J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

4965 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wes.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.

At Wilkinson Elementary, we provide high levels of learning for all students. We increase student achievement by having high standards and expectations in which students value and develop a drive, desire, and passion for learning. This is achieved by students being actively engaged in the learning process. By creating an optimal learning environment built on respect, safety and kindness, all students are achievers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wilkinson Elementary exists to provide a safe, caring and stimulating environment to prepare life long learners for success by assisting them in acquiring the necessary skills to achieve their fullest potential in a competitive global workplace.

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
Hayward, Carolyn	Principal	Instructional leader/supervisor of the school and all school activities
Hoffman, Kara	Assistant Principal	Leader of PBIS and staff professional development, head of discipline
Hinton, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	Grade 6 teacher, SAC chair
Jones, LeAnne	Teacher, K-12	Title I ELA, Title I compliance
VanVactor, Alice	Teacher, K-12	Title I ELA, ITF
Massey, Brian	Teacher, K-12	Title I math and science
Amidon, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Grade 1 Team Lead
Schloffman, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Grade 3 Team Lead
Adkison, Wendi	Teacher, K-12	Grade 6 Team Lead
Anloague, Arnold	School Counselor	guidance and assessment
Wright, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	Resource Team Lead
LaSauce, Joy	Teacher, K-12	Grade 4 Team Lead

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 Advisory Council including administrators, teachers and school staff, parents and community members, meets regularly throughout the year to evaluate the needs of the school and its stakeholders. During the first meeting of the year, SAC members will review the data and evaluate the goals and action steps proposed in the draft of the SIP. They may suggest changes as they see fit.

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))

SIP monitoring will occur at least quarterly. Data from all sources (FAST/STAR, i-REady, Lexia, classroom performance, etc.) will be reviewed regularly by teachers and administrators in data meetings and PLC. The School Literacy Leadership Team (SLLT) comprised of teachers and school and district level administrators and specialists,will meet monthly to review the progress of ELA instruction and interventions. The ITF and school psychologist will meet monthly with teachers of scholars in MTSS to review their progress. If the data indicate that the plan requires revision, this will be done through our School Advisory Council.

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	15%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	17	22	16	15	27	24	35	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	20	18	20	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	13	19	18	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	5	4	12	14	0	0	35

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	25	29	23	29	27	30	27	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	6	5	4	6	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	2	6	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	1	0	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	22	8	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	12	18	9	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	30	16	21	8	22	0	0	118

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	5	4	5	14	7	9	1	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	25	29	23	29	27	30	27	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	6	5	4	6	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	2	6	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	1	0	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	22	8	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	12	18	9	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	30	16	21	8	22	0	0	118

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	5	4	5	14	7	9	1	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	51	59	53	52	63	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				56			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			60		
Math Achievement*	53	64	59	63	51	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				67			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			40		
Science Achievement*	49	65	54	55	69	59	48		
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](https://www.floridacims.org).

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	216
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
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	35	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	48			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	51			

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				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	55			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	57			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	51			53			49					
SWD	29			31			27				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	38			55							3	
MUL	75			33							2	
PAC												
WHT	53			54			50				4	
FRL	47			49			46				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	52	56	51	63	67	67	55					
SWD	31	46	42	43	54	56	39					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50	50		50	71							
MUL	64			57								
PAC												
WHT	53	55	51	64	68	67	57					
FRL	48	53	52	60	67	70	47					

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	50	57	60	57	53	40	48					
SWD	37	57	65	42	48	46	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47			53								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	57	62	57	52	39	47					
FRL	45	53	52	50	48	41	38					

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	45%	61%	-16%	58%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	59%	2%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	75%	-15%	54%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	67%	-7%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%

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.

With 49% proficiency, Science was our lowest area of performance. After experiencing a significant gain last year, from 48% to 55%, this was a surprising loss. Teachers new to this content area likely contributed to this decline. Additionally, many of our scholars lack the basic foundational skills needed to comprehend the content and assessment. We will address this need through our ELA and Math goals.

