Rideout Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://roe.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 performance of all students. RideOut Elementary, working in conjunction with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Based on the premise that all students can learn, our teachers will provide opportunities for each child to experience maximized academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

RideOut Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and technologically advanced 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
Stewart, Trisha	Principal	The principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development, revision and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Bright, Steven	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development or revision and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Erwin, Denise	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Como, Ava	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Reneau, Kim	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Brown, Erin	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Shipley, Cassandra	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Pasternak, Anna	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Tison, Cecilia	Teacher, ESE	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Selby, Lynda	Teacher, K-12	
Rountree, Sarah	Psychologist	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.

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.

Our school based leadership team has met to discuss data from the previous school year. We have determined the next steps in supporting student growth and the necessary means to close academic gaps with individual students, subgroups as well as grade levels. Parents will be involved in the process, when our data and proposed plan is shared at our first SAC meeting. We will share the data from the previous school year and all baseline data we have prior to the meeting. It is important to gain parent input and support in the learning process. As we discuss the data, we will discuss resources and support we can provide to parents so they can be true partners in their child(rens) education. We will discuss barriers that we can avoid when working towards proficiency of all students.

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))

As our school based leadership team along with our Schools literacy leadership team we will meet to discuss the SIP monthly and our progress towards the goals set within the plan. As there is a need to adjust based on progress or lack of progress we will work as a team to develop adjustments to meet the needs of all students being served at RideOut Elementary.

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	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: 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	16	10	18	12	11	11	21	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	2	1	7	0	0	13
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	1	2	0	6	10	18	16	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	4	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	1	7	9	7	6	3	10	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	4	17	10	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	29	4	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	1	7	9	7	6	3	10	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	4	17	10	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	29	4	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

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

The "Grade Level" header spans columns K through 8.

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*	56	59	53	65	63	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				60			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			65		
Math Achievement*	64	64	59	72	51	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				68			77		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			68		
Science Achievement*	65	65	54	64	69	59	71		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
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	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	2	1
HSP	65			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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	57			

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	33	Yes	1	
HSP	73			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	55			

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	56			64			65					
SWD	50			42			44				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			14							2	
HSP	63			66							2	
MUL	54			68							2	

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	58			66			78				4	
FRL	50			54			56				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	65	60	44	72	68	59	64					
SWD	47	45	43	45	42	43	45					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	40		29	40							
HSP	76	65		82	70							
MUL	68	65		82	83							
PAC												
WHT	65	59	52	70	66	61	58					
FRL	55	55	50	59	63	52	48					

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	65	59	65	75	77	68	71					
SWD	38	35		42	52	46	45					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			50								
HSP	61	47		79	73		64					
MUL	63			76								
PAC												
WHT	69	59	57	76	74	65	72					
FRL	56	58		64	73		65					

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	56%	55%	1%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	59%	12%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	78%	75%	3%	54%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	67%	-1%	61%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	63%	3%	51%	15%

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.

Based on our 22-23 SY FAST data our 6th Grade ELA proficiency level was the lowest with 46%. The contributing factors for this decrease was a change in ELA instructors mid year. This group of students were 64% on the previous years FSA. The inconsistency of instruction did have a great impact on these students. The same group of students scored 80% proficient in the Math FAST assessment.

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

The area that have the greatest decline from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year was our ELA Proficiency. This dropped from 65% to 56%, the decline that impacted the level of proficiency in our 6th grade class was a large factor in this overall decrease.

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.

The area that had the greatest gap between state and school scores was ELA proficiency in 6th grade with a difference of 5% points below the state average.

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

Science had a growth of 2% from the previous year moving up to 66% proficient.

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

Continuing to encourage students to be present and on time to school as it directly affects their ability to be successful academically both in the class and on state assessments.

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

Our number one focus will be on ELA proficiency
We will also focus on our ELA BQ and Math BQ students this school year.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

An area of focus for RideOut Elementary for the 23-24 school year will be PBIS with a strong emphasis on schoolwide expectations.

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

When our students are made aware of schoolwide expectations we expect to see a 10% decrease each 9 weeks in our Behavior Incident Notification (BIN) and discipline incidents.

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

The area of focus will be monitored each month our PBIS team meets to discuss success of our program and needs for improvement. The schoolwide Behavior Incident Notification (BIN) data as well as discipline incidents will be reviewed and the PBIS team will discuss ways to address specific behaviors within our plan. We will determine next steps and needs to review expectations per grade level, class or even specific students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steven Bright (steven.bright@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.)

