

Alachua County Public Schools

Joseph Williams Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Joseph Williams Elementary School

1245 SE 7TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

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

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.

We are committed to the success of every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Williams, our students are loved, believed in, and challenged to be creative risk-takers who are prepared for future success.

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
Stokes, Anyana	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of databased decision-making; Provide opportunities for teacher collaboration and knowledge building; Facilitate implementation of RTI; Provides or coordinates professional development; Attend EPT, IEP, 504 and RTI meetings; Conduct walkthroughs to monitor fidelity and integrity of core curriculum and intervention implementation; Monitor teacher effectiveness; Communicates with all shareholders information regarding school data and student achievement progress: Provides a common vision for student relationship building and behavior management
Robinson, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional support and coordinate professional development/ coaching support for instructors; Coordinate school wide assessments, conduct walk-throughs to monitor implementation of SIP strategies, monitors behavior intervention, monitors student achievement through analyzing school-wide data, assist with the development of intervention and differentiated instruction; Attend EPT, IEP, 504 and RTI meetings.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council includes parents, community partners, teachers, school support staff, and the school principal. The SIP is an agenda item and is discussed at each regularly scheduled meeting. Stakeholders are provided the SIP in advance and protocols are used to solicit input on the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be an agenda item that is discussed at each regularly scheduled SAC meeting. The areas of focus are highlighted and progress towards the desired outcome are shared.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	TSI
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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2020-21: D 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
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	0	24	34	20	28	21	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	9	14	6	8	14	0	0	0	51
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	42	29	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	48	37	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	60	91	30	29	35	0	0	0	245

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	0	0	0	

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	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	3	25	17	29	17	22	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	6	13	13	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	1	8	8	15	10	6	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	1	6	4	14	9	11	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	22	30	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	25	30	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	26	14	35	15	13	0	0	0	103
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	19	11	30	28	38	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	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	3	25	17	29	17	22	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	6	13	13	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	1	8	8	15	10	6	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	1	6	4	14	9	11	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	22	30	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	25	30	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	26	14	35	15	13	0	0	0	103
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	19	11	30	28	38	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	45			43			42		
ELA Learning Gains	62			34			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49			29			22		
Math Achievement*	44			42			41		
Math Learning Gains	59			47			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42			33			22		
Science Achievement*	42			35			42		
Social Studies Achievement*									
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	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
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	22	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	100			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	93			
FRL	32	Yes	3	

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	45	62	49	44	59	42	42					
SWD	15	32	33	13	25	23	13					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100	88		100	100		100					
BLK	18	48	51	16	40	45	11					
HSP	100			100								
MUL	60	67		50	61							

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
PAC												
WHT	91	88		100	88		100					
FRL	17	47	48	16	43	43	9					

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	43	34	29	42	47	33	35					
SWD	16	15		13	27		10					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	98	79		100	93		100					
BLK	16	20	29	14	31	33	7					
HSP												
MUL	55			50								
PAC												
WHT	97			97								
FRL	17	22	25	14	32	29	11					

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	42	42	22	41	42	22	42					
SWD	17	30	31	21	47	42						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100	92		100	97		100					
BLK	17	22	23	15	20	21	12					
HSP	60			60								
MUL	43	18		54	40							
PAC												
WHT	100	75		100	75							
FRL	17	24	22	16	22	24	16					

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance was demonstrated in 3rd grade ELA (36%). this group has historically performed at a lower rate of proficiency. Some contributing factors may be the shift to assessments being computer-based and new state standards. Also the acquisition of foundational skills would have been the 2020, 2021 school years (COVID years).

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 4th grade math (-4%). Some contributing factors may be the shift to assessments being computer-based and new state standards. Also the acquisition of foundational skills would have been the 2020, 2021 school years (COVID years).

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.

When compared to the state average, the largest gap was in 3rd Grade Math (21%) Some contributing factors may be the shift to assessments being computer-based and new state standards. Also the acquisition of foundational skills would have been the 2020, 2021 school years (COVID years). Three of the 5 teachers, first year teaching 3rd grade.

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

Most improvement demonstrated in 5th grade math (+13%). Teacher consistency. All teachers returning from previous year. Departmentalized.

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

Areas of concern might be the number of students with one or more indicators. Need for more wrap around services to address needs that effect the early warning indicators. High numbers of students scoring at level 1 in both ELA and Math.