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

Science was also our area of greatest decline, going from 55% in 2022 to 49% in 2023. Teachers new to this content area likely contributed to this decline. Scholars in this cohort also experienced substantial need in the basic reading and math skills necessary for success in science. We will address these deficiencies in our ELA and Math goals.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA (grades 3-6) had the greatest gap when compared to the state proficiency. Although grade 3, at 61% proficient was significantly above the state average of 50%, our average for grades 3-6 was 49% proficient, compared to the state average of 52%. Although we made efforts to increase attendance, 35% of scholars in grades 4-6 had absences of 10% or greater. This greatly impacted our ability to reach them.

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

ELA showed the most improvement schoolwide from 52% in 2022 to 57% in 2023, with Grade 3 improving 19% over last year. This met our school improvement goal. We had a strategic emphasis on increasing reading proficiency, and incorporated new actions utilizing Kid Lips (K-1), and SRA Corrective Reading for selected scholars in grades 2-6.

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

Upon reflection of the EWS data, attendance and scholars scoring level 1 in reading and math are areas of concern. Though we have made a concerted effort to improve attendance, we still had 156 scholars with less than 90% attendance last year. Our scholars scoring level 1 in reading decreased only slightly from 75 to 71, while those scoring a 1 in math increased from 63 to 64.

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

1. ELA--increase overall proficiency
2. Math--increase overall proficiency
3. PBIS--increase parent and family engagement

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.

A strategic focus will be placed on achieving an increase in overall ELA proficiency schoolwide. Current data indicates that 57% of our scholars are proficient in ELA. An increase in this area will close the achievement gap in reading and will translate across curriculums, affecting an increase in achievement in all other content areas.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency in reading from 57% to 62% as measured by FAST/STAR.

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

Progress monitoring will be STAR (K-2) and FAST (3-6), in addition to Acadience and Lexia Core.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@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 program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 components of reading
Small group instruction
Direct-explicit instruction
Explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction
Progress monitoring
Teacher access to training
Explicit comprehension strategy
Explicit vocabulary instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to their ESSA ratings, there is strong evidence to support the lasting effects of 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.

Strategic use of instructional coaches and curriculum specialists to support teachers and paraprofessionals

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023, on-going

60 minute ELA intervention block supported by Title I coaches and paraprofessionals

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Targeted intervention groups utilizing evidence-based strategies and tools for instruction (Corrective Reading, Spelling through Morphographs, Spelling Mastery, Sound Partners, SIPPS, PRIDE) as student need requires

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Weekly PLCs and data meetings (at least 3 times a year--B/M/E) to inform instruction by analyzing instruction, assessment, and student work

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Purchase of technology (chromebooks, document cameras, earbuds) to support instruction (Lexia Core, Savvas, and Google Classroom) and assessment (FAST/STAR). Tech assisted instruction will allow for targeted comprehension instruction, as well as remediation and extension in reading comprehension. Data derived from FAST/STAR will inform instruction, assisting with the formation of and instruction of targeted small groups.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023

Kid Lips will be implemented in all K-1 classrooms to support phonemic awareness which is an essential element leading to reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Heggerty will be implemented in all K-2 classrooms to support the foundational skills essential to reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Assessment of scholars grades K-6 using Acadience 3 times a year to determine effectiveness of tier 1 instruction and scholar need with the support of an assessment team including Title I teachers and Title I funded "Adult Temporary Labor" who will be hired to administer the assessment, calculate scores and evaluate results 2 weeks beginning, mid, and end of year.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Teachers in grades K-6 will be invited to participate in an after-school book study of Fair Isn't Always Equal, in which they will discuss assessment and grading in the differentiated classroom. They will explore ways this can be used to instruct and evaluate reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023

Supplies will be purchased to support the goal of reading comprehension (mirrors, paper, cardstock, toner, etc.)

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Comprehension of informational text will be emphasized utilizing Studies Weekly (Science).

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Vocabulary will be explicitly taught in Math, ELA and Science.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Science concepts and vocabulary will be reinforced with informational text.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

#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.

