

Clay County Schools

Lakeside 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
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

Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://les.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 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
Wolfe, Dawn	Principal	The principal's duties include working collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure students are receiving high levels of instruction. Responsibilities also include overseeing the school's leadership team, serving as the instructional leader of the school, and providing professional development to staff based on data and needs. Communicating with stakeholders, maintaining the budget, and other operational functions of the school.
Fowler, Christy	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responsible for tracking and implementing safety drills, Responding to student discipline issues, and other operational functions of the school.
Warner, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responsible for tracking and implementing safety drills, Responding to student discipline issues, and other operational functions of the school.
Calciano, Beth	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team leader and Intervention Team Facilitator
Corless, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Team Leader
Davis, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	6th grade Team Leader
Halifko, Lucille	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade Team Leader
Jernigan, Kelly	Instructional Media	Instructional Media Specialist
Lee, Jenny	Teacher, K-12	5th grade Team leader
Thomas, Kristal	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade Team Leader
Childress, Janice	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Ivins, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Kern, Mariah	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Team Leader

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 stakeholders comprised of administration, teachers, parents and the SAC team collaborate to create the School Improvement Plan. End of year data is shared and discussed. The needs and areas for improvement guide the development of the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan will be monitored by several school groups throughout the year. The admin team will monitor the goals of the SIP on a quarterly basis using school progress monitoring data. Progress towards these goals will also be monitored through classroom walkthroughs. The school-based leadership team will also be responsible for monitoring progress toward established goals using school assessment data on a quarterly basis. As the plan is being monitored if necessary changes need to take place, the admin team, school-based leadership team, and the SAC team will work collaboratively to make those changes.

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	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	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	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	14	14	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	14	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	7	14	14	0	0	35

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

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

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	7	14	14	20	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	14	24	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

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	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	7	14	14	20	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	14	24	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

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	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	21
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*	59	59	53	64	63	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				63			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			60		
Math Achievement*	61	64	59	69	51	50	67		
Math Learning Gains				73			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			63		
Science Achievement*	53	65	54	53	69	59	52		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	55	59	23			64		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	56			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	67			

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	55			

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	44			
ELL	24	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	60			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	53			

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	59			61			53					63
SWD	33			43			28				4	
ELL	30			55							3	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			45			8				4	
HSP	55			60			33				5	70
MUL	68			58			71				4	

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	66			66			68				4	
FRL	53			55			44				5	62

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	64	63	53	69	73	62	53					23
SWD	29	54	55	46	61	54	9					
ELL	21			29								23
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	38	38	54	68	58						
HSP	58	67		59	67	67	44					
MUL	72	68		66	82		83					
PAC												
WHT	69	66	52	76	73	52	52					
FRL	54	48	40	58	67	63	41					

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	68	66	60	67	66	63	52					64
SWD	31	46	48	38	52	52	15					
ELL	70	75		55	67							64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	56	40	44	56	45	20					
HSP	66	63		60	64		47					
MUL	79	50		65	33							
PAC												
WHT	72	68	71	72	70	72	62					
FRL	56	63	58	53	64	58	37					

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	54%	55%	-1%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	61%	61%	0%	47%	14%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	92%	75%	17%	54%	38%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	67%	-14%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	63%	-14%	51%	-2%

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.

The overall achievement level in ELA showed the lowest performance. Learning loss continues to play into the achievement of many students. Issues with attendance also were a factor. We saw that a large percentage of our ELL and SWD students are not making the academic progress that we would expect. Lakeside's ELL population has grown tremendously and plans to provide the appropriate support is still being crafted. We also saw that our high-performing students in prior assessments did not make gains. A

new assessment was used this past year so the possibility of students not being fully prepared could be a factor.

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

Overall achievement level in ELA showed the greatest decline from the previous year. There was a 12-point decrease in the area of ELA. Teachers were still learning how to use their resources to instruct students. A new assessment was used this past year. Students and teachers will still need time to adjust to the differences in the assessment. Attendance was also an issue in grades 3rd-6th, therefore academic gaps developed in those students.

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.

Overall achievement level in ELA showed the greatest gap. There was a 12-point decrease in the area of ELA. Teachers were still learning how to use their resources to instruct students. A new assessment was used this past year. Students and teachers will still need time to adjust to the differences in the assessment. Attendance was also an issue in grades 3rd-6th, so academic gaps developed in those students.

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

Ninety-two percent of 6th graders scored in the proficient range. A continued focus on intentional planning and the use of appropriate grade-level resources. As a school, not one overall data component showed improvement. Overall Math proficiency did drop by 9 points. Sixth-grade math scores continue to be high.

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

Our ELL students are not making academic progress. The data also shows that our SWD are not making the necessary gains to be proficient.

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

- Increase ELA proficiency overall
- Increase ELA proficiency of ELL students
- Increase ELA proficiency of SWD

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.

