

Clay County Schools

Keystone Heights 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Keystone Heights Elementary

335 SW PECAN ST, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khe.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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond 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.

Keystone Heights Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable 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
Turbeville, Beth	Principal	Gather the SIP team together and to facilitate the process of completing and implementing the year-long school improvement plan for 2023-2024.

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.

The school leadership team first began by disaggregating our school data and ruminating on the data in late May and early June. We began to formulate some ideas about our vision for improvement based upon the data. We met with the SAC committee in May 2023 and discussed our vision. The school leadership team put our plan into full "action steps" in collaboration with our SAC committee on August 14, 2023. Our school improvement goals were developed and our vision to implementation steps as a result

The school leadership team consisted of Principal Beth Turbeville, Assistant Principal Kayleigh Williams, Assistant Principal Cory Stone, Math/Science Coach Brandi Kirkland and Former Title 1 Lead Missy Gillenwaters. Once we moved into collaboration with our school SAC committee, the following individuals were also included in decision making for our SIP plan: (new) Title 1 Lead Megan Slater, (Parent) Shelly Alvers, (Parent) Jenna Langford, (Parent) Brittany McCall, (Parent) Jackie Huntley, (Teacher) Eric Scamahorn, (Teacher) Ebonie Bennett, (Teacher) Selina Jones, (Teacher) Liz Gamsby, (Parent) Shannon Tisdale, (Principals Secretary & Bookkeeper) Shannon Bishop.

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))

Our school improvement goals were presented to our faculty, along with our plan for improvement for the 2023-2024 school year. It will be regularly monitored through five (5) collaborative data meetings between teachers, content coaches, and administration throughout the school year. The first data meeting was held during pre-planning. The group looked at last year's summative data and then took some time to look forward with the students teachers will be teaching to formulate a plan based on their student data. After PM1, during the first week in October, teachers, coaches and administration, will meet again to look at our school improvement goals, create learning target plans, and analyze student data to check for alignment with SIP goals. Collaboratively, plans will be made for differentiation and remediation for instruction to continue to align students to SIP goals. During this and future meetings, the opportunity for revised plans to ensure for continuous improvement will be a must. Data meetings will occur once again in January and March after PM2 and Quarter 3 to continue this process of analyzing data, checking for alignment with SIP goals and formulating plans for interventions and remediation of standards and skills. One final data meeting will be held during the last week of school to discuss how students ended the school year after analyzing data from PM3. A final check for an alignment with the SIP goals will provide the feedback needed on our level of success.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	11%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	31	24	16	25	24	28	26	0	0	174	
One or more suspensions	7	11	14	16	19	33	22	0	0	122	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	6	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	25	34	18	0	0	101	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	18	42	9	0	0	91	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	12	28	40	0	0	89	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	11	2	3	9	13	29	17	0	0	84

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	5	2	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	19	20	16	15	17	18	21	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	9	4	3	0	0	22	
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	22	31	13	17	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	16	16	15	0	0	61	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	18	30	22	31	13	17	0	0	145	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	8	7	5	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	19	20	16	15	17	18	21	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	9	4	3	0	0	22	
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	22	31	13	17	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	16	16	15	0	0	61	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	18	30	22	31	13	17	0	0	145	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	8	7	5	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55	59	53	56	63	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				47			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			52		
Math Achievement*	60	64	59	71	51	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				71			73		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			68		
Science Achievement*	56	65	54	62	69	59	69		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		55	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	225
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	44			

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				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	61			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	51			

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	55			60			56					
SWD	32			38			31				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	63			67							2	
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	55			60			55				4	
FRL	42			50			44				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	56	47	42	71	71	58	62					
SWD	35	34	29	53	58	48	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	58	50		63	72							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	46	39	72	71	54	63					
FRL	45	46	40	59	63	53	51					

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	71	66	52	78	73	68	69					
SWD	53	50	41	63	67	58	42					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			60								
HSP	77	70		82	60							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	66	51	78	73	67	68					
FRL	64	57	17	69	65	63	60					

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	43%	55%	-12%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	47%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	76%	75%	1%	54%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	67%	4%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	63%	-9%	51%	3%

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.

Our school's lowest performance was in reading with 53% proficiency. Contributing factors to low performance could possibly include 67 students with a substantial reading deficiency who received intensive interventions starting in January, post-covid instability, and a 4% increase in economically disadvantaged students from the previous year.

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

5th grade math showed the greatest decline with 39% proficiency in 2023 from 60% proficiency in 2022. One of our math teachers took an extended leave of absence due to a family emergency, and despite a strong substitute teacher and an intervention plan provided by a push-in teacher, the students struggled to learn grade level content.

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.

5th grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with 39% proficiency as compared to the state with 55% proficiency. Our 5th grade data in ELA and math were our weakest across the board.

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

4th grade ELA showed the most improvement from 2022 with 46% to 62% in 2023 (a 16 point increase in proficiency). We had a new teacher who taught all content who showed high scores, along with another new teacher to 4th grade who moved up from 3rd grade who is strong with a history of strong test scores.

