

Alachua County Public Schools

Chester Shell 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 | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 28 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 30 |

Chester Shell Elementary School

21633 SE 65TH AVE, Hawthorne, FL 32640

<https://www.sbac.edu/shell>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

Shell Elementary School, in partnership with the community, are dedicated to providing a safe, positive, and enriching learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chester Shell Elementary will support the whole child. We will work to produce successful contributing members of our community. Shell is driven to be a school where all students are reading on grade level.

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 |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Haukland, Edward | Principal | To provide effective leadership in the administration and supervision of elementary school operations to promote the successful education of students in a safe an orderly environment. |
| Goans, Sabreena | Assistant Principal | To assist the Principal in providing effective leadership in the administration and supervision of elementary school operations to promote the successful education of students in a safe and orderly environment. |
| Bundrick, Sarah | Dean | To assist the Principal with the development, implementation and coordination of the student behavior-management program for the school. |
| Hutchinson, Karla | Administrative Support | To provide effective leadership and intensive supports to schools in order to meet school improvement goals that align with School Improvement State System of Support for Deficient and Failing Schools requirements, to assist the District in meeting the goals and objectives of the District's vision and mission. |
| Warren, Lisa | Instructional Coach | To develop and implement curriculum at the school level in accordance with state, district and school objectives/guidelines. Provide resources and deliver instructional coaching to teachers using best practices. |

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.

Leadership of the Hawthorne Homecoming Committee will be an integral part of Shell's initiative to increase attendance above 90%.

Faculty will supply input during grade-level instructional meetings.

SAC will review and advise on student improvement initiatives.

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))

Shell will continuously monitor the SIP through:

- BSI instructional reviews
- SAC quarterly meetings
- Grade-level planning meetings
- Leadership meetings
- Title 1 parent nights

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 | 49% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | Yes |
| 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 | 2021-22: D |

| | |
|---|--|
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 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 | 24 | 20 | 23 | 28 | 34 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 2 | 5 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 24 | 3 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 25 | 17 | 21 | 33 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 26 | 33 | 30 | 39 | 31 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | |

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 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

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 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 2 | 28 | 27 | 33 | 36 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 18 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 2 | 27 | 16 | 24 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | |
| | 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 | 2 | 15 | 21 | 26 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 2 | 28 | 27 | 33 | 36 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 18 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 2 | 27 | 16 | 24 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | |
| | 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 | 2 | 15 | 21 | 26 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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* | 32 | 52 | 53 | 28 | 53 | 56 | 27 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44 | | | 20 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 62 | | | 15 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 25 | 53 | 59 | 36 | 40 | 50 | 30 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 40 | | | 13 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43 | | | 14 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 30 | 54 | 54 | 28 | 54 | 59 | 18 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 58 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 43 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 47 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 61 | 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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 31 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 125 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 281 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| 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 | 20 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 16 | Yes | 4 | 3 |
| HSP | 45 | | | |
| MUL | 30 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| 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 | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| FRL | 29 | Yes | 2 | 1 |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD | 35 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | Yes | 3 | 2 |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | 26 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 32 | | | 25 | | | 30 | | | | | |
| SWD | 20 | | | 20 | | | 8 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 13 | | | 12 | | | 17 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 40 | | | 50 | | | | | | | 2 | |

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 | 35 | | | 24 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | | | 31 | | | 38 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 29 | | | 21 | | | 29 | | | | 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 | 28 | 44 | 62 | 36 | 40 | 43 | 28 | | | | | |
| SWD | 14 | 46 | 62 | 22 | 37 | 27 | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 34 | | 28 | 32 | 43 | 23 | | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 25 | | | 27 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 31 | 52 | 67 | 38 | 38 | 36 | 28 | | | | | |
| FRL | 22 | 41 | 62 | 32 | 39 | 46 | 28 | | | | | |

