

Clay County Schools

Doctors Inlet Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary School's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, rigorous, engaging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing learning opportunities that are relevant to the real world and transcend the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Doctors Inlet Elementary school exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring life skills.

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
Ayers, Carolyn	Principal	
Farber, Jocelyn	Assistant Principal	
Wellons, Techla	Teacher, K-12	
Forbis, Allyson	Teacher, K-12	
Lang, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Guess, Carli	Teacher, K-12	
Haynes, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Hanlin, Anita	Teacher, ESE	
Currin, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Senters, April	School Counselor	
Mineo, Kristi	SAC Member	
Paine, Lauren	Instructional Media	

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.

We look at our school data, discuss it with teachers, staff, and families to decide on our goals for the year. We align our school goals to the Clay County schools district goals for consistency.

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))

We will look at our SIP quarterly as well as after progress monitoring assessments. We will adjust our instruction based on PM. We will review the progress at our School Advisory Council meetings quarterly. These meetings have representatives from our staff, community, and families.

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	66%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	14	15	13	9	10	16	11	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	6

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	1	2	2	2	2	2	4	0	0	15

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	11	7	7	13	14	8	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	10
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	10	13	17	11	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	7	19	8	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	4	14	13	0	0	34

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	1	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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	8	11	7	7	13	14	8	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	10
Course failure in 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	10	13	17	11	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	7	19	8	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	4	14	13	0	0	34

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	1	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	7
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*	58	59	53	59	63	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				56			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			52		
Math Achievement*	61	64	59	62	51	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				70			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76			40		
Science Achievement*	78	65	54	70	69	59	69		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	80	55	59	36			73		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	66			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	59			

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	43			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	69			

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%
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	58			61			78					80
SWD	37			35							3	
ELL	47			65							3	80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			46			82				3	
HSP	55			70							3	
MUL	82			91							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			59			74				4	
FRL	54			56			76				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	59	56	53	62	70	76	70					36
SWD	30	41	43	37	51	64	32					
ELL	62	67		54	79							36
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	61	63		47	56	55						
HSP	65	64	50	58	84	94	69					
MUL	54			62								
PAC												
WHT	57	54	56	65	70	78	68					
FRL	51	52	49	53	63	70	60					

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	63	65	52	64	64	40	69					73
SWD	40	49	40	44	59	38	52					
ELL	36			43								73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	69		45	62							
HSP	55	71		61	71							80
MUL	44	30		50	60							
PAC												
WHT	68	67	54	69	63	40	72					
FRL	54	60	65	52	52	50	52					

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	62%	55%	7%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	68%	75%	-7%	54%	14%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	63%	16%	51%	28%

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 ELA Achievement - We have declined over the past several year in this area. With the addition of the new curriculum and standards our teachers struggled to get all the information in during the instructional day. They have created systems to help support learning and our struggling readers.

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

Overall ELA Achievement - We have declined over the past several year in this area. With the addition of the new curriculum and standards our teachers struggled to get all the information in during the instructional day. Staff have created systems to help support learning and our struggling readers with the Science of reading and proficiency.

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.

ELA - most schools in the state had issues with the proficiency

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

Science 79%; We had a schoolwide focus dedicated resources and teachers to help our Science scores. We had engaging targeted lessons to help close learning gaps and misconceptions for all 5th grade Science and fair game standards.

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

Attendance and referrals for high frequency students. The more class they miss the bigger the gap becomes instructionally for reading, math, and writing.

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

Teacher Retention & Development
Student & Family engagement
Reading Proficiency
Math Proficiency

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

We have a new teacher and included new to DIS teacher mentoring program to focus on best instructional practices in and out of the classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improved alignment to the CCDS Instructional vision based on classroom walkthroughs, classroom management /discipline data, and evaluations. By completing these session we will decrease classroom management and behavioral issues while increasing student engagement and FAST scores. By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase student engagement and accountability from 34.70% to 40.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the progress for our specific teachers by informal classroom walkthroughs and evaluations. By completing these session we will decrease classroom management and behavioral issues while increasing student engagement and FAST scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.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.)