Based on FAST data from last year, the overall achievement in this area was 56%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to increase overall proficiency from 56% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Lexia Core 5, and classroom performance. Grade level teams will determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration. The school based Literacy Leadership team will also analyze data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@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.)

All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. Evidence based supplemental materials are being used with students in small groups along with the SAVVAS Reading series. There will be more of a focus placed on the identification of the specific reading deficiency a student has so that an appropriate and specific intervention can be used to remediate it.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the standard of instruction that is used by the district. Students that have been taught multiple reading strategies demonstrate greater improvement in reading proficeincy.

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.

Monitoring of school-wide reading data

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Small group instruction based on regulare progress monitoring, is implemented by reading teachers.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Strong Tier 1 instruction is provided through continuous professional development to maximize whole-group teaching.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

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

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

Based on FAST data from last year, the overall achievement in this area was 61%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The intended outcome is to increase overall proficiency in the area of math from 61% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including Eureka assessments, iReady, and classroom performance. Grade level teams will determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration. The school based Literacy Leadership team will also analyze data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@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.)

All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. Evidence based supplemental materials are being used with students in small groups along with the Eureka Math series. If further intervention is required then the use of T2 or T3 evidence based interventions will be used to remediate deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the standard of instruction that is used by the district. Interventions to evaluate and provide students explicit instruction of foundational, concrete skills will improve their ability to learn grade level content.

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.

Monitoring of school-wide math data from iReady Math Diagnostics, FAST Math PM, and Eureka Assessments.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Small group instruction in addition to whole group instruction.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Strong T1 instruction through the use of Eureka.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

The overall percentage of ELL students who are scoring proficient on the state ELA assessment is below 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall percentage of ELL students who earn a proficient score on the state ELA assessment will be at 50%

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Imagine Learning, and classroom performance. Teachers will use the PLC process to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will be held with the administration. Frequent check-ins with the assigned ESOL assistant will also be completed to monitor progress of our ELL students. The ELL committee through the SBLLT will also have an active role in monitoring the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@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.)

The ELL students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small-group instruction in conjunction with whole-group instruction. Evidence based supplemental materials will be used with students along with the Reading series. Identified ELL students will also have access to Imagine Learning and the ESOL Assistant.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School wide data and the ELL report were used to determine these strategies.

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.

Reading data from students who receive ELL services will be tracked through classroom performance, progress monitoring data, and Imagine Learning data. Grade level teams and the ELL Committee will be monitoring this data.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

ELL students will use the Imagine Learning program on a daily basis.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: May 2024

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

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

Based on the 22-23 school climate survey, 25.9% of 4th-6th graders stated that they felt that their classrooms were managed properly.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The intended goal is to increase this percentage to 40%.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be monitored through the PBIS committee. A newly created committee composed of teacher leaders will also be monitoring students' perceptions of classroom management through a mid-year survey given to 4th through 6th students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@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.)

Multiple PBIS strategies will be implemented to help address this issue. Consistent expectations create the best environment for academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School data was provided through the Clay County School Climate Survey results.

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.

A School-wide discipline plan will be created and implemented with teacher collaboration

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 2023

Lessons developed in regard to school-wide expectations were developed by teacher leaders and were taught by all teachers during the first 5 days of school

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: August 2024 and continued, consistent use of classroom management strategies throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

The overall percentage of Black/African American students who are scoring proficient on the state ELA assessment is at 30%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall percentage of Black/ African American students who earn a proficient score on the state ELA assessment will increase to 42%

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor data from multiple sources, including the area of focus will be monitored through various ways. One way will be through the use of SAVVAS assessments and classroom performance. Teachers will use the PLC process to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will be held with the administration.. The SBLLT will also have an active role in monitoring the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@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.)

The Black/African American students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small-group instruction in conjunction with whole-group instruction. Evidence-based supplemental materials will be used with students along with the Reading series.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide data and the ATSI state report were used to determine these strategies.

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.

Reading data from students who are included in this sub-group will be tracked through classroom performance and progress monitoring data. Grade-level teams and the SBLLT will be monitoring this data.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#6. 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.

The overall percentage of students with disabilities who are scoring proficient on the state ELA assessment is at 34%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall percentage of students with disabilities who earn a proficient score on the state ELA assessment will increase to 42%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor data from multiple sources, including the area of focus will be monitored through various ways. One way will be through the use of SAVVAS assessments and classroom performance. Teachers will use the PLC process to determine trends and analyze data. ESE teachers will also be actively monitoring their student's progress. Data meetings will be held with the administration. The SBLLT will also have an active role in monitoring the data.

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.)

The students in this sub-group have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small-group instruction in conjunction with whole-group instruction. They are also receiving specially designed instruction that is directly related to their goals on their IEPs. Evidence-based supplemental materials will be used with students along with the Reading series.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide data and the ATSI state report were used to determine these strategies.

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.

Reading data from students who are included in this sub-group will be tracked through classroom performance and progress monitoring data. Grade-level teams and the SBLLT will be monitoring this data. ESE Teachers will also be monitoring the progress of their students.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024