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 | 27 | 20 | 15 | 30 | 13 | 14 | 18 | | | | | |
| SWD | 8 | 0 | | 5 | 6 | | 6 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 19 | | 30 | 13 | | 0 | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 20 | | | 9 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 30 | 17 | | 31 | 13 | | 22 | | | | | |

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 | 23 | 20 | 18 | 28 | 11 | 8 | 15 | | | | | |

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 | 34% | 53% | -19% | 54% | -20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 54% | -12% | 58% | -16% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 49% | -15% | 50% | -16% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 52% | -16% | 59% | -23% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 25% | 58% | -33% | 61% | -36% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 23% | 54% | -31% | 55% | -32% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 51% | -20% | 51% | -20% |

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.

Overall performance:

22-23: 31%, Science 21-22: 15% proficient
 22-23 FAST Math PM3 was 28%., Math 21-22: 36%
 22-23 FAST ELA PM3 was 36%., ELA 21-22: 28%

Our subgroup data follows:

SWD 22-23 ELA was 39% proficient from 21-22 = 14% proficient
 SWD 22-23 Math was 29% proficient from 21-22 = 22% proficient
 SWD 22-23 Science was 35% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 ELA was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient
 Black/AA Students 22-23 Math was 12% proficient from 21-22 = 28% proficient
 Black/AA Students 22-23 Science was 17%

Multi-racial Students 22-23 ELA was 33% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient
 Multi-racial Students 22-23 Math was 22% proficient from 21-22 = 27% proficient
 Multi-racial Students 22-23 Science was 14% proficient

In the 22-23 school year, 21% of our students scored on or above grade level (Core Support) in fundamental reading skills on the DIBELS assessment. Grade level breakdown is as follows:

Kindergarten- 16%
 First grade-18%
 Second grade-29%
 Third grade-36%
 Fourth grade-21%

DIBELS Benchmark Comp. (Spring '23)

| Grade Level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | K | Grand Total |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| No Score | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 21 |
| Core Support | 10 | 17 | 25 | 13 | 8 | 73 |
| Core^ Support | 3 | 3 | | | | |
| Intensive Support | 36 | 28 | 34 | 34 | 25 | 157 |
| Strategic Support | 6 | 10 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 42 |
| Grand Total | 56 | 58 | 69 | 62 | 51 | 296 |

Contributing factors for our lowest student proficiency scores in math include attendance, different presentation and modality of math test (computer vs paper, open response vs multiple choice), and additional intervention time only included reading support.

Attendance data:

Number of students with greater than 10% absent rates:

K = 24 out of 48 students
 1 = 20 out of 43 students
 2 = 23 out of 53 students
 3 = 28 out of 71 students
 4 = 34 out of 58 students
 5 = 27 out of 65 students

22-23 OSS:

K = 4
 1st = 2
 2nd = 3

3rd = 6
 4th = 4
 5th = 4
 All = 23

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

Shell's students declined by 7% in math according the state assessments taken in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school years.

21-21 = 35%

22-23 = 28%

Contributing factors for our lowest student proficiency scores in math include attendance, different presentation and modality of math test (computer vs paper, open response vs multiple choice), new benchmarks/materials, and additional intervention time only included reading support.

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.

Shell's math proficiency scores are 31% below the state average of 59%. In the 22-23 school year, Shell was 28% proficient, which was a drop of 7% from the 21-22 proficiency level of 36%. We implemented an intervention period for all grade levels to address the reading gap, but did not add math during this block.

Other contributing factors for our lowest student proficiency scores in math include attendance, different presentation and modality of math test (computer vs paper, open response vs multiple choice), new benchmarks/materials, and additional intervention time only included reading support.

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

The reading proficiency data showed the most improvement through our efforts during the intervention blocks, Title 1 support services, and planning meetings to facilitate student discussions and benchmark expectations with teachers. Shell grew 9% from the 21-22 year of 28% proficient to the 22-23 school year of 36% proficient. This puts Shell at an 18% gap from the state average of 54%.