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

We had 122 students with 1 or more suspensions (ISS and/or OSS) during 2022-2023. We are taking a proactive approach to restorative discipline by updating our discipline flowchart. We also provided some training and collaboration with teachers on classroom expectations in an effort to be proactive with starting off the year with explicit expectations. Our goal is to reduce suspensions by 50%.

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

1. Reduce the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency
2. Increase the number of students who are achieving in math and reading with proficiency
3. Increase the number of students in subgroups who are achieving in math and reading with proficiency
4. Reduce the number of suspensions on our campus by 50% or more
5. Increase our attendance percentage to 95% present while reducing tardies, as well.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Using our school FAST data, KHE will focus on ELA Achievement for ALL students. From 2021/2022 to 2022/2023 we stayed stagnant by only increasing overall achievement by .25%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus is reading. By using the strategies and the action plan as described in our school improvement plan, we will increase reading proficiency from 53% to 60% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Meeting with teachers in five data meetings throughout the school year to analyze progress monitoring data through state and local assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@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.)

Teachers will use explicit comprehension Instruction in tier I and small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students that have been taught multiple, explicit, comprehension strategies will demonstrate greater improvement in reading comprehension.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Using our school data from the FAST, KHE will focus on math achievement for ALL students. From 2021/2022 to 2022/2023 math achievement went down 4.75% in proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be math. By using the strategies and action plan in our school improvement plan, we will increase our math proficiency from 61% to 70% during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Meeting with teachers in five data meetings throughout the school year to analyze progress monitoring data through state and local assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@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.)

Teachers will use instructional scaffolding and small group instruction to improve Math proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional scaffolding and small group instruction implemented in combination provide supports and specific instruction to develop skills.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Using our NGSSS Assessment, our scores dropped 3% from 2022 to 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on NGSSSA data, our area of focus will be science. By using the strategies and action plan in our school improvement plan, we will increase our NGSSS Assessment in the area of Nature of Science from 60% to 70% during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Meeting with teachers in five data meetings throughout the school year to analyze progress monitoring data through state and local assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@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.)

Inquiry based lessons will be implemented across all grade levels to improve school Science learning and ultimately improve state assessment scores.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Inquiry or experimental based learning, involves gaining knowledge and skills through activities rather than passive learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on Synergy data, our area of focus will be classroom management. By using the strategies and actions in the school improvement plan, we will increase positive, clear and consistent classroom expectations to increase our Benchmarks of Quality in the classroom from 50% to 75% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through walkthrough data input through continuous walkthroughs from administration via the district walkthrough dashboard and through the PBIS walkthrough by Kristi Gomez at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayleigh Williams (kayleigh.williams@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.)

Positive, proactive behavior practices will be implented in a schoolwide framework framework with consistant use throughout the campus to reduce discipline incidents on the school campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The effectiveness of positive, proactive behavior practices are most effective when implented in schoolwide framework.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. 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.

Based on May 2023 FAST data, our area of focus for the ESSA subgroup is students with disabilities. By using the strategies and the action plan in our SIP, we will increase growth in the federal percent of points index from 34% to 42% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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 the action plan in our SIP, we will increase growth in the federal percent of points index from 34% to 42% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through tracking student growth progress through Acadience assessments, FAST PM 1, FAST PM 2, STAR Reading (grades K-2) and STAR Math (grades K-2).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@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.)

Evidence based interventions for ELA include Foundations for grades K-2, Corrective Reading for grades 3-6, and Morphographic Instruction for grade 4.

Evidence based interventions for Math include I-Ready Standards Mastery and I-Ready Instruction Book and Practice and Problem-Solving Book.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In collaboration with district curriculum leaders, specialists and coaches, each grade level created intervention groups to target specific students based on a triangulation of informal and formal data.

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.

Focused, targeted intervention groups based on a triangulation of informal/formal data. Interventions will take place 60 minutes each day in ELA and 30 minutes each day in Math.

Person Responsible: Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net)

By When: Intervention groups will take place daily and continuously until the PM3 assessments in May.

ELA and Math tutoring before and after school.

Person Responsible: Kayleigh Williams (kayleigh.williams@myoneclay.net)

By When: Before and after school tutoring will take place weekly and will continue until May 2024.

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

Kindergarten - Teachers will focus on letter naming upper and lower case letters. They will teach beginning, middle and last sound in words. They will teach high frequency words. They will work on students writing letters correctly.

First Grade - Teachers will teach students to sound out and write simple words with short vowel sounds, final -e, common long vowel spellings, blends and r-controlled vowels. Teachers will teach high frequency words, decodable or not with automaticity. Teachers will teach writing all letters correctly.

Second Grade - Teachers will teach decoding words with complex combinations (e.g., oo,ea,ou,oi,oy,ow). They will teach decoding words with common prefixes and suffixes.

All of these instructional practices are part of the BEST standards and will provide our students an education where they will be successful in the future. We used our Lexia data to help support our reasons for choosing practices we want our teachers to focus on in class with students.

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

Third Grade - Teachers will teach decoding multisyllabic words and words with suffixes such as -ful, -less, and -est. They will teach grade appropriate vocabulary in both speaking and writing. Teachers will teach, summarizing, characters and plot, text features, main idea and details, compare and contrast, along with figurative language.

