

Clay County Schools

Lake Asbury 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Lake Asbury Elementary School

2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://lae.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 increase the academic achievement of all students. Lake Asbury Elementary, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Our teachers will provide rigorous and relevant learning opportunities for each child to experience academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Asbury Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and a diverse society.

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
Butcher, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Responsibilities as an inclusion teacher are the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students in order to contribute to the goals of our SIP.
Petelli, Treena	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. Responding to student discipline issues and other operational functions of the school.
Hanson, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	Responsibilities as an ESE teacher are the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students in order to contribute to the goals of our SIP.
Roche, Heather	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. Responding to student discipline issues and other operational functions of the school.
Ehlinger, Jessica	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. Responding to student discipline issues and other operational functions of the school.
Halter, Jonathan	Teacher, K-12	Establish a safe, respectful and inclusive classroom climate conducive to learning. In addition to maintaining a growth mindset toward student learning, teaching practice, and personal/collective professional development.
Milla, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	Establish a safe, respectful and inclusive classroom climate conducive to learning. In addition to maintaining a growth mindset toward student learning, teaching practice, and personal/collective professional development.

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 ensured that we had members from every stakeholder group were involved in creating our SIP.

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 SIP will regularly be monitored by ongoing walkthroughs in classrooms and data will be discussed during data chats with grade level and ESE teachers monthly where data is shared and analyzed to monitor progress for our students to ensure gaps are being closed.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
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) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	147	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	3	10	9	15	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	44	

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	1	1	10	10	9	15	0	46

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	8	5	0	6	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	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	147	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	3	10	9	15	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	44	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	5	0	6	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) 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	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	147	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	3	10	9	15	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	44	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
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*	60	59	53	68	63	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				62			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			41		
Math Achievement*	69	64	59	75	51	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				78			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			46		
Science Achievement*	77	65	54	73	69	59	70		
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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	265
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

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	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
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	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	71			
HSP	59			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	61			

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	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	70			
HSP	66			

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	84			
PAC				
WHT	68			
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	60			69			77					
SWD	46			52			62				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70			72			67				4	
HSP	59			52			75				4	
MUL	64			79							2	
PAC												
WHT	58			70			77				4	
FRL	55			63			73				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	68	62	54	75	78	70	73					
SWD	43	56	43	56	65	55	41					
ELL												
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	67	64	54	67	82	82	75					
HSP	53	68		60	76		75					
MUL	83	72		87	95							
PAC												
WHT	69	61	52	77	77	66	71					
FRL	50	47	31	59	70	68	45					

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	58	41	68	60	46	70					
SWD	32	45	27	44	47	35	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			51	54							
HSP	70	67		66	65		67					
MUL	68	64		68	57							
PAC												
WHT	65	58	47	71	60	41	74					
FRL	55	56	42	56	51	44	74					

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	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	47%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	91%	75%	16%	54%	37%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	67%	12%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	63%	12%	51%	24%

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 lowest data component was in ELA. Contributing factors were a new state testing system, new processes for providing interventions, and new curriculum.

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

Based on the data, our ELA lowest quartile growth remains our greatest area of need. Although our scholars improved from 48% to 54% from the school years 2022 to 2023, we would like to see an increase in proficiency for this group.

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.

Although we showed a gain in our ELA lower quartile growth, this remains our lowest area. We will continue to incorporate intensive interventions for our lower quartile scholars. We continue to focus on small group instruction based on data collected through professional learning communities as well as classroom formative assessments.

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

The area that was most improved for us is our math lower quartile with a 24 point increase from the 2022 to the 2023 school year. There was more consistency with delivering small group differentiated instruction. There were longer blocks of time with the ESE teachers pushing into the math classrooms.

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

One area of concern is attendance. We had 147 students in grades K-6 that were absent 10% or more days. If our scholars are not present at school and receiving instruction, our progress diminishes.

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

1. Increasing ELA proficiency for our lowest 25% of students in all grade levels
2. Increasing ELA proficiency for all scholars
3. Increasing Math proficiency for our lowest 25% in all grade levels
4. Increasing Math proficiency for all scholars
5. Increasing attendance

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.