Actions that Shell took in the area of ELA was implementation of an intervention period added to the schedule beginning after Spring Break to focus on reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension in a differentiated setting. The Title 1 schedule included pull-out and push-in support for students based on data. Student groups were fluid and changed in response to data chats and teacher input.

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

The greatest number of students who scored a level 1 on the FAST assessment. In addition to FAST, student attendance continues to be a concern and therefore a focus.

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

1. Attendance & Behavior
2. Math Proficiency
3. Reading and Writing Proficiency
4. Rapid Response Tiered System to address student needs

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 Differentiation**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.

Although we have begun to close the gap when compared to previous year's Early Warning Systems and Statewide Assessments, we are still performing below the state average. Shell's Math gap is 31% lower than the state average and Shell fell 7% from the previous year's proficiency. While Shell grew in Reading proficiency by 9% over last year, as a result of an additional intervention period implemented in Q4, a gap of 18% still exists from the state average.

In the 22-23 school year, 21% of our students scored on or above grade level (Core Support) in fundamental reading skills on the DIBELS assessment. Grade level breakdown is as follows:

Kindergarten- 16%

First grade-18%

Second grade-29%

Third grade-36%

Fourth grade-21%

DIBELS Benchmark Comp. (Spring '23)

Grade Level 1 2 3 4 K Grand Total

No Score 4 3 6 3 5 21

Core Support 10 17 25 13 8 73

Core^ Support 3 3

Intensive Support 36 28 34 34 25 157

Strategic Support 6 10 4 12 10 42

Grand Total 56 58 69 62 51 296

Our subgroup data follows:

SWD 22-23 ELA was 39% proficient from 21-22 = 14% proficient

SWD 22-23 Math was 29% proficient from 21-22 = 22% proficient

SWD 22-23 Science was 35% proficient

Black/AA 22-23 ELA was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient

Black/AA 22-23 Math was 12% proficient from 21-22 = 28% proficient

Black/AA 22-23 Science was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 23% proficient

Multi 22-23 ELA was 33% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient

Multi 22-23 Math was 22% proficient from 21-22 = 27% proficient

Multi 22-23 Science was 14% proficient

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall measurable outcome:

46% of students will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of students will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

In kindergarten we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on their end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In first grade we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In second grade we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In third grade we have set a goal of 50% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In fourth grade we have set a goal of 54% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In fifth grade we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

Improvement comparisons in DIBELS, SIPPS/UFLI, FAST, ISIP, classroom assessments, tiered student data, Common assessments (Chapter and Unit Assessments), Science AIMS assessment, Waggle, Student attendance (absences, tardy, PBIS tracking & incentives), Walkthrough feedback over time

Subgroup measurable outcomes:

46% of SWD will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of SWD will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

46% of Black/AA Students will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of Black/AA Students will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

46% of Multi-racial Students will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of Multi-racial Students will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

Our monitored subgroup data follows:

SWD 22-23 ELA was 39% proficient from 21-22 = 14% proficient

SWD 22-23 Math was 29% proficient from 21-22 = 22% proficient

SWD 22-23 Science was 35% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 ELA was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 Math was 12% proficient from 21-22 = 28% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 Science was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 23% proficient

Multi-racial Students 22-23 ELA was 33% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient

Multi-racial Students 22-23 Math was 22% proficient from 21-22 = 27% proficient

Multi-racial Students 22-23 Science was 14% proficient

Monitoring:

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

Shell will monitor student performance using a tiered system of data collection and discussion which includes the following:

-Data chats;

Quarterly for tier 1 students, every 4 weeks for tier 2 students, and every 2 weeks for tier 3 students;

-District level common assessments;

-DIBELS progress monitoring;

-FAST progress monitoring; and

-ELA unit and Math chapter common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Edward Haukland (hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Shell's Intervention period will include Read Naturally for ELA and Waggle and Reflex for Math with opportunity for enrichment using IXL Math and IRLA book studies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Read Naturally was chosen for its differentiation ability, its focus on vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and background-knowledge building. Reflex was chosen for its computation skill-building along with the district provided IXL math.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

Conduct Tiered data chats. Fluid grouping of students based on data.