Our school has purchased PBIS rewards as a means to reward and incentive our stduents for making positive behavioral choices. Each month will will also review and assess this data collected. We can look at grade level, class and student data specifically. This data discussion will allow us to determine incentives and ways we can motivate our students and reward good choices.

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

In order to provide models of expected behaviors and to review schoolwide expectations, this can be done by including students in a positive manner. With the use of this program, students are rewarded immediately with points and they also earn the opportunity to earn tangible rewards throughout the school year.

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.

Step 1: PBIS team meets to discuss new PBIS plan
R.A.C.E to success and Schoolwide Expectations
Step 2: Purchase PBIS Rewards (prizes for quarterly incentive store)

Step 3: Train teachers and staff on the implementation of our schoolwide expectations as well rewards program to motivate and support each student. Explain the Behavior Intervention Notification and how this will allow us to collect behavior data to support students.

Step 4: Data Analysis during monthly PBIS meetings based on School Wide Expectation implementation, behavior data (BIN's) and students shopping in our PBIS store with earned points through PBIS rewards.

Person Responsible: Steven Bright (steven.bright@myoneclay.net)

By When: PBIS plan, School Wide expectations, teacher training will be completed during preplanning. PBIS meetings monthly with agendas

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

As an MTSS model school our schools literacy leadership team will be looking at data and determining academic and behavioral next steps for all students. The need to be intentional comes from the testing data collected last school year.

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

Our Literacy Leadership team will be reviewing baseline data provided by our FAST PM1 assessment as well as our Acadience data and we will determine current students with substantial reading deficiency. Each student will be provided MTSS in order to increase their reading levels. 10% of our students will increase their scores in PM 2 and PM 3.

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

We will monitor our progress during biweekly data chats as well as monthly School Based Literacy Leadership team meetings with county support monthly. We will talk about each student that is considered to have substantial reading deficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@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.)

Each student deemed to have substantial reading deficiency will be provided with MTSS nsaed on their specific needs.All other students that are following below proficient will have a data discussion based on their classroom data as well as PM data.

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

Each student will need specific programs and supports based on their needs.

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.

Universal Data Collected per grade level
Analysis of Data during biweekly data chats
Identify students needs and next steps
Provide steps to address needs and progress
Agendas for Literacy Leadership Team
Literacy Leadership Team Meetings Monthly

Address students academic and behavioral needs based on data collected
Follow steps, supporting subgroups as well as individual students.

Person Responsible: Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

By When: Universal Screeners completed buy 9/5 based on attendance Data Meetings (biweekly) Grade Level needs assessments (monthly for literacy leadership) Literacy Leadership Meetings Monthly (Agendas for progress and next steps)

#3. 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.

Area of focus will be addressing our Black/ African American subgroup that hits 33% in FPPI below the 41% minimum mark.

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

As a school we will identify each subgroup being served on our campus, we will identify our Black/ African American students and determine their level. Our goal will be to increase to 45% or higher in order to increase above the 41% minimum requirement.

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

As a school we will monitor each subgroup during each school based, universal screeners as well as State testing. We will break these numbers down by grade level and discuss supports provided to each subgroups, especially our black/ african american subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@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 be provided with strong Tier 1 instruction with the use of provided supplementary curriculum. As needed students will be provided with Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports based on collected data in order to support academic gap closure.
There will be an increase in small group instruction, individualized academic supports based on county programs and materials used.

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

Intentional instruction of each student, especially focusing on our black/ african american subgroups will provide the interventions in order to close academic gaps.The progress will be documented through biweekly data meetings as well as school based literacy leadership monthly meetings.

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.

Identify our student population that falls within this subgroup
Share this subgroup data with grade levels
Determine grade level needs to support all subgroups with a strong focus on our black/ african american subgroup

Biweekly data meetings/ PLC Data chats
Monthly Literacy Leadership meetings

Person Responsible: Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

By When: Identify Students per subgroups September Share Subgroups September-October Grade Level Needs: September and ongoing Data Chats: Biweekly Literacy Leadership Meetings: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

As we monitor the needs of our students, we will evaluate the needs for interventions. This will be discuss and monitored during each of our literacy leadership meetings. Each student will be provided with specific interventions through MTSS or goals on their IEP if this pertains to individual students. If there in a need to purchase approved supplemental materials to meet the needs of our ATSI subgroups, this will be discuss during our literacy leadership team meetings.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$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