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

Improve student overall achievement in math and ELA.
Improve achievement of student in underperforming subgroups.
Improve attendance and behavior.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

African American Students (33%), Students with Disabilities (22%), and Free and Reduced Lunch students (32%) are performing below 41% in both ELA and Math on state assessments. Improved standards aligned tasks, instruction, and release of learning will positively impact student performance on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of students in the identified subgroups will show monthly improvement Grade level Benchmark assessments. Students in subgroups will improve proficiency by 5% or more on PM1 and PM2. End of year PM3 data will demonstrate subgroups performance at 41% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored using benchmark textbook assessments that are aligned to state standards. Data would be reviewed by teachers and leadership team monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@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.)

UFLI, Small group instruction, use of math manipulatives, high dose tutoring, and intentional selection of students to receive intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher identification of students and continual monitoring of student progress assist with selecting appropriate strategies and interventions. We know that acquiring usable knowledge will support student acquisition of and provide links to new learning. Improved foundational skills and small group explicit instruction support student mastery of standards and improve demonstration of achievement.

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.

1. Weekly grade level collaborative Instructional Planning; focused on standards and standards task alignment.
2. Quarterly teacher data chats facilitated by administrator.
3. Small group instruction within Math, ELA, and Science

5. Teacher PLCs (B.E.S.T. Standards, Student Engagement, Release of Learning)
6. Integration of Intervention. Targeted, identified students.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

A review of attendance data led us to identify Improve student attendance as an area of focus. Twenty percent of Williams students had attendance below 90% (71students). It is important for students to be in attendance at school in order to receive the full advantage of educational opportunities. We must engage students in a way that they are eager to attend and willing participants in school, in their education.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monthly monitoring of Skyward Truancy Reports. Monthly target 92% of students attendance above 90%. For the year, decrease by 10% the number of students who have attendance below 90%.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly meetings with attendance team.
Monthly analysis of attendance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anyana Stokes (stokesay@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.)

Continued implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports. Professional Development and PLCs for teachers. Increase teacher capacity to engage students and manage classroom behaviors. Increase family engagement with and in the school through phone calls, home visits, newsletters, teacher communications.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Basis of PBIS is to reinforce desired student behaviors and create a positive school culture. Through PBIS we will establish a common language and a school-wide set of expectation. It will also allow us a systematic way in which to intervene and follow up. We also want to increase and improve beyond school enrichment opportunities (clubs, groups). Helping to build individual determination within our students.

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.

1. Improve student engagement using Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports
2. Provide teacher PD and support in the area of students engagement.

3. Provide support for and improve family engagement through improved and increased communication.
4. Beyond school day enrichment, engagement through the establishment of clubs and activities.

Person Responsible: Anyana Stokes (stokesay@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. 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.

Improve achievement of all students as well as improve the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. We must engage students in their education and provide opportunities to strengthen background knowledge. Many of our lower quartile students are performing 2 or more grade levels behind. We must provide targeted intervention and support of foundation skills while also providing access and success on grade level tasks for students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase schoolwide achievement in ELA and Math by 10%

Monitoring:

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

Grade Level common assessments in ELA, Math, and Science.
Monthly and quarterly grade level teacher data chats led by administrators and instructional coaches

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anyana Stokes (stokesay@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.)

Early identification of students in need of additional supports and intervention. Progress Monitoring through quarterly data meetings with teachers led by administrators. Increase student's background knowledge. Provide extended day, beyond the bell learning opportunities. Support for and increase teacher planning opportunities and professional development in standards based and aligned instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher identification of students and continual monitoring of student progress and assist with selecting appropriate strategies and interventions. We know that acquiring usable knowledge will support student acquisition of and provide links to new learning.

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.

1. Weekly grade level collaborative Instructional Planning, focused on standards and standards task alignment.

2. Quarterly teacher and student data chats.
3. Small group instruction and literacy stations within ELA and Math. High dose tutoring to support ELA Foundational Skills.
4. Increase student access to extended learning opportunities. (Field trips, Extended Day Intervention)
5. Teacher PD and PLCs (B.E.S.T. Standards, Student Engagement, Release of Learning)

Person Responsible: Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)

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 school improvement plan and funding allocations are brought before the SAC and discussed. The district Title 1 office also reviews budget items funded through Title 1 funds.

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

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

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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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****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.

The SIP is an agenda item at all School Advisory Committee meetings. The SIP is provided for review ahead of submission to the district and input is solicited.

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))

Bi-monthly newsletters are provided to families and available in the school's front office. The marquee is used to advertise family engagement opportunities. Teachers maintain contact logs and are encouraged to communicate school's mission and student progress on a regular basis. williams.sbac.edu

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 II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

As a school we will continue to focus on professional development that addresses standards aligned instruction and student engagement. We are committed to offering accelerated opportunities to diverse subgroups. We are also committed to providing enriching opportunities beyond the school building. We will use district aligned curriculum which is vetted and designed to strengthen the academic program within the school.

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))

N/A

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$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