



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>30</b>

## Archer Elementary

14533 SW 170TH ST, Archer, FL 32618

<https://www.sbac.edu/archer>

### 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.

The mission of Archer Elementary School is to establish an educational setting where students have an opportunity to develop into well-rounded individuals. Through strong academics and a focus on the whole student, we strongly believe every child can reach their potential. Archer Elementary will provide each student with the necessary skills to become life-long learners.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Archer Elementary School is to have every student:

Develop leadership qualities to help them in life.

Build a strong academic foundation in the areas of language arts, math, science, and writing.

Be compassionate and caring of others.

Develop an understanding of community and relationships.

### 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
Hartwell, Libby	Principal	
Williamson, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Liebach, Tracy	School Counselor	
Whiddon , Daniel	Dean	
Hyde, Mary Ferris	Instructional Coach	
Willcox, Thomas	Other	

#### 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.

Input for school improvement is gathered throughout the year from our leadership team as well as faculty and staff members. Strategies are discussed and vetted through our monthly data chat process. This is also our mechanism for monitoring our SIP goals and strategies throughout the year.

**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))

Input for school improvement is gathered throughout the year from our leadership team as well as faculty and staff members. Strategies are discussed and vetted through our monthly data chat process. This is also our mechanism for monitoring our SIP goals and strategies throughout the year.

Demographic Data	
<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	45%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	94%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 ESSA Identification</b>	TSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C  2019-20: C  2018-19: C  2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	16	11	19	17	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	5	4	13	5	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	2	12	9	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	22	45	15	26	21	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	23	13	13	21	17	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	22	45	15	26	21	0	0	0	129
	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	6	4	4	20	17	0	0	0	51

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	20	17	14	18	0	0	0	83
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	7	12	17	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	17	0	0	0	39
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	4	12	14	0	0	0	30

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	20	17	14	18	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	17	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	17	0	0	0	39
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	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	4	12	14	0	0	0	30

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	53	56	62	59	57
ELA Learning Gains	59	56	61	54	57	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48	43	52	24	49	53
Math Achievement*	55	55	60	61	60	63
Math Learning Gains	50	58	64	62	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27	46	55	41	49	51
Science Achievement*	50	48	51	70	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

\* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

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	26	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	63			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

**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)

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	56	59	48	55	50	27	50					
SWD	29	40	36	19	20	15	23					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	50	52	19	36	32	18					
HSP	66	70		62	58		58					
MUL	67			55								
PAC												

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
WHT	64	58	38	64	51	20	57					
FRL	40	49	46	40	35	25	33					

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	61	50	33	63	48	22	53					
SWD	11			18								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	50		35	50		29					
HSP	64	54		64	54		64					
MUL	67			52								
PAC												
WHT	66	41	33	75	48		58					
FRL	39	32	29	40	33	27	26					

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	62	54	24	61	62	41	70					
SWD	12	21	18	26	53	53	8					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90			80								
BLK	40	40	17	32	50	45	35					
HSP	68	56		65	63							
MUL	58	64		63	64							
PAC												
WHT	70	60	27	72	65	36	87					
FRL	39	44	31	42	53	38	43					

**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	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	49%	3%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	58%	5%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	54%	8%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	51%	8%	51%	8%

### 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.**

ELA for 3rd and 4th grade students was the lowest. In 3rd grade 52% were proficient and in 4th 53%. Students in these grade levels have a foundational reading skill deficit.

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

Math proficiency improved from 55% to 62 % and Science 50% to 59%. Our ELA overall proficiency stayed the same at 56%.

**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.**

Fourth grade students were 4 percentage points below the state average. The contributing factors were missed instruction during critical phonics instruction and larger class sizes (25 students per class).

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

5th grade science improved to 59% during the 2022-23 school year. Teachers created a spiral review including standards from third to fifth grade. Class size was smaller in 5th grade with an average of 15 students. We also utilized a science lab teacher who collaborated with all fifth grade teachers.

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

Students with disabilities, black and free and lunch lunch students are not performing at proficiency in all subject areas.

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

1. Overall Reading Proficiency
2. Overall Math Proficiency
3. Students with disabilities proficiency in ELA and Math
4. Black proficiency in ELA and Math
5. Students on Free and Reduced Lunch proficiency in ELA and Math

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. 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.

In ELA 40% of students who are Black/African American are proficient. In Math 39% of these students are proficient.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

On the FAST PM3 assessment 41% of Black/African American students will be proficient in ELA and Math.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monthly data chats with grade level teams to discuss district chapter tests, Dibels, ISIP assessments and State FAST testing. In addition MTSS team meets monthly to evaluate individual student needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**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.)

Black/African American students will be prioritized in Title I interventions and in targeted computer based instruction. Provide incentives to attend after school tutoring opportunities. Pair students who are not proficient with mentors.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide more opportunities of access to grade level curriculum. We also are working towards building positive relationship and school culture.

