Chaires Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

http://www.leonschools.net/chaires

Demographics

Principal: Richard Holmes

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2020-21: (52%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](www.floridacims.org)

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to focus instruction on developing the whole child. We are committed to providing opportunities designed to meet individual needs and ensure that every child experiences success, academically, emotionally, and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide students with a caring and supportive learning environment that allows each child to reach their full potential through quality instruction and experiences. Chaires Elementary is a community-based school and together we can make a difference in the lives of our students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holmes, Richard	Principal	Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensure implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support TTI and communicates with the outside stakeholders regarding school0based RTI. Selects one teacher from each grade level to provide information about core instruction, data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure the implementation of Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction and support. Selects one ESE teacher to provide information about intervention instruction, participate in student data collection, and collaborate with general education teachers.
Harp, Myra	Instructional Coach	Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assist with the design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective strategies.
Sperling, Brooks	Assistant Principal	Provide vision, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensure implementation of the intervention support, and adequate professional development is provided to support TTI and communicates with the outside stakeholders regarding school0based RTI. Selects one teacher from each grade level to provide information about core instruction, data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure the implementation of Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction and support. Selects one ESE teacher to provide information about intervention instruction, participate in student data collection, and collaborate with general education teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/11/2021, Richard Holmes

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

459

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	85	81	81	73	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	6	18	10	10	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	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 who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	3	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/8/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	93	89	72	79	75	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	11	2	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	93	89	72	79	75	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	11	2	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%			62%			53%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%			44%			50%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%			40%			38%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	64%			53%			56%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%			58%			65%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%			47%			40%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	57%			58%			53%	52%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	66%	-12%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	36	38	29	32	52	43	28				
BLK	32	40	35	32	59	59	36				
HSP				73							
MUL	54			57							
WHT	73	65		79	75		67				
FRL	38	43	30	46	60	48	41				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	28	20		33	50		28				
BLK	43	43		28	45		33				
HSP	57			57							
WHT	75	47		71	69		78				
FRL	47	32		36	52		48				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	23	32	30	25	50	40	27				
BLK	41	44	39	39	55	44	45				
WHT	60	52	38	66	71	38	55				
FRL	45	41	31	46	59	35	46				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Proficiency in ELA was down compared to previous years but Learning Gains in ELA were up. Math proficiency was up compared to the last few years but Learning Gains and Lowest 25% Learning Gains saw significant improvements when compared to years past. Students with Disabilities scored 37% in the ESSA Federal Index, with ELA and Science being the two content areas with the lowest percentages. The ELA percentages were up from the previous two years and Science was consistent with scores from previous years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA (proficiency, learning gains, and L25 learning gains) is the area with the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Learning loss sustained due to the pandemic is one factor contributing to this need for improvement. Additionally, about a quarter of our student population are students with disabilities and their pathway to proficiency often takes longer. We saw improvements in our overall Learning Gains and Lowest 25% Learning Gains and our Students With Disabilities showed significant improvements in Proficiency and Learning Gains. This data tells us we are reaching these students but will need to continue to provide an infrastructure of ESE services and Tiered instructional supports. In order to continue to impact ELA instruction across the board we need to ensure that we are making data driven instructional decisions and using our standards to drive our instruction. In an effort to encourage more reading for pleasure, as we recognize simple reading is a key factor in strengthening this area, we are instituting school-wide focuses on pleasure reading and celebrating students" efforts.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math was our area of greatest improvement. All components of math saw significant improvement from the previous few years.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

While the impact of the pandemic left gaps in math just as in ELA, identifying the areas of need and providing those lessons proved more direct than with ELA which is very spiraled in nature. Teachers were able to use standards mastery data from progress monitoring tools to provide instruction and/or remediation in areas of need.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Progress monitoring data will need to be analyzed regularly in order to drive instructional decisions. Students who are meeting academic targets will need to be exposed to high cognitive demand tasks in order to synthesize new information and move forward. Students needing Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions will regularly receive their interventions using evidence based instruction. The school will have two interventionists this year to assist in ensuring we are accelerating learning for all.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers are implementing both new standards and new curriculum materials this school year. Additionally, we will be introducing the new FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment in grades 3-5. In an effort to meet those professional development needs we have set monthly grade level meetings to discuss instructional needs, to analyze progress monitoring data, and to provide professional development support. During those monthly meetings, instructional needs may arise that require additional professional development and we will work in collaboration with our district curriculum development department to offer those opportunities.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Students in grades K-3, who are not meeting grade level expectations, will have the opportunity to participate in "beyond the bell" tutoring after school during the first semester. Additionally, students in grades K-4, who are not demonstrating mastery of grade level standards, will be offered the opportunity to participate in a summer learning loss recovery program with an emphasis on literacy.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.	Our students with disabilities performed below the Federal Index threshold of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency for ELA was 38% in the 2022 school year and 32% in math. We would like to see and increase of at least 2% in both areas.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student classroom assessments and progress monitoring data will be reviewed to identify areas in need of reteach and/or remediation. Students will receive instructional support and ESE support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible

Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	ELA Proficiency was one of two areas where we saw a drop in our percentage from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We would like to see our proficiency increase by at least two percentage points taking us to 60% or higher.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student classroom assessment and progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students" progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Holmes (holmesr@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Science was one of two areas in which we saw a drop in our proficiency from the precious year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We would like to see our proficiency raise by a minimum of two percentage points.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student classroom assessment will be reviewed to identify areas in need of additional instructional support. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss students" progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Using evidence-based curriculum and intervention materials, students will receive standards aligned whole and small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Standards-aligned whole group instruction ensures all students are exposed to grade level appropriate content with opportunity for practice and feedback. Small group instruction will allow for focused instruction on targeted skills. Teachers will be able to closely monitor progress, provide feedback, and adjust the pace of instruction as needed. Research shows that comprehensive instructional programs, feedback, clear learning objectives, and small group instruction all have the potential to accelerate student achievement.

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.

1. Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.
2. Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded.
3. Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students.
4. Monitor interventions to ensure small group instruction is being implemented according to the schedule.
5. Provide ongoing Professional Development to teachers to support instruction.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Kindergarten--Using a structured literacy approach, kindergarteners will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for kindergarten will be to ensure they are receiving explicit phonics instruction every day using a phonics scope and sequence. During the 21-22 school year 28% of kindergarten students were not on track to score a Level 3.

1st Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 1st graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 1st grade will be to ensure they are receiving explicit phonics instruction every day using a phonics scope and sequence. During the 21-22 school year 33% of 1st grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

2nd Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 2nd graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 2nd grade will be to ensure they are receiving explicit phonics instruction every day using a phonics scope and sequence. During the 21-22 school year 49% of 2nd grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

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

3rd Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 3rd graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 3rd grade will be to strengthen comprehension by building vocabulary and background knowledge. During the 21-22 school year 35% of 3rd grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

4th Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 4th graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 4th grade will be to strengthen comprehension by building vocabulary and background knowledge. During the 21-22 school year 54% of 4th grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

5th Grade--Using a structured literacy approach, 5th graders will receive explicit and systematic instruction using evidence-based curriculum materials. An area of focus for 5th grade will be to strengthen comprehension by building vocabulary and background knowledge. During the 21-22 school year 37% of 5th grade students were not on track to score a Level 3.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

During the 21-22 school year each grade, K-3, had fewer than 50% of students not on track to score a Level 3 by the end of the school year. We would like to decrease the percentage of students not on track to score a Level 3 by a minimum of two percentage points at each grade.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

During the 21-22 school year, the 4th grade students had 54% of students who scored below a Level 3. We would like to decrease that percentage by a minimum of 2 percentage points in the 22-23 school year. We would like to see both 3rd and 5th grades decrease their percentage of students performing below Level 3 by a minimum of two percentage points as well.

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Each grade level is scheduled to meet monthly with the Leadership Team to discuss student progress and problem solve to further impact student achievement. Additionally, all grade levels are holding a Professional Planning Day, following the initial round of Progress Monitoring, to develop a long-term plan for meeting academic needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Holmes, Richard, holmesr@leonschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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?

Students will receive core instruction using Savass MyView. Additionally, students will use Lexia Core5 to supplement their academics. Students will receive both whole group and differentiated small group instruction. Students who need Tier II or Tier III interventions will receive them daily using either Lexia Core5 teacher lead interventions, Savaas My View interventions, Phonics for Reading, and/or Corrective; decisions about intervention materials will be based off of data derived from student assessments and ongoing progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The core curriculum materials are aligned to the newly adopted state standards and meet the state's definition of and evidence-based program. Further, each of the possible intervention materials that may be employed meet the state standards for evidence-based as well.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching--Chaires has a full time Literacy Coach who works alongside both teachers and students to monitor and impact ELA instruction. Additionally, the Literacy Coach participates in all monthly Progress Monitoring meetings and oversees all Interventions.	Holmes, Richard, holmesr@leonschools.net
Assessment--Using data from core curriculum, Lexia Core5, and FAST 3-5, student progress will be monitored and discussed at monthly Progress Monitoring meetings. These data will be used to drive instruction and made academic decisions.	

Positive Culture & Environment
A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Chaires is a community school. With our teachers and staff, we promote a "student need" culture. The diversity of our faculty and staff is a representation of our students and parents. This allows students to feel like they are a part of the community and promotes a trusting learning environment. Our outside stakeholders are just as diverse. They are volunteers, college students, and business leaders. These stake holders allow our mission of developing future leaders to come together and improve our school's culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Our stakeholder provide support to the school community in myriad ways. They can be found volunteering in the classrooms to promote literacy in our Pre-K and Kindergarten classrooms, organizing school supply drives to ensure that our teachers and students want for nothing, helping us incentivize both our students and staff to promote excellence in all areas, and much more. Regardless the effort, our stakeholders'

actions on campus are invaluable in promoting a positive and effective learning environment for faculty and students.