

Leon County Schools

SEALEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 3

 A. School Mission and Vision 3

 B. School Leadership Team 3

 C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 7

 D. Demographic Data 8

 E. Early Warning Systems 9

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 12

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 13

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 14

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 15

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 18

 E. Grade Level Data Review 21

III. Planning for Improvement 22

IV. Positive Culture and Environment 34

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 36

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 40

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 42

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Leon County School Board on School Board Approval 10/8/24.

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)
<p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. 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.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Demetria Clemons

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the management of all school functions.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Leslie Moore

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist in the management of all school functions.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Laurel Bryant

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for primary students.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Sonja Daymond

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for intermediate students.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Danielle Hess

Position Title

Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the management of Reading curriculum, interventions, and progress monitoring.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Heather Kidd

Position Title

Behavior Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for assisting in managing classroom behavior and implementing behavior plans.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Amy Lato

Position Title

Psychologist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students brought to the MTSS team.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Amy Parnell

Position Title

Behavior Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students with behavior concerns brought to the MTSS team.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Kristen Obert

Position Title

Staffing Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for ensuring state and federal compliance when considering students to receive exceptional student services.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Jeanne Thorbjornsen

Position Title

Social Worker

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for communicating with families to provide resources within the community to assist with

home and school life

Leadership Team Member #11

Employee's Name

Chandra Denson

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for tracking student evaluations, parent requests, and interventions within the MTSS/ Rtl process. Coordinates meetings with staff and parents. 504 Coordinator for the school

Leadership Team Member #12

Employee's Name

Anne Marie Lock

Position Title

Speech and Language Pathologist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for evaluating students based on speech and language concerns. Provides therapy services to identified students.

Leadership Team Member #13

Employee's Name

Laura Camoesas

Position Title

Media Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for developing the Collection Development Plan.

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

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

SIP Committee consisting of leadership and teachers meets to discuss previous year's state testing data and ESSA results. Team discusses reasonable growth and identifies strategies that can be used to achieve those goals, as well as recognize barriers that will need to be overcome. Once drafted, the SIP goes before SAC for approval with a public forum for discussion and possible revision.

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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

The leadership team will monitor student progress quarterly and hold data meetings with grade level to discuss how to best support meeting the SIP goals. This progress will be communicated at quarterly SAC meetings, so all stakeholders are aware on the school's continuous improvement efforts.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	79.4%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	87.3%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)* WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: C 2022-23: C* 2021-22: C 2020-21: 2019-20: B

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days	8	6	12	5	13	11	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	4	16	0	0	0	26
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	1	28	39	29	0	3	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	28	38	35	0	4	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	0	0	1						1
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0					0

Current Year 2024-25

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	5	12	5	2	4	0	0	0	28

Current Year 2024-25

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days	3	7	7	10	8	9				44
One or more suspensions										0
Course failure in ELA										0
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				2	15	12				29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					3	5				8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	3	1	2	8						25

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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	5	2				8

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year		3		2						5
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	53	56	57	47	54	53	56	57	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	63	59	58	49	56	53			
ELA Learning Gains	55	58	60				64		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	51	52	57				41		
Math Achievement *	48	60	62	45	56	59	51	47	50
Math Learning Gains	47	59	62				64		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	49	47	52				60		
Science Achievement *	35	54	57	37	52	54	38	57	59
Social Studies Achievement *								60	64
Graduation Rate								50	50
Middle School Acceleration								47	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	62	61			52	59			

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	50%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	401
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
50%	45%	53%	35%		58%	50%

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 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%
Students With Disabilities	39%	Yes	4	
Black/African American Students	51%	No		
Hispanic Students	54%	No		
Multiracial Students	30%	Yes	2	1
White Students	60%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	42%	No		
2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	18%	Yes	3	1
Black/African	41%	No		

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
American Students				
Hispanic Students	40%	Yes	1	
Multiracial Students	35%	Yes	1	
White Students	60%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	37%	Yes	1	

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%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	2	
English Language Learners				
Native American Students				