**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.

Recruit highly effective teachers for tutoring

**Person Responsible:** Mary Ferris Hyde (hydemd@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

Pair students with Mentors

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Whiddon (whiddondl@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

Identify students in need of tutoring

**Person Responsible:** Mary Ferris Hyde (hydemd@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

**#2. 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.

Archer had 39 discipline offenses in the 2022-23 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Archer's goal is to reduce the number of discipline offenses to 37.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monthly behavior data will be presented at PBIS meeting.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**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.)

Archer will have monthly (PBIS) meetings to discuss behavior data. During this time team members will discuss problem behavior areas and develop ideas to reduce behavior occurrences. The team will also work to develop incentives for all students.

Each classroom has a think space to eliminate the need for office intervention for behavior.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student who spend more time in class have higher achievement in academic areas.

**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.

Present behavior data to staff members

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Whiddon (whiddondl@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** On a monthly basis

Develop ideas for behavior incentives

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Whiddon (whiddondl@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** Monthly basis

Create student think spaces in each classroom

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Liebach (liebachtl@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** August 1

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged****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.

23% of Economically Disadvantaged students are proficient.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Economically disadvantaged students will be 41% proficient in ELA and Math.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monthly data chats with grade level teams to discuss district chapter tests, Dibels, ISIP assessments and State FAST testing. In addition MTSS team meets monthly to evaluate individual student needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**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.)

Economically disadvantaged students will be prioritized in Title I interventions and in targeted computer based instruction. Provide incentives to attend after school tutoring opportunities. Pair students who are not proficient with mentors.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide more opportunities of access to grade level curriculum. We also are working towards building positive relationship and school culture.

**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.

Recruit mentors and match them with students

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Whiddon (whiddondl@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

Recruit teacher for after school tutoring

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

Create Title I intervention groups based on FAST PM 1 data

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

#### #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.

In ELA, 17% of students with a disability were proficient. In Math, 31% of students with a disability were proficient.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

In ELA and Math 41% of students with a disability will be proficient.

##### Monitoring:

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

Monthly data chats with grade level teams to discuss district chapter tests, Dibels, ISIP assessments and State FAST testing. In addition MTSS team meets monthly to evaluate individual student needs. Quarterly evaluations of accommodations being successful and appropriate for individual students.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

##### 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.)

Students with disabilities will be prioritized in creating a master schedule to allow for specialized instruction. Provide incentives to attend after school tutoring opportunities. Pair students who are not proficient with mentors.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide more opportunities of access to grade level curriculum. We also are working towards building positive relationship and school culture.

##### 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.

Recruit mentors and pair them with students

**Person Responsible:** Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

Build master schedule with help from IEP team members to include the best available services for students with disabilities.

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** August 10

Create schedules of paras that prioritize student learning times

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** August 10

Provide incentives for students to attend after school tutoring

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

**#5. 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.

In ELA, 56% of students are proficient.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In ELA, 62% of student will be proficient

**Monitoring:**

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

Monthly data chats with grade level teams to discuss district chapter tests, Dibels, ISIP assessments and State FAST testing. In addition MTSS team meets monthly to evaluate individual student needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**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 have UFLI instruction with fidelity K-2 as well as opportunities additional instruction through an intervention block. K-5 students will have access to Istation for a minimum of 30 minutes at least twice a week. Students 2nd-5th grade will have access to accelerated reader.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide more opportunities of access to grade level curriculum.

**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.

Create schedule for labs and carts to maximize student use school wide

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** August 10

Provide UFLI coaching

**Person Responsible:** Mary Ferris Hyde (hydemd@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** On going

Purchase accelerated reader and plan for usage

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** August 30

Monthly data chats

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** On going

## #6. 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.

In Math 62% of students were proficient.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

In Math, 67% of students will be proficient

### Monitoring:

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

Monthly data chats with grade level teams to discuss district chapter tests, Reflex usage and State FAST testing. In addition MTSS team meets monthly to evaluate individual student needs.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

### 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.)

Grade levels will utilize a spiral review of all standards. Students in 2nd through 5th grade will have access to Reflex math at least three times a week.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide more opportunities of access to grade level curriculum.

### 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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

### 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.

Provide guidance to teachers on Reflex math and usage

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** August 30

Teachers collaborate to turn in a spiral review calendar with specific standards

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Williamson (williaea@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** October 1st

Monthly data chats

**Person Responsible:** Mary Ferris Hyde (hydemd@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** On going

## 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).

The principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

## 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

Archer's area of focus is based on 34% of Kindergarteners and 30% of 2nd graders scoring below the 40th percentile. In K - 2, we are using a Title I pull out teacher so that every classroom has 30 minutes of intervention instruction available. Also all three of our Kindergarten classrooms have para support throughout the day. Kindergarten is also equipped with 4 student computers and 5 iPads per class. We have also set aside a computer lab for the sole use by K-2 teachers and allocated time for each teacher to have additional instructional time in there this year.