Push-in and pull-out support schedule through Title 1 personnel.

Students in need will be provided with mp3 players loaded with Read Naturally stories, along with the paper story, to listen and practice on the bus ride home.

Person Responsible: Lisa Warren (warrenlk@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Quarterly for tier 1 students, every 4 weeks for tier 2 students, and every 2 weeks for tier 3 students Daily/weekly support, adjusted in response to student needs.

School-wide book study on "Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind" to support differentiated student needs and teacher learning.

Students will be provided UDL style assistance to engage them and can include noise cancelling headphones to support auditory sensory considerations, Flocabulary to build vocabulary and background knowledge, among others.

Person Responsible: Sabreena Goans (goanssl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Monthly faculty check-ins with admin to review learning. Weekly book group meetings August - December with goals set.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Using district approved curriculum to deliver benchmark-aligned instruction to meet the needs of students' learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall measurable outcome:

46% of students will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of students will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

51% of students proficient in Science EOY assessment.

Subgroup measurable outcomes:

46% of SWD will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of SWD will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

46% of Black/AA Students will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of Black/AA Students will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

46% of Multi-racial Students will perform on grade level in ELA as measured by PM3.

41% of Multi-racial Students will perform on grade level in Math as measured by PM3.

Our monitored subgroup data follows:

SWD 22-23 ELA was 39% proficient from 21-22 = 14% proficient

SWD 22-23 Math was 29% proficient from 21-22 = 22% proficient

SWD 22-23 Science was 35% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 ELA was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 Math was 12% proficient from 21-22 = 28% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 Science was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 23% proficient

Multi-racial Students 22-23 ELA was 33% proficient from 21-22 = 20% proficient

Multi-racial Students 22-23 Math was 22% proficient from 21-22 = 27% proficient

Multi-racial Students 22-23 Science was 14% proficient

Grade-level growth in ISIP, Common assessments (Chapter and Unit Assessments), and Science AIMS assessment of 10% each assessment through proficiency.

Walkthrough feedback shows at least 90% alignment with grade-level standards/benchmarks during core instructional time.

Monitoring:

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

Administrative classroom walk-throughs, weekly planning meetings, data chats, assessment results, and coaching will be continued this year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sabreena Goans (goanssl@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Through district-adopted curriculum students will receive grade-level instruction and intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Alachua county's supported curriculum was selected because it meets the evidence-based criteria to deliver benchmark-aligned 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?

Yes

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.

Data chats through Title 1, to address students' needs using benchmark-aligned curriculum. Fluid grouping of students based on data using district-adopted curriculum.

Weekly planning meeting through Title 1 following the district outlined scope and sequence.

Person Responsible: Lisa Warren (warrenlk@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Quarterly for tier 1 students, every 4 weeks for tier 2 students, and every 2 weeks for tier 3 students. Daily/weekly support, adjusted in response to student needs.

BSI conference for 2 admin and 1 IIC in Summer 2024 to support Benchmark-aligned instructional practices that support the district-adopted curriculum.

Person Responsible: Edward Haukland (hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Summer 2024

School-wide peer-coaching PD will increase community expertise in meeting student needs through Benchmark-aligned instruction. Teacher pairs will meet for pre-conference, observation, and post-conference for each person.

Person Responsible: Edward Haukland (hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August-May with at least one coaching cycle per quarter, per person completed. Reflections will be turned in to Principal at the end of each coaching cycle.

#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.

In the 22-23 school year, Shell continued to be below 90% attendance rate.

Our goal is to reduce the number of Out of school suspensions.