A strategic focus will be placed on achieving an increase in overall math proficiency schoolwide. Current data indicates that 61% of our scholars are proficient in math. An increase in this area will establish our scholars as confident problem-solvers, ready to advance to higher level math topics.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency from 61% to 66% as measured by STAR/FAST.

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

Progress monitoring will be STAR (grades K-2) and FAST (grades 3-6).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@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.)

Dedicated time for math in the school schedule
Individual and small group instruction
Visual representations
Teacher modeling
Demonstrate multiple problem-solving strategies
Teacher access to training

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to their ESSA ratings, there is strong evidence to support the lasting effects of 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.

Teachers will increase scholar fluency utilizing the supplemental curriculum Building Fact Fluency (Grades 1-2 addition/subtraction; Grade 3 addition/subtraction, multiplication/division; Grades 4-6 multiplication/ division)

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Teachers will utilize Eureka Math 2 curriculum with fidelity to develop mathematical thinking and reasoning skills.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Strategic use of Title I funded coach and district curriculum specialists to support instructional and paraprofessional staff.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

A Title I funded math teacher will be hired for class size reduction

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023

Scholars needing intensive remediation may receive Corrective Math

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Interactive Monitors will be used to enhance instruction and student interaction.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

PLCs and data meetings to inform instruction by analyzing instruction, assessment, and student work.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Generation Genius site license will be utilized in STEM resource to support achievement in math.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

#3. 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.

A strategic focus will be student engagement. Because we know that parent and family involvement in school activities can increase student engagement, we will strive to increase parent and family engagement as measured by attendance at parent and family events.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase parent and family engagement as measured by attendance at PFE events from 43% to 50% by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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

We will track the percentage of parents attending at least 1 PFE event.

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.)

Foster positive relationships
Teachers having and expectation of success for all students
Volunteering: Offering parents opportunities to visit their child's school and find ways to recruit and train parents

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that the strategies we have selected have a high correlation to positive outcomes.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Staff will participate in professional development on the importance of parent and family engagement.

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023

Parents will be encouraged to recognize staff members using the Wildcat Wow form.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Parent volunteer meeting 8/25 to introduce volunteer opportunities

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/25/2023

Parents will be notified of all PFE events as early as possible and in at least 3 ways (flier, social media, phone calls, synergy email, newsletters).

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/23, on-going

Teachers and staff will actively promote parental involvement at all conferences.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Sign-in sheets and feedback forms from every event will be analyzed to address barriers to attendance and level of parental engagement.

Person Responsible: LeAnne Jones (mary.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

SAC members will regularly meet to address attendance barriers and seek parental input in providing and promoting quality events which will support student achievement through home/school connection.

Person Responsible: Taylor Hinton (taylor.hinton@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/29/2023, on-going

Print center copies of student planners and Home/School Learning compacts will promote engagement of scholars and families.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

A strategic focus will be placed upon increasing the reading proficiency of Students with Disabilities. Current data indicates that 35% of our Students with Disabilities are proficient in ELA. An increase in this area will reduce the achievement gap for these scholars, thereby affecting an increase in achievement in all content areas.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase ELA proficiency of our Students with Disabilities from 35% to 41%, as measured by the FAST and STAR assessments.

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

Progress monitoring will be STAR (K-2) and FAST (3-6), in addition to Acadience (K-6) and Lexia Core.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@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 program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 components of reading
Small group instruction
Direct-explicit instruction
Explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction
Progress monitoring
Teacher access to training
Explicit comprehension strategy
Explicit vocabulary instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to their ESSA ratings, there is strong evidence to support the lasting effects of 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.

Employ the inclusion co-teach model in grades 2-4.

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: August 2023

All scholars, including SWD, will be assessed beginning, middle and end of year using Acadience Reading to determine instructional needs.

Person Responsible: Alice VanVactor (alice.vanvactor@myoneclay.net)

By When: BOY by 9/23 MOY by 2/24 EOY by 5/24

SWD requiring Corrective Reading will receive this direct instruction in a leveled small group appropriate to their needs.