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%
Asian Students				
Black/African American Students	49%	No		
Hispanic Students				
Multiracial Students	51%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	79%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	No		

D. 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)

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	53%	63%	55%	51%	48%	47%	49%	35%					
Students With Disabilities	35%	58%	40%	50%	21%	33%	47%	31%					
Black/African American Students	54%	59%	61%	62%	47%	44%	55%	29%					
Hispanic Students	58%				50%								
Multiracial Students	28%		33%		22%	47%		20%					
White Students	62%	78%	55%		62%	58%		47%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	42%	52%	46%	48%	38%	41%	46%	21%					

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.
All Students	47%	49%			45%			37%		
Students With Disabilities	23%	16%			18%			15%		
Black/African American Students	45%	52%			37%			31%		
Hispanic Students	40%				40%					
Multiracial Students	42%				33%			30%		
White Students	60%	50%			71%			58%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	41%	40%			35%			32%		

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.
All Students	56%		64%	41%	51%	64%	60%	38%		
Students With Disabilities	37%		42%	36%	34%	68%	53%	13%		
English Language Learners										
Native American Students										
Asian Students										
Black/African American Students	52%		62%	38%	44%	62%	56%	26%		
Hispanic Students										
Multiracial Students	39%		60%		44%	60%				
Pacific Islander Students										
White Students	78%		80%		76%	80%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students	47%		63%	44%	42%	61%	55%	27%		

E. 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.

2023-24 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	3	59%	55%	4%	55%	4%
Ela	4	48%	51%	-3%	53%	-5%
Ela	5	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Math	3	65%	60%	5%	60%	5%
Math	4	44%	56%	-12%	58%	-14%
Math	5	34%	51%	-17%	56%	-22%
Science	5	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was seen in the 3rd grade Math proficiency. On the 2023 statewide assessment 51 percent of all 3rd grade students met the state expectation of a Level 3 or higher. However, on the 2024 state assessment, 65 percent of 3rd grade students met the state expectation of a Level 3 or higher. The addition of instructional coaches who meet with small groups of students was a contributing factor to the improvement in 3rd grade math scores on the state assessment.

Lowest Performance

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 5th grade Science, with only 35 percent of 5th grade students meeting the state expectation of a Level 3 or higher. A contributing factor to the low scores could be attributed to a new teacher to 5th grade Science.

Greatest Decline

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 previous year was the percentage of 5th students who met state expectations of a level 3 or higher on the statewide Math assessment. On the 2023 statewide assessment 49 percent scored a Level 3 or higher, while only 39 percent scored a level 3 or higher in 2024. There were two teachers added to the grade level that were new to the content area or the grade level. Additionally, this grade level has a large population of students with disabilities.

Greatest Gap

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.

Overall, the greatest gap existed with 5th grade students' achievement on the Science assessment. Only 35 percent of 5th grade students met the state achievement expectation of a Level 3 or higher

as compared to the state average of 53 percent. As we return to the normality of education after the pandemic, there will be a new focus on science instruction rather than recouping learning loss.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

One area of concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 achievement on the statewide Math assessment (44).

Another area of concern is the number of students with attendance below 90 percent (53).

Highest Priorities

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

1. Continued support and improvement for Students with Disabilities.
2. Monitoring and intervening when noticing patterns of poor attendance.
3. Increase support and development for Math instruction.
4. Increase support and intervention strategies for Reading.
5. Increase performance on the Science assessment.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to the Federal Index and in relation with Every Student Succeeds Act, Students with Disabilities did not meet the minimum Federal Index of 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to see each of this subgroup meet the minimum requirement of 41 percent.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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 Waggle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Lexia Power School, Individualized teacher-led instruction

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Identify Tier 2 and 3 students who fit into the ESSA subgroup.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will identify students from the identified ESSA groups who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #2

Develop intervention groups to support student growth and achievement.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students from the identified ESSA group who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #3

Monitor student data for efficacy.