Students learn best in the classroom setting. Keeping students in the classroom will increase their ability to receive and practice grade-level instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Shell's goal is to have 95% attendance rate.

Additionally, students who are chronically absent will decrease by at least 50% per grade level.

Decreasing the number of OSS by 15% will support student growth.

Improvement comparisons in student attendance (absences, tardy, PBIS tracking & incentives) and walkthrough feedback over time

22-23 Attendance:

Number of students with greater than 10% absent rates:

K = 24 out of 48 students

1 = 20 out of 43 students

2 = 23 out of 53 students

3 = 28 out of 71 students

4 = 34 out of 58 students

5 = 27 out of 65 students

22-23 OSS students:

K = 4

1st = 2

2nd = 3

3rd = 6

4th = 4

5th = 4

All = 23

Monitoring:

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

Family Liaison will monitor attendance, contact families as needed, work with truancy officer, and facilitate a positive reward response to increase attendance.

Classroom behavior system data, tier 2 and/or 3 assessment data, referral data, PBIS Google sheet data for each class & student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shakenya Ivey (iveysn@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

PBIS reward, MTSS system, and tracking for improved attendance.

Increase home-school communication via Family Liaison, classroom teachers, and guardians to support attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the 22-23 school year, students participating in this intervention showed increased attendance rates, therefore, we will continue to implement this.

PBIS supports a positive school culture by addressing behaviors of individual students and implementing school-wide reward systems. The MTSS system identifies and provides specific behavioral supports and allows for frequent monitoring of identified behavioral needs.

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?

Yes

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.

Family Liaison will report attendance, keep contact logs, contact families as needed, work with truancy officer, and facilitate a positive reward response to increase attendance.

Person Responsible: Shakenya Ivey (iveysn@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Review will be quarterly with bi-monthly check-in with administration.

School-wide support through SEL 7-Mindsets program to increase student confidence and behavior. 7 Mindsets will train teachers and weekly lessons will be delivered to students by classroom teachers. Weekly home-school communication to support this.

Person Responsible: Sarah Bundrick (bundrickse@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Review through PBIS meetings and lead teacher meetings to discuss effectiveness and reduction of behavior calls/suspensions.

Monitor classroom behavior.

Implement the 2-2-2 tiered behavior communication system which identifies tier 2 or 3 students in a timely manner.

Utilize EPT, FBA, and BIP processes with fidelity.

Administer Schoolwide PBIS system.

Person Responsible: Sarah Bundrick (bundrickse@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Classroom behavior systems turned in to BRT by first week of school. 2-2-2 behavior system monitored through tiered data chats. As needed, EPT, FBA, and BIP created. Bi-Quarterly PBIS school-wide rewards.

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 principal and SI Principal will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Title I department will facilitate the budget alignment processes to ensure student needs are met.

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

In the 22-23 school year, 21% of our students scored on or above grade level (Core Support) in fundamental reading skills on the DIBELS assessment. Grade level breakdown is as follows:

Kindergarten- 16%

First grade-18%

Second grade-29%

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

In the 22-23 school year, 21% of our students scored on or above grade level (Core Support) in fundamental reading skills on the DIBELS assessment. Grade level breakdown is as follows:

Second grade-29%

Third grade-36%

Fourth grade-21%

Overall performance: ELA 22-23 FAST ELA PM3 was 36%, 21-22: 28%

Grade 3: ELA 22-23 FAST ELA PM3 was 34%

Grade 4: ELA 22-23 FAST ELA PM3 was 43%

Grade 5: ELA 22-23 FAST ELA PM3 was 33%

Our subgroup data follows:

SWD 22-23 ELA was 39% proficient from 21-22 = 14% proficient

Black/AA Students 22-23 ELA was 17% proficient from 21-22 = 20%

Multi-racial Students 22-23 ELA was 33% proficient from 21-22 = 20%

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

In kindergarten we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on their end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In first grade we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In second grade we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

On grade level proficiency will be monitored through unit assessments and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In third grade we have set a goal of 50% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In fourth grade we have set a goal of 54% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In fifth grade we have set a goal of 41% or more scoring at Core Support or above on the end of the year composite score in DIBELS.

