Sealey Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sealey Elementary School

2815 ALLEN RD, Tallahassee, FL 32312

https://www.leonschools.net/sealey

Demographics

Principal: Demetria Clemons

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2022

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)	83%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2020-21: (35%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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.

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.

Sealey Elementary Math and Science Magnet School prepares students to be responsible, respectful and independent learners who will grow in his/her intellectual, physical and emotional development in a way that increases academic performance and encourages student and school success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Sealey Elementary Community is dedicated to the process of engaging successful, safe and respectful academic achievers who appreciate diversity and the foundations of the learning environment in order to foster a spirit that conscientiously contributes to our society.

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	
Cloud, Clayton	Assistant Principal		Assist in the management of all school functions.
Clemons, Demetria	Principal		Responsible for the management of all school functions
Bryant, Laurel	Instructional Coach		Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for primary students
Daymond, Sonja	Instructional Coach		Responsible for TIer 3 interventions for intermediate students
Hess, Danielle	Reading Coach		Responsible for the management of Reading curriculum, interventions, and progress monitoring
Kidd, Heather	Behavior Specialist		Responsible for assisting in managing classroom behavior and implementing behavior plans
Lato, Amy	Psychologist		Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students brought to the MTSS team
Parnell, Amy	Behavior Specialist		Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students with behavior concerns brought to the MTSS team
Reece, Christopher	Staffing Specialist		Responsible for ensuring state and federal compliance when considering students to receive exceptional students services
Thorbjornsen, Jeanne	Other		Social Worker; Responsible for communicating with families to provide resources within the community to assist with home and school life
Crews, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor		Social Worker; Responsible for communicating with families to provide resources within the community to assist with home and school life
Hayes, Chandra	Guidance Counselor		Responsible for tracking student evaluations, parent requests, and interventions within the MTSS/ RtI process. Coordinates meetings with staff and parents. 504 Coordinator for the school

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lock, Anne Marie		Responsible for evaluating students based on speech and language concerns. Provides therapy services to identified students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/12/2022, Demetria Clemons

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.*

1

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

418

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.

6

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	59	57	60	81	69	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	6	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	4	15	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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	64	66	77	72	67	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	13	13	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
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	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	64	66	77	72	67	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	13	13	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
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	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	56%	58%	56%	49%			61%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	60%	61%	46%			61%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	52%	41%			56%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	58%	60%	33%			69%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%	60%	64%	16%			68%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	55%	18%			47%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	50%	51%	40%			48%	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	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	68%	63%	5%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	66%	2%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
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	37	42	36	34	68	53	13				
BLK	52	62	38	44	62	56	26				
MUL	39	60		44	60						
WHT	78	80		76	80						
FRL	47	63	44	42	61	55	27				

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	18	45		15	9		9				
BLK	45	40	29	25	7	8	33				
HSP	40			20							
MUL	50			50							
WHT	65	60		54	40		60				
FRL	34	38	64	16	9	21	15				

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	31	41	45	37	38	40	21				
ELL		60			80						
BLK	57	57	54	64	64	41	41				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	73	60		77	72		60				
FRL	54	59	56	64	66	53	44				

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	53
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	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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

English Language Learners	
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	49
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
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	79
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	48
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?

As a whole, Sealey's reading and math scores decreased from previous years. No tested grade levels had more than 60% proficient on the statewide reading assessment. Math proficiency and learning gains also suffered, especially for students in fifth grade.

Additionally, Sealey's sub-populations of Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners showing proficiency were much lower than those of the rest of the student population. Most of these students compose our lowest 25%, which, outside of fourth grade math, only saw an average of 40% make a learning gain in reading and math on the statewide assessment.

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

The greatest need for improvement is learning gains of our lowest 25%. Outside of fourth grade math, Sealey only saw an average of 40% make a learning gain in reading and math on the statewide assessment. Many of these students also struggle with an average of 70% consistently performing at a Level 1 or Urgent level on progress monitoring assessments.

Sealey must also continue to address the performance of our various sub-populations, specifically Students with Disabilities due to not meeting the ESSA requirements. Many of these students compose our lowest 25%.

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

Contributing factors included the missed direct instructional time due to the COVID-19 pandemic. New skills could not be built upon the multiple gaps that were created from this lack of instruction.

Additional intervention teachers will be used to pull out and push into classroom to help fill gaps left by the pandemic.

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

Math proficiency in third and fourth, as well as math learning gains in fourth grade showed a dramatic improvement. Third grade moved from 37% proficient in 2021 to 65% in 2022. Fourth grade moved from 27% proficient in 2021 to 58% in 2022. Fourth grade learning gains overall rose from 16% to 72% and learning gains from the lowest 25% rose from 18% in 2021 to 71% in 2022.

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

Contributing factors included a more concentrated effort on filling in gaps created by the loss of instruction during the pandemic. Sealey utilized multiple intervention teachers to pull out and push into classrooms to help fill gaps left by the pandemic. Additionally, our Media Specialist created time during his Special Area rotation to review facts to build automaticity.