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

Archer's area of focus is based on 48% of 3rd graders, 47% of 4th graders and 37% of 5th graders scoring a level 3 on ELA FAST. Our rising 2nd graders had a score of 30% and we have allocated Title I instruction for an additional hour of small group instruction in our two 3rd grade classrooms. An instructional high dose tutor is being utilized specifically for 3rd-5th grade SIPP's instruction. In 5th grade there is a class size reduction teacher to provide more small group instructional opportunities. Students in 3-5, also have access to a lab or laptop cart on an every other day rotation to increase the opportunity for digital practice.

## Measurable Outcomes

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

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

### Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

In graders K-2, 50% of students will score above the 40th percentile on ELA FAST.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In grades 3-5, 50% of students will score a Level 3 or high on the ELA FAST.

## 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.

Archer Elementary will track student progress using the FAST assessments three times a year. We will also utilize district common assessments to track proficiency. Grade levels will meet on a monthly basis for data analysis and to problem solve areas of need.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williamson, Elizabeth , williaea@gm.sbac.edu

## 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?

Students in K-2 use UFLI for phonics instruction. Intervention for these grades levels also focus on UFLI intervention to build the foundational reading skills. All students utilize Benchmark Advance as the core

curriculum with fidelity. In 3-5 students have SIPPs and Great Leaps as an additional intervention. Top score is used to support the writing instruction in 4th and 5th grades.

**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?

UFLI, SIPPS and Great Leaps are interventions identified in our district wide reading plan. Benchmark Advance is the district wide adopted reading curriculum. Top Score is a research based writing curriculum that provides opportunities to mimic writing assessments similar to FAST.

**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
The literacy leadership team will share data with faculty and staff at the beginning of the year. On monthly basis, teachers will meet as a grade level and share recent assessment data. During this time teachers will also look at standards and develop strategies to best increase student success.	Williamson, Elizabeth , williaea@gm.sbac.edu
Ensure teachers/paras are trained in reading intervention programs	Hyde, Mary Ferris, hydemd@gm.sbac.edu
Identify students in need of interventions and create a schedule	Williamson, Elizabeth , williaea@gm.sbac.edu
Create computer lab and laptop schedules	Williamson, Elizabeth , williaea@gm.sbac.edu

**Title I Requirements**

**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**  
List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

During preplanning, our SIP is shared with faculty and staff. It is revisited throughout the year after our state/district wide assessments.

At Open House in September, parents are shown how to access the SIP on the website <https://www.sbac.edu/archer>. Copies are made available if requested.

We also include our SIP plan as part of SAC meetings and ask for input from community members.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Archer Elementary uses the Ron Clark Academy model. Every student, faculty and staff member at Archer Elementary is assigned to one of four houses: Altriusmo, Amistad, Reveur or Isbindi. Students are able to earn points for their houses in a variety of ways. Some are academic like mastery of math facts or AR points and others are behavioral. At the end of the week, the house with the most points has their flag raised on the house flag pole. Students also participate in events schoolwide for their house and wear their house colors on Wednesdays.

We are a PBIS school. Students are able to earn "Archer bucks" for displaying positive behavior expectations. Using the Archer bucks students are able to purchase items in a school store or pay to participate in school wide events. Teachers also have classroom stores where students are able to purchase items.

Our school counselor works with every grade level on specific age appropriate lessons. She coordinates with the media specialist during "Start with Hello" week. Students in every class create an affirmation leaf and post on the wall next to our art and music rooms. We also installed a "buddy bench" on the playground and students were explicitly taught how to use it.

Once a month, our PTA and family liaison coordinate a lunch, breakfast or snack area for teachers. There are also birthday cards and treats for faculty and staff.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

Archer plans to strengthen the academic program at the school by developing a master schedule with a focus on implementing interventions and ESE resources. In 5th grade we are utilizing a class size reduction teacher to provide smaller classes and increase instruction.

All K-2 teachers are utilizing UFLI instruction on a daily basis. Students who are struggling with this curriculum have an opportunity for intervention with another teacher.

In our magnet program, all third and fourth graders are offered an accelerated math curriculum. Students 3-5 in the magnet building have accelerated curriculum in ELA and in science. The science curriculum is

supported through a science lab. We also offer additional opportunities for all 5th graders to have access to instruction in the science lab. Students who are identified as gifted in first and second grade also have science instruction daily in the lab.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

Archer collaborates with other schools that have a magnets in Alachua County to determine the best use of resources and support systems for students.

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students’ access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

**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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00

5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Approval**

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

Yes