In third grade, we have set a goal of meeting the district average of 46% of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the final summative assessment.

In fourth grade we have set a goal of meeting the district average of 46% of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the final summative assessment.

In fifth grade we have set a goal of meeting the district average of 46% of students scoring at or above a level 3 on the final summative assessment.

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.

Literacy Leadership -

1. - Meet at minimum one after each progress monitoring assessment window to evaluate the effectiveness of our literacy programs and practices.

Literacy Coaching -

1. - Create a coaching plan to sort all teachers into a tiered level according to assessment data and walkthrough data in the area of literacy.

2. - The Instructional Leadership Team will meet monthly to determine the effectiveness of the coaching plans and evaluate teacher needs to be sure they are still in the correct coaching Tier.

Assessment -

1. - Communicate the ELA benchmarks to be assessed on each of the three FAST progress monitoring assessments.
2. - Create a testing schedule that meets all student needs and allows for students to show their best work.
3. - Meet with teachers within a week to analyze the reading assessment data and create an instructional plan for remediation.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Haukland, Edward, hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu

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?

We will be using the UFLI foundational reading program whole group for grades K-2 and as an intervention in grades 3-5. We will be using SIPPS as an intervention in high dose tutoring for grades 1-5. We will be using the Read Naturally Program to develop fluency for grades 1-5. These intervention processes will occur alongside tier 1 grade level 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?

The practices/programs we are putting in place will address the lack of fundamental reading skills in all of our grade levels. We implemented Read Naturally after Spring Break and had an increase of 9% in grades 3-5 as measured by EOY assessment.

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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Coaching - 1. - Create a coaching plan to sort all teachers into a tiered level according to assessment data and walkthrough data in the area of literacy. | Haukland, Edward, hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu |
| Assessment - 1. - Communicate the ELA benchmarks to be assessed on each of the three FAST progress monitoring assessments. 2. - Create a testing schedule that meets all student needs and allows for students to show their best work. 3. - Meet with teachers within a week to analyze the reading assessment data and create an instructional plan for remediation. | Goans, Sabreena, goanssl@gm.sbac.edu |

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.

Shell will provide information on our School Improvement Plan, Title 1 budgets, and our Schoolwide Plan through:

- Title 1 Annual Meeting
- SAC meetings
- PTO meetings
- Faculty meetings
- Title 1 Parent and Family Engagement events
- Shell webpage
- Shell Facebook Page

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))

Shell will build positive relationships with families and stakeholders through:

- Parent and Family Engagement events
- Hawthorne Homecoming community event, held each summer
- Shell's Facebook page
- Shell's website

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)

The Title 1 office will continue to provide push-in and pull-out support for struggling and accelerated students. The intervention block will be a time for both reading and math support (as identified through our area of focus), tiered for struggling and accelerated learners.

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))

Shell partners with the US Department of Agriculture to provide free breakfasts and lunches to students through the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) program.

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))

District provided guidance counselor to meet with students in small group and individually based upon student needs. EPT process includes a team of support professionals to provide academic, behavior, and mental health support. Faculty as access to a Google Form to request counseling services for students.

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).

Shell will implement a specialized model for Tier 2 student intervention. This will include two weeks of in-class documented interventions and two parent contacts by the teacher prior to requesting tier 2 support. This dynamic process will address students every two weeks and adjust levels of support as needed.

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))

Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind.
Love and Logic.
Tiered coaching.

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))

Spring time Kindergarten Round-up
First day of Kindergarten readiness assessments and teacher feedback.