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

During our grade-level intervention blocks, we will also hold acceleration groups. These groups will focus on going deeper in comprehension skills using literary discussions and novel studies, extend writing instruction, higher-level math problems, and do more cross-curricular learning.

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.

Sealey will hold professional development on accelerated academics from district personnel working directly with our talented and gifted teacher. We will also work on extension activities within the classroom and improving cross-curricular instruction.

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

Sealey will assess the impact of providing a second intervention teacher and the results of student achievement and learning gains. We will be looking closely at the effect of the math pull-out instruction done across all grade levels.

Sealey was also granted a second guidance counselor to assist in providing students services that may be barriers to learning, such as therapy, counseling, and assisting in providing life needs (i.e. food, clothing, medical, etc.)

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

:

#1. 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.**	Sealey experienced a drop from previous years in our math scores across testing grade levels. Our focus will be on increasing math proficiency, which was at 51% overall.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Sealey plans to raise our overall proficiency percentage to at least 53% of tested students.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR Math and Dreambox.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Sealey has added two intervention specialist to assist with remediating targeted students through 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.**	Sealey's intervention specialist will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Go Math interventions, Zearn, and Dreambox to "fill in the gaps" of prerequisite and grade level skills. This will also allow the students to receive grade level instruction since their performance will be assessed using a state-wide assessment on grade level standards.

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.

Progress monitoring administration and data collection

Person Responsible	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Evaluation and feedback

Person Responsible	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Communication with stakeholders

Person Responsible	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

#2. 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.	According to the Federal Index and in relation to the Every Student Succeeds Act, students with disabilities did not meet the minimum 41%, only being at 40%
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Sealey would like to see our students with disabilities meet the minimum requirement of 41%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR, Lexia, and Dreambox.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Sealey's resource teachers will provide pull-out and push-in services for eligible students. This will allow identified students to receive grade level curriculum, but also small group instruction to provide opportunities for remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Sealey has found that having students receive instruction in the regular education classroom with non-disabled peers can be beneficial, especially if their proficiency is measured on a state-wide assessment on grade level standards. However, if teachers are able to provide the proper support and "fill in the gaps" students will have an easier time understanding and applying those skills.

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

#3. 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.**	Sealey's overall proficiency was only 57%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Sealey would like our overall ELA proficiency to 58%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as FAST, STAR, and Lexia
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Sealey has added two intervention specialist to assist with remediating targeted students through 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.**	Sealey's intervention specialist will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Savvas interventions, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Lexia, etc. This will allow the students to receive grade level instruction and "fill in any gaps" from previous years.

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 saw a decrease from 40% proficient to 38% on the statewide assessment.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Sealey will have 40% of the tested students demonstrate proficiency on the statewide science assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Science standards will be broken down by complexity and hands-on application
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	By focusing on complex science concepts and providing more hands-on application, students will become more familiar with the scientific process and important vocabulary.

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.	

Progress monitoring administration and data collection

Person Responsible	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Evaluation and feedback

Person Responsible	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Communication with stakeholders

Person Responsible	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Evaluation and feedback

Person Responsible	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Communication with stakeholders

Person Responsible	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

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

not applicable

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

not applicable

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)

not applicable

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

4- 50 LG 50
5-41 LG 50

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.

not applicable

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

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?

not applicable

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?

not applicable

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-

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.

Sealey communicates school information to our families through a variety of formats:
school newsletter, school Facebook page, listserv, Parent Portal, and the school website. In addition, teachers send home weekly reports, and newsletters to keep the parents informed of individual classroom information. Teachers also communicate with families through individual notes, emails, text messages, and web pages.

At the beginning of the year, grade levels host an open house so that parents can learn firsthand the expectations and routines of their children's classrooms, and all teachers hold a conference with parents during the first semester.

Throughout the year, the school invites parents to numerous activities held at Sealey, including the Veteran's Day Assembly, Science Night, Black History Assembly, strings and chorus performances, and Family Literacy Nights.

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

Administration-Will routinely communicate with parents and the community expectations, information, and feedback, evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, materials, and performances, manage the distribution of funds and resources to provide support for student safety and learning
Faculty and staff-Provide effective instruction using District adopted curriculum or research-based supplemental programs, maintain positive working relationships with parents, students, and school staff, complete responsibilities to promote the healthy functioning of the school environment, i.e. maintenance, instructional support, clerical duties.
Guidance counselors- Work with teachers and parents to identify students in need of small group or individual counseling on topics such as divorce, friendship, death, and anger management. In addition, they will coordinate the mentoring program at Sealey so that students in need of extra support can meet with an adult mentor weekly.
District staff-Participate in the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team to meet weekly to review the data of
students who were referred to the team by their teachers and to make recommendations as to how to proceed to ensure the students receive necessary support. In addition, the Behavior Team meets regularly and is focused on reviewing behavioral referrals and on making recommendations as to how to proceed to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on students' needs.
Parents and community members-Work to build healthy working relationships with teachers and school staff members, communicate concerns and seek feedback to help support students at home, participate in school and community events