We will define and teach how to incorporate positive expectations and interventions Teachers and staff will establish positive connections that foster positive relationships with students. Teachers and families will have meaningful two-way communication. Teachers will have access to coaching, feedback and professional learning to help with these interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will have trusting relationships and meaningful communication with families. This will help educate families about their children's progress and school services. Teachers will engaged in professional learning around best instructional / communication practices.

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 create a personal connection to ensure every child has an advocate. This will help with classroom student engagement and with the families of Doctors Inlet Elementary. Teachers will track progress, scores, and engagement through attendance, discipline data, and improved classroom grades.

Person Responsible: Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

By When: On going throughout the school year.

#2. 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.

Students will improve their ELA reading proficiency in all academic areas. We will use subgroups and demographic information to identify and support our populations of learners needing additional interventions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase reading proficiency from 58 to 62 by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the PM assessments for FAST as well as evidence based reading strategies to support learning for all readers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.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.)

We will use Progress Monitoring, Individual & Small Group Instruction, Provide Additional Programs/ tutoring Outside of the Regular School Day Learning at home: Share ideas to promote at-home learning so parents can monitor and help with homework (PFE) as well as having classroom discussions and high level questioning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will use the following to provide rationale for reading proficiency with our students: Phonological Awareness and Phonemic awareness instruction (Strong): The National Reading Panel found positive effects of phonemic awareness (PA) instruction on improving students' ability to apply phonemic awareness in their reading and spelling. Learning to manipulate phonemes in words helped the students learn to read.

Explicit, systematic phonological awareness instruction: strong evidence
Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence

*Students who have been explicitly taught multiple comprehension strategies demonstrate greater improvements in reading comprehension. However, students should be proficient with each strategy before they attempt to combine them.

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.

We will provide targeted instruction and assistance for struggling students through small group instruction with our staff. We will use district supported materials and technology to close achievement gaps. Data notebooks will be used to help track and identify needs of students with instructional levels.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. 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.

Students will improve their Math proficiency in all academic areas. We will use subgroups and demographic information to identify and support our populations of learners needing additional interventions

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Math Proficiency from 65 to 67 by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the PM assessments for FAST as well as evidence based reading strategies to support learning for all readers.

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.)

We will use and provide hands on manipulatives with visual representations for students to help with comprehension of math. We will communicate ideas to promote learning at home with families. Staff will support small group instruction by looking at the data and targeting specific skills and interventions with students. Afterschool sessions will be provided for additional learning opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By continually monitoring a child's progress, teachers can gather the information they need to match lessons to an individual child's knowledge level. Current math objectives should be coordinated with activities in the classroom and lessons in other subject areas so children can master skills and extend concepts. Struggling students should receive explicit instruction to ensure that they have the foundational skills and conceptual knowledge necessary for understanding grade level content. Modeling with unambiguous explanations and strong demonstrations that use clear and concise language, variety and active student participation makes instruction more explicit.

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.

Staff will use small group instruction based on data to help students achieve proficiency. Teachers will be provided opportunities to observe other highly effective teachers to improve their instructional practice. Staff will have the opportunity to collaborate and plan together for increased student achievement.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our students with disabilities have dropped their ELA performance over the past several years. We are working to build their confidence and learning up to standards and proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to improve our ATSI subgroup of students with disabilities from 37% to 42% proficiency based on FAST testing at the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will look at our progress monitoring, tutoring, and FAST data to determine if our interventions and supports are working for our special populations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.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.)

Small Group Instruction, Remediation, and tutoring are all being used to help support our students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We push into our general education classrooms to support students in their classroom least restrictive environment.

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.

- small group instruction for SWD
- intensive reading/math groups for SWD
- additional tutoring and remediation for SWD

Person Responsible: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of the year we will increase our SWD proficiency from 37% to 42%.