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Sealey experienced a large discrepancy in the percentage of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the statewide Math assessment, 48 percent, as compared to the State average of 58 percent. The

focus for the 2023-2024 school year will be increasing the number of students who score a Level 3 or higher, closing the gap with the State's average.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey plans to raise the overall percentage of students who score a Level 3 or higher to at least 50 percent.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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 Waggle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Waggle, STAR Math, Instructional Coaching, Ready

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.

Action Step #2

Monitoring Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Sealey experienced a slight discrepancy in the percentage of students who scored a Level 3 or higher on the ELA assessment, 53%, as compared to the State average, 54%. The focus for the 2024-2025 school year will be to completely close the gap with the State's average.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like our overall ELA proficiency to reach 56%

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific

strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Sealey has added two intervention specialists to assist with remediating targeted students through small group instruction. Sealey will use Lexia, UFLI, and Savvas to support student achievement.

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monthly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.

Action Step #2

Monitoring Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Sealey saw a decrease from 36 percent of students who earned a Level 3 or higher to 35 percent on the 5th grade statewide Science assessment.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey will have at least 40 percent of the tested 5th grade students score a Level 3 or higher on the statewide Science assessment.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

HMH Into Science Science standards broken down by complexity and hands-on application.

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Quarterly progress monitoring to determine the efficacy of instruction and to provide tiered instruction.

Action Step #2

Monitoring Instruction**Person Monitoring:**
Leslie Moore**By When/Frequency:**
Weekly**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #5

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Multiracial Students (MUL)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to the Federal Index and in relation with Every Student Succeeds Act, Multiracial students did not meet the minimum Federal Index of 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to see each of this subgroup meet the minimum requirement of 41 percent.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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 Waggle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Lexia Power School, Individualized teacher-led instruction

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention.

Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Identifying Students who Need Tiered Support

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will identify students from the identified ESSA groups who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #2

Developing Tier 2 and Tier 3 Groups

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, the instructional coaches will develop a plan to move students from the identified ESSA group who did not score a Level 3 or better during progress monitoring windows.

Action Step #3

Monitoring for Efficacy

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Monitor instruction to ensure it is standards based and appropriately scaffolded using levels of complexity as a guide.

Area of Focus #6

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

48 percent of Sealey's 4th grade students scored a Level 3 or higher on the state assessment, while 47 percent of Sealey's 5th grade students scored at a Level 3 or higher. Each grade level (3-5) must meet the minimum threshold of 50 percent of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the state assessment. If a grade level does not meet this requirement, the school is identified as a RAISE school. Sealey has been identified as a Universal Support school based on 4th and 5th grade FAST results.

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

Students in grades K-2 will receive 30 minutes of UFLI instruction daily during the 90 minute reading block. Students will also develop listening comprehension, deepen vocabulary, and develop writing skills using SAVVAS. Each grade level participates in "Walk to Read" time each day. This time allows students to receive additional support based on their individual needs. Students who require Tier 3 interventions, receive those during this time. Other students may receive acceleration based on progress monitoring data.

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

In addition to their 90 minute reading block, each grade level has a "Walk to Read" time each day. This 45-minute block of time is designed to provide support to students based on their progress monitoring data. Students requiring Tier 3 interventions will receive them during this time. Students who do not require Tier 3 interventions will be grouped together based on needs..

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

No Answer Entered

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

Sealey's 4th grade data will meet the minimum threshold of 50 percent in part due to the change in staffing in 4th grade. Mr. Farsi, who was part of the team that produced 59 percent of all 3rd graders scoring a Level 3 or higher last year, has been moved to 4th grade. Not only will his students benefit from his expertise, but from the consistency of having him as their teacher for two years.

Sealey's 5th grade data will meet the minimum threshold of 50 percent through continued coaching, Walk to Read, and data chats.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Sealey has added two intervention specialists to assist with remediating targeted students through small group instruction. Sealey will use Lexia, UFLI, and Savvas to support student achievement.

