1	1	2	5	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	6	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	6	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	4	2	4	3	2	5	6	27

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	3	1	3	1	1	2	5	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	3	45	53	4	46	55	6		
ELA Learning Gains				27			30		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	6	44	55	3	40	42	6		
Math Learning Gains				13			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	0	39	52		43	54	12		
Social Studies Achievement*		55	68		52	59	0		
Middle School Acceleration		55	70		42	51			
Graduation Rate	92	52	74	90	39	50			
College and Career Acceleration	0	23	53		48	70			
ELP Progress		56	55		65	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	101
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	137
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	90

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	20	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	8	Yes	4	4
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	3	Yes	4	4

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%
FRL	9	Yes	4	4

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	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	3	3
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	3	Yes	3	3
FRL	0	Yes	3	3

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	3			6			0			92	0	
SWD	3			6			0			0	5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	8			8							2	
HSP												
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	0			6							2	
FRL	9			9							2	

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	4	27		3	13					90		
SWD	4	27		3	13					90		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	9	50		8								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0	10		0								
FRL				0								

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	6	30		6	31		12	0				
SWD	6	30		6	31		12	0				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14	27		0								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0	31		13								
FRL	0	36		8	30							

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. 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.

Math showed the lowest performance. 70% of our students maintained or showed growth on Task 1 of the FSAA Performance Task or scored 2 or higher on FSAA Datafolio. It is hard to determine the contributing factor for the lowest performance. We actually improved from previous year of 41% to 70%.

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

The area of ELA showed the greatest decline from 76% to 71%. We felt this was a minimal decline.

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.

It is hard to compare our scores with state averages.

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

Math showed the most improvement. We had many more of our students assessed using FSAA Datafolio which allows students to be assessed throughout the year.

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

Attendance is an area of concern. So many of our students have challenges getting to school due to medical conditions and many also have behavioral challenges at home which makes it difficult for families to get them to school even when bus transportation is available.

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

1. Increase number of students tested on Datafolio
2. Implement evidence based practices schoolwide using the ALCOT
3. Continue to make gains in ELA and Math
4. Increase effectiveness with behavioral interventions.

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.

Most of our students are scoring Level 1 on ELA Assessments. 71% of the students that were tested maintained or improved skill level on Task 1 on FSAA Performance Task assessment or made a Level 2 or higher on FSAA Datafolio assessments. 26% scored Level 2 or higher on FSAA Performance Task, 88% scored Level 2 or higher on Datafolio and overall 46% scored Level 2 or higher in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of the students that are tested will maintain or improve skill level on Task 1 on FSAA Performance Task assessment or will score 2 or higher if tested with FSAA Datafolio..

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through monthly navigational meetings and monthly progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Use of adapted grade level appropriate reading materials and use of evidence based practices when providing instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence from DOE and the state ACCESS Project in addition to research and collaboration with FSU.

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.

Teachers will provide reading instruction with fidelity using a variety of school / district / state endorsed curriculum and strategies leading to increased student performance.

Teachers/staff will use evidence based practices to provide instruction

Person Responsible: Zellanye Hutchins (hutchinsz@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Use of Unique Learning Systems Curriculum

Use of Attainment Reading curriculum

Use of individualized appropriate curriculums based on student needs

Use of evidence based strategies in providing instruction

Use of novel study by departments
Effective use of progress monitoring tools with ULS

Person Responsible: Christy Fulater (fulaterc@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Utilize the DOE Project Access Weebly for resources and strategies. Book studies on identified books on instruction for students with significant disabilities and their extensive support needs such as High Leverage Practices and Students with Extensive Support Needs and the ALCOT.

Person Responsible: Betsy Pittinger (pittingerb@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Most of our students are scoring Level 1 in the area of Math. 70% of the students that were tested maintained or improved skill level on Task 1 on FSAA Performance Task or scored 2 or higher on FSAA Datafolio. 41% scored Level 2 or higher on FSAA Performance Task, 88% scored Level 2 or higher on FSAA Datafolio and overall 55% scored a Level 2 or higher in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of the students that are tested will maintain or improve skill level on Task 1 on FSAA Performance Task or will score 2 or higher if tested with FSAA Datafolio.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through monthly navigational meetings and monthly progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will discover and use additional resources and strategies and effective ways to progress monitor achievement in the area of math from the Access Project, collaboration with FSA and research leading to improved scores on the state assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective instruction on access points requires specialized resources and strategies. The ALCOT will help drive the use of evidence based practices in 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 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.

Teachers will discover and use additional resources and strategies and effective ways to progress monitor achievement in the area of math leading to improved scores on the state assessments.

Person Responsible: Betsy Pittinger (pittingerb@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Teachers will use the resources made available through our district, state Access Project and FSU and will collaborate with others through training, peer observations, and navigational meetings to best provide instruction in math using a variety of materials and strategies.

Person Responsible: Christy Fulater (fulaterc@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Use of adapted tools such as adapted calculators, number lines, learning kits, etc.

Person Responsible: Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

A little less than half (45%) of our students score Level 1 in the area of Science. 43% of the students scored a Level 2 or higher on FSAA Performance Task. 75% scored a Level 2 or higher on FSAA Datafolio. Overall 55% scored a Level 2 or higher in Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

95% of the students tested in science will correctly answer 5 or more items (30% accuracy) out of the 16 items assessed on FSAA Performance Task or will score a 2 or higher if assessed using the FSAA Datafolio assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through monthly navigational meetings and monthly progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Used of specialized curriculum that present adapted grade level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Resources used are recommended by DOE Access Project, district curriculum developer and other special education center school principals in the state of Florida.

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.

Teachers will collaborate with others through training, peer observations and navigational meetings to best provide instruction in science using a variety of materials and strategies.

Person Responsible: Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

The curriculum committee will solicit input from teachers on the key materials needed to best provide instruction and will work to obtain those items for each classroom.

Person Responsible: Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Teachers will collaborate with others through training, peer observations and navigational meetings to best provide instruction in science using a variety of materials and strategies.

Person Responsible: Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

The curriculum committee will solicit input from teachers on the key materials needed to best provide instruction and will work to obtain those items for each classroom.

Person Responsible: Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of the classroom staff that work for the entire school year will be trained in behavioral procedures.

Monitoring:

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

Behavioral data will be shared with staff monthly.

The Problem Solving Team is involved in determining when additional evaluations and supports may need to be put in place and involves all of the key stakeholders.

Behavioral Case Management meetings will be held at least twice a month and on an as needed basis to review progress on action steps and involves key stakeholders.

Behavioral data is shared with guardians when requested in addition to every nine weeks and when a new Individual Education Plan is developed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports
PBS Team reviews data and interventions school wide
Use of Social Skills Instruction,
Implementation of FBAs and BIPs
CPI and TEACH training for all staff
Individualized training and monitoring for staff on individual plans

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The above evidence based interventions are recommended practices in the field of special education. The school has maintained their status as a GOLD and possibly Platinum level school in the implementation of PBIS in the state of Florida.

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.

Training on CPI for all staff

Training on TEACH to select staff

Ongoing skill instruction to identified staff

Utilize a Positive Behavior Support Committee

Utilize a Behavior Support Response Team

Provide ongoing training to Paraprofessionals and Teachers on effective behavioral strategies and the recording of data

Person Responsible: Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

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).

The School Advisory Council votes on the use of school improvement funding based on recommendations received from the SITE Team. Staff provide input to their SITE Representative and SITE (of which the Professional Development Advocate is a member) comes up with a recommendation that is presented to the SAC.