Fifth Grade - Teachers will teach grade level phonics and word analysis skills to read and write single-syllable and multisyllabic words. Teachers will teach summarizing texts, main idea and details, text features, analyze setting, events, and plot. Teachers will teach how students figure meanings of unknown words using context clues, figurative language, word relationships, and background knowledge.

All of these instructional practices are part of the BEST standards and will provide our students an education where they will be successful in the future. We used our last year FSA data to see where we need to improve as a school. Third grade was 51% proficient and fifth grade was 43% proficient.

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

Kindergarten teachers will administer Dibels/ Acadiance, Lexia, and STAR Renaissance Early Literacy and STAR Reading.

1st and 2nd grade will administer Lexia, STAR Renaissance Early Literacy, and STAR Reading.

Kindergarten will improve from 25% to 70% on Grade level material in Lexia.

1st Grade will improve from 20% to 65% on Grade level material in Lexia.

2nd Grade will improve from 18% to 65% on Grade level material in Lexia.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, our school will meet the following outcomes:

Using FAST data:

Fifth grade ELA will improve from 53% to 60% proficient.

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.

Meet collaboratively with teachers, coaches and administration in five data meetings throughout the year to align school improvement goals with progress monitoring data through Lexia, STAR Reading, STAR Math, and FAST Assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net

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?

Teachers will implement district curriculum to its fullest. All curriculum will be aligned with the district reading plan, school improvement goals and vision. Teachers will teach the BEST ELA Standards daily, placing their learning targets with success criteria visibly for students to see and for teachers to refer to. The following curriculum will be used: Kid Lips, Heggerty, SAVAAS, Lexia Core 5 and Corrective Reading as needed. Teachers will teach, model, provide scaffolding, and provide differentiated small groups based on student need. Students will receive explicit comprehension instruction along with phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction. Students will be provided with frequent practice that can be monitored by teachers in small groups. Deliberate linkage will be placed between reading and writing.

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?

We will follow the 2023-2024 CCDS K-12 VPK-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan (CERP). Our school-based instructional plan is aligned to the district plan. Adhering to the district curriculum will provide our teachers with the tools they need to teach our students to reach proficiency. Our school district approves evidence based curriculum that has been proven success.

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 Leadership- Implement monthly literacy team meetings to ensure our school is on track with ELA school improvement goal alignment.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Literacy Leadership-Provide Professional Development in the area of Literacy for Faculty and Staff	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Literacy Leadership- Lead, plan and organize five (5) Collaborative Data Meetings Throughout the Year to Analyze Progress Monitoring Data and to Strategize/Plan for Differentiated Instruction Based on Data	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Literacy Coaching- Through Title 1 Funding and guidance through our New Teacher Support District Lead Coach, mentor teachers are paired with new teachers on our campus to provide literacy coaching in an effort to retain new teachers at KHE.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Assessment- Teachers will collaborate to build formative assessments during PLC's that are aligned with the FAST state assessments.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Professional Learning- The district Literacy Curriculum Coaches will provide ongoing professional learning throughout the 23/24 school year for teachers to support SIP literacy goals.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net

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.

Our school improvement plan will be disseminated through our SAC committee. It will also be made available through our Title 1 information on our school website.

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))

Our school builds positive relationships through Parent/Family Engagement Nights at KHE. We will have a Game/Trivia Night in October, a STEM Night in February, a Daddy/Daughter Dance in April and a Mom/Son Date Night in April. We also have a Volunteer Initiative and allow parents to eat lunch with their students each day. We have a "hostess" in our cafeteria who facilitates this process to make the visiting experience a delightful one. During pre-planning, every teacher made mandatory phone calls home to every parent to welcome them/their child back to school, as well. The Family Engagement Plan will be made available on our school website and through our SAC committee meeting agenda in September, as well.

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))

This year, we have a larger cafetorium with double the seating for students at one time. We are able to use less staff over the course of the day supervising students for lunch and more staff helping in classrooms. We also shortened recess to 20 minutes and maximized every minute on our master schedule. We begin announcements 5 minutes earlier to give instruction an earlier start. Administration was strategic with teacher placement and scheduling.

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))

N/A

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))

Our school counselors will be providing mandatory classroom instruction throughout the 2023-2024 school year. Additionally, students have opportunities through clubs after hours at KHE to find enjoyment through such as the Art Club, Chorus, and Robotics.

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).

Our school implements PBIS and focuses on restorative discipline practices. We have a discipline flow chart that explicitly describes the path teachers and staff should follow when taking action to discipline students. Our school-wide PBIS Rewards is a strong Tier 1 program that our school uses.

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))

The Clay County School District provides new teacher support coaches who visit and provide support to new teachers once a week at KHE. Our school provides "Indian Guides" as mentors who pair with new teachers and "new to KHE teachers" to help them adjust and acclimate to KHE. This is done in an effort to retain effective teachers at KHE.

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

Our school works with Child Find to assist in acquiring children from local daycare centers and helping them transition into pre-k.