The 2023 FAST PM 3 results showed that 60% of our students were proficient in ELA, with 40% below grade level or non-proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the percentage of students proficient in ELA as measured on the FAST PM 3 assessment from 60% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student growth using the following data sets: FAST PM 1 to PM 2, Lexia, and curriculum based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Roche (heather.roche@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 implement small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted curriculum to include Savvas, Lexia Core 5, From Phonics to Reading, and other approved materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With increased rigor and implementation of grade level appropriate materials, our students will show improvement in the area of ELA.

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.

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach BEST ELA standards with the grade level expectation of rigor. Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

Person Responsible: Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

In the past several years since 2020, attendance has become optional. We are using tangible incentives as well as creating excitement for scholars surrounding learning. We are also continuing our student success team meetings to work with families to increase scholar attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will run a Synergy report every 4-1/2 weeks to monitor our grade levels' attendance rate. Our goal will be to continue to increase our percentage of students at school. The end goal will be to have 95% of students attending school.

Monitoring:

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

LAE Attendance Team will meet monthly on the first Thursday of the month. The attendance team consists of the records secretary, social worker, and administrator. Input is provided by teachers via a Google Form and in the Contact Log of Synergy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Treena Petelli (treena.petrelli@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.)

Creating a positive school and class environment will impact the will of students for attending school. We will use positive reinforcements, recognition, and family positive notes. This year we have also increased opportunities for activities (art club, robotics, music) which we hope to create experiences students will not want to miss.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As shared by Attendance Works, schools can increase attendance by creating a welcoming environment that emphasizes building relationships with families and stresses the importance of going to class every day. "The key is developing a school-wide school culture that promotes a sense of safety, respect and personal responsibility, where students feel connected and know that someone notices, in a caring manner, when they missed school."

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.

Recognize when students are consistently present. Students with attendance of 95% or higher for each nine weeks will be awarded: certificate at awards ceremony, backpack attendance tags, and a thank you note for parents.

Person Responsible: Treena Petelli (treena.petrelli@myoneclay.net)

By When: Classrooms will be recognized every 4-1/2 weeks for having the highest attendance compared to the classes in their grade level.

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

The students in grades K-2 will be given the Acadience screener in September, January and April.

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

The students in grades 3-5 that score a level one on their PM 1 assessment (23-24, 3rd grade) and their PM 3 assessment (22-23, 4-5) will be given the Corrective Reading baseline assessment. These students will be given a progress monitoring assessment every 10 lessons to track their progress with the lessons. The lessons will be administered in small groups with other students at their levels.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

In our previous school year, our 1st grade scholars which are now 2nd graders, had 50 percent or more students who were shown to not be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. We will layer in supported learning with state supports as a Universal school and district support for coaches/specialist to provide training. We will implement Phonics to Reading, Heggerty, Kid Lips, and SAVAAS with fidelity so our 2nd grade students show an increase in proficiency on their state progress monitoring assessments. For PM 3, our goal is to have all 2nd grade student proficient in ELA.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

The 2nd graders will be assessed using Acadience at the beginning of the school year, again in January and then again in April. We will monitor their progress with this resource as well as PM 1 to PM 2 and PM 1 to PM 3 to progress monitor our scholars.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Roche, Heather, heather.roche@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?

Implementing Phonics to Reading, Heggerty, Kid Lips and SAVAAS with fidelity does satisfy the needs of using evidence-based resources that are approved by our district and align with the BEST ELA Standards very closely.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The resources mentioned above address the ELA needs of our 2nd graders. These are evidence-based resources so they are proven to show effectiveness for struggling readers.

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
Identify the students that are struggling because we have 3 new administrators at LAE this school year. We will analyze the data from last school year with the PM 1 data just received.	Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net
We will have data chats with our 2nd grade teachers to discuss the data and identify as a team who our struggling readers are.	Petelli, Treena, treena.petrelli@myoneclay.net
Devise a schedule for Acadience testing and assign a testing administrator to each classroom. Share a spreadsheet for each 2nd grade teacher to input their student data.	Ehlinger, Jessica, jessica.ehlinger@myoneclay.net
Teachers implement evidence-based resources with the layering of supported learning with state supports as a Universal school and district support for coaches/specialist to provide training on how to effectively implement these resources.	Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net
Monitor the progress of our 2nd grade students to ensure they are making progress.	Petelli, Treena, treena.petrelli@myoneclay.net
Admin conducting frequent walk-throughs to support and guide 2nd grade teachers.	Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No