Person Responsible: LeAnne Jones (mary.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023

Instructional staff will be trained in Universal Design for Learning

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 1/2024

ESE teachers and co-teachers will receive training in collaborative planning and teaching

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 1/2024

ESE teachers will receive training in and maintain documentation of Specially Designed Instruction for their scholars.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

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

2022-23 Data from STAR PM 3 reflects the following are not on track to score a level 3 or above:
Kindergarten-10%
Grade 1 - 31%
Grade 2 - 25%

Current year's data is forthcoming.

Scholars in Grades K-2 are supported in their emerging literacy skills through a high quality tier 1 curriculum, Savvas, supplemented with From Phonics to Reading, Heggerty for phonemic awareness, and Lexia Core 5. Additionally, grades K and 1 also participate daily in Kid Lips. Teachers and trained paraprofessionals scaffold instruction in the small group setting, supporting the individual needs of scholars based upon data. These evidence-based practices and programs were selected because they have demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

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

2022-23 Data from FAST PM data:
Grade 3 - 39% below level 3
Grade 4 - 55% below level 3
Grade 5 - 57% below level 3

Current year's data is forthcoming.

Scholars in Grades 3-5 are working to increase their decoding skills with the ultimate goal of comprehending grade level text in all subjects. This is done utilizing a high quality tier 1 curriculum, Savvas, which is supplemented with From Phonics to Reading in Grade 3, Spelling Through Morphology in Grade 4, and Lexia Core 5. Scholars in need of intervention may receive SRA Corrective Reading, Spelling Mastery, PRIDE Reading and Spelling, or the Wilson System. Targeted small group instruction allows teachers and trained paraprofessionals to meet the specific needs of each scholar. These evidence-based practices and programs were selected because of their demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

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

Based on 2022-23 data, Grades K-2 are not projected to have 50% or less on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2022-23 data, 52% of scholars in Grade 4 did not meet proficiency. Our goal is to reduce this to no more than 45% below Level 3 by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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.

Quarterly data meetings will be held with all faculty where all data sources including FAST/STAR progress monitoring, Lexia Core/Power Up, Savvas, Acadience and intervention data are reviewed to determine their effect upon our desired outcomes. As needed, scholars may be evaluated for different and/or additional interventions. ELA PLCs will meet weekly to review/revise instruction. Observational data from administrators and/or district content coaches/specialists will be used to monitor progress. The newly formed SLLT will meet monthly to monitor progress and evaluate needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@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?

In accordance with the District's CERP and the B.E.S.T. standards, the following evidence-based practices/programs will be implemented to achieve the anticipated outcomes:
90 minutes of daily, uninterrrupted, tier 1 core instruction SAVVAS
Lexia Core 5, K-5
Heggerty , grades K-2
From Phonics to Reading, grades k-3
Kid Lips, grade K-1
Spelling Mastery, grades 3-5 tier 2
Spelling through Morphographs, grades 3-6 tier 2
SIPPS, grades 1-2 tier 2
SRA Decoding/Corrective Reading, grades 3-6 tier 3

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 evidence-based practices and programs above were selected in accordance with the CERP and because they have demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

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
A School Literacy Leadership Team consisting of teacher leaders, administration, and district literacy experts will be formed to review data and progress toward our goal monthly.	Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net
All scholars will be assessed using Acadience Reading 3 times a year to evaluate progress and the need for intervention.	Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net
To strengthen their instructional practice, ELA teachers will be offered the following professional learning opportunities: Grades 2-6: Teachers will collaboratively plan, deliver, and evaluate instruction with district coaches and curriculum specialists. Grades K-6: Fair Isn't Always Equal; Teachers will learn to assess and differentiate standards based learning MTSS leadership: The RTI Approach for Evaluating Learning Disabilities; Annual Growth for All Students, Catch Up Growth for Those Who Are Behind Title I Coaches: Better Conversations	Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net