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: Differentiation | | | | \$324,011.56 |
|---|----------|--|---|----------------|------|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 5100 | 150 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | 0.75 | \$17,798.40 |
| | | | Notes: Salary for 1, 6-hour/daily Instructional Paraprofessional to support intervention instruction | | | |
| | 5100 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$2,415.24 |
| | | | Notes: Retirement benefits @ 13.57% for 1, 6-hour/daily Instructional Paraprofessional to support intervention instruction | | | |
| | 5100 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$1,361.58 |
| | | | Notes: SSI benefits @ 7.65% for 1, 6-hour/daily Instructional Paraprofessional to support intervention instruction | | | |
| | 5100 | 230 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$8,473.00 |
| | | | Notes: Insurance benefits for 1, 6-hour/daily Instructional Paraprofessional to support intervention instruction | | | |
| | 5100 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$90.77 |
| | | | Notes: Early Retirement benefits @ 0.51% for 1, 6-hour/daily Instructional Paraprofessional to support intervention instruction | | | |
| | 5100 | 120 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$45,204.68 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|-----|---|-----------------|-----|-------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary for 1 Intervention Teacher to provide small group instruction</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$6,134.28 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Retirement benefits @ 13.57% for 1 Intervention Teacher to provide small group instruction</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$3,458.17 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI benefits @ 7.65% for 1 Intervention Teacher to provide small group instruction</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 230 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$8,473.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Insurance benefits for 1 Intervention Teacher to provide small group instruction</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$230.54 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Early Retirement benefits @ 0.51% for 1 Intervention Teacher to provide small group instruction</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 120 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$12,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 25 Teacher Stipends for 24 hours each @ \$20/hr. to participate in a school-wide Book Study on Engaging Students with Poverty in Minds beyond the contract day.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$918.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI Benefits @ 7.65% for 25 Teacher Stipends for 24 hours each @ \$20/hr. to participate in a school-wide Book Study on Engaging Students with Poverty in Minds beyond the contract day.</i> | | | |
| | 640 | 130 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$480.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 1 Stipend for the Instructional Intervention Coach for 24 hours @ \$20/hr. to participate in a school-wide Book Study on Engaging Students with Poverty in Minds beyond the contract day.</i> | | | |
| | 640 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$36.72 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI Benefits @ 7.65% for 1 Stipend for the Instructional Intervention Coach for 24 hours each @ \$20/hr. to participate in a school-wide Book Study on Engaging Students with Poverty in Minds beyond the contract day.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$424.75 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 25 Noise cancelling headphones @ \$16.99 each for students with auditory sensory considerations</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 649 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$528.49 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 25 mp3 player @ \$20.99 each for the Read Naturally program</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 369 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$3,375.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Technology Related Rentals - Flocabulary web-based program site license</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 120 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | 2.0 | \$98,205.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary - Intervention Teachers</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|---|-----------------|------|---------------------|
| | 5100 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$13,529.99 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Retirement Benefits - Intervention Teachers</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$7,627.44 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI Benefits - Intervention Teachers</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 230 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$25,419.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Insurance - Intervention Teachers</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$508.50 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Early Retirement Benefits - Intervention Teachers</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 150 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | 1.5 | \$34,484.40 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary -</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$4,679.53 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Retirement Benefits -</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$2,638.06 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI Benefits -</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 230 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$16,946.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Insurance -</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$175.87 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Early Retirement Benefits -</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 369 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$2,613.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 325 licenses for IXL Reading and Science</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 369 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$3,065.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: AR Licenses for 325 students in grades 1-5</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 369 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$2,717.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Flocabulary</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | | | | \$111,400.74 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 6300 | 110 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | 0.09 | \$9,224.56 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary for School Improvement Principal Specialist to work in partnership with the school administration to review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|-----|---|-----------------|-----|-------------|
| | | | addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data as outlined in Section IV. | | | |
| | 6300 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$1,251.77 |
| | | | Notes: Retirement benefits @ 13.57% for School Improvement Principal Specialist | | | |
| | 6300 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$705.68 |
| | | | Notes: SSI benefits @ 7.65% for School Improvement Principal Specialist | | | |
| | 6300 | 230 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$763.92 |
| | | | Notes: Insurance benefits for School Improvement Principal Specialist | | | |
| | 6300 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$47.04 |
| | | | Notes: Early Retirement benefits @ 0.51% for School Improvement Principal Specialist | | | |
| | 7730 | 330 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$3,087.62 |
| | | | Notes: BSI Conference Travel Expenses for Administrators: Hotel (3 nights x 2 admin) @ \$389.00 per night Per Diem Meals (4 days at \$36/day) Mileage (2 cars at \$120.68) Tolls (2 cars at \$30) Parking (2 cars at \$28.per day Total - \$3087.62 | | | |
| | 6400 | 130 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$480.00 |
| | | | Notes: Stipend for 1 Instructional Intervention Coach for 24 hours @ \$20/hr. to attend the BSI Conference | | | |
| | 6400 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$36.72 |
| | | | Notes: SSI Benefits @ 7.65% for Stipend for 1 Instructional Intervention Coach for 24 hours @ \$20/hr. to attend the BSI Conference | | | |
| | 6400 | 330 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$1,573.83 |
| | | | Notes: BSI Conference Travel Expenses for Instructional Intervention Coach: Hotel (3 nights x 1 coach) @\$389.00 per night Per Diem Meals (4 days at \$36) Mileage (1 car at \$120.70) Tolls (1 car at \$30) Parking (1 car at \$28.per day) Total - \$1,573.83 | | | |
| | 6300 | 120 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$8,700.00 |
| | | | Notes: 29 Teacher Stipends for 15 hours each @ \$20/hr. to participate in a Peer Coaching Professional Learning Community | | | |
| | 6300 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$665.55 |
| | | | Notes: SSI Benefits @ 7.65% for 29 Teacher Stipends for 15 hours each @ \$20/hr. to participate in a Peer Coaching Professional Learning Community | | | |
| | 6400 | 130 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | \$53,846.70 |
| | | | Notes: Salary - Title I Instructional Intervention Coach | | | |
| | 6400 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$7,307.00 |
| | | | Notes: Retirement Benefits - Title I Instructional Intervention Coach | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|--|-----------------|--|------------|
| | 6400 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$4,119.27 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI Benefits - Title I Instructional Intervention Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 230 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$8,473.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Insurance Benefits - Title I Instructional Intervention Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$274.62 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Early Retirement Benefits - Title I Instructional Intervention Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 1300 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$3,192.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary - ESY - IIC 14, 6 hrs/per day@ \$38/hr</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$433.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - IIC Retirement 13.57%</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$244.19 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - IIC SSI @ 7.65%</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$16.28 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - IIC Early Retirement @.51%</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 150 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$4,032.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary - ESY - 3 Paraprofessionals 6 hrs/per day 14 days at \$16.00/hr</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 210 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$547.14 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - Paras Retirement @ 13.57%</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$308.48 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - Paras SSI @ 7.65%</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 290 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$20.57 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - Paras Early Retirement @ .51%</i> | | | |
| | 5900 | 510 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ESY - Materials</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 120 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$1,718.20 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplemental - Monitoring and implementation of the schoolwide Title I program.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 220 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | Title, I Part A | | \$131.45 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SSI benefits for the Title I Lead Teacher Supplemental</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|---|----------------|-----|---------------------|
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | | | | \$12,799.75 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 5100 | 369 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$10,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Technology Related Rental - Schoolwide access to the 7 Mindsets online curriculum for Social Skills and Character Education.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$1,050.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Training Consultant for 7 Mindsets curriculum - 1, 3-hour on-site training session with the staff and 3, 1-hour coaching sessions with the administrative team.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl | UniSIG | | \$1,249.75 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 25 class sets of polyvinyl folders @ \$49.99 a set to be used for the schoolwide Home-School Communication system.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$448,212.05 |

Budget Approval

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

No