Rationale:

District approved evidence-based plan to support student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Literacy Leadership

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The Literacy team will meet monthly to collaborate how to better support student literacy. The team will analyze progress monitoring data and discuss classroom walkthroughs, highlighting areas of success and areas for support.

Action Step #2

Literacy Coaching

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Administration will meet with the literacy coach to identify teachers who would benefit from literacy coaching each month. Ms. Hess will work to develop a coaching cycle to support identified teachers. Administration will continue walkthroughs to ensure that the coaching has shown improvement.

Action Step #3

Assessments

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Students will participate in progress monitoring assessments throughout the year. Students will have weekly assessments, monthly STAR assessments, iReady Diagnostics and FAST three times a year. After each assessment, the data will be analyzed by the classroom teacher and administration and discussed at monthly meetings.

Action Step #4

Professional Learning

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Sealey will host quarterly professional development opportunities to support faculty growth in literacy instruction.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to our Early Warning System indicators, there were 55 students who were absent 10% or more of school days. That was approximately 13% of our student population

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sealey would like to lower the number of students absent 10% or more of the available school days by 5 students.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly attendance reports will be pulled to track student attendance. Monthly meetings with Sealey's attendance committee will be held to discuss ways to intervene.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leslie Moore

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Sealey's attendance committee, comprised of administration, guidance, social worker, and teachers, will work to develop plans of actions, which can include community resources, possible transportation, and before/after school care.

Rationale:

Childcare and transportation have been notable barriers for some families with students having poor attendance. Understanding and attempting to address these barriers may lead to improve school attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:**Action Step #1**

Weekly Attendance Reports

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly attendance reports will be pulled to determine students who may have absentee patterns.

Action Step #2

Monthly Attendance Meetings

Person Monitoring:

Leslie Moore

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The Attendance Committee will hold monthly meetings to develop plans to support student attendance.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

Sealey builds the School Improvement Plan with a group of teacher leaders. Data is disaggregated, reviewed, and priorities set for the upcoming school year. Once a plan is created, it is presented to our School Advisory Council (SAC) for review and approval.

Throughout the course of the year, student progress and school efforts are reported to SAC. At this time, community members and parents are able to ask questions, provide feedback, and discuss possible decisions for improvement.

The SIP is posted to the school's website at the following address: <https://www.leonschools.net/domain/5322>

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

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.

The PFEP plan is posted to the school's website at the following address:

<https://www.leonschools.net/domain/5708>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(ii))

Sealey will utilize a planned block of instruction that will specifically target student needs. This block of time is structured based on providing an opportunity to remediate, review, and enrich to strengthen the learning opportunities within the classroom. Student groups are developed based on progress monitoring and state-wide assessment data, which adjust based upon student growth. Specific skills are targeted or extended based on data collected.

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Sealey ensures mental health services and counseling for students by employing a full-time school counselor and a mental health professional to support students. We have a continued partnership with local mental health agencies to offer counseling and mentoring services. Sealey promotes a school climate that encourages students to seek help when needed. During monthly data chats and attendance meetings, there is system to identify students who may benefit from counseling services.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Sealey provides awareness of postsecondary and workforce opportunities in a variety of ways. We collaborate with local colleges, universities, and vocational schools for campus visits. Career exploration activities are embedded in classroom discussions and activities. Various professionals in Tallahassee are invited to speak to students to provide insight into various careers.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

Sealey uses a schoolwide PBIS model to support student behavior. Through this plan, there are established schoolwide expectations and rules are communicated consistently. Students are rewarded for their positive choices through grade-level incentive programs tailored to the needs of the students. There is continuous monitoring and analyzing of student discipline data to identify areas of need.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii(V)).

Sealey strives to maintain a positive school culture and a supporting work environment that values and respects all members of the school community. Veteran teachers mentor those who are new to Sealey to provide support and guidance. Sealey fosters a collaborative environment that encourages teachers to work together and participate in the decision-making process. There are multiple opportunities for paraprofessionals to participate in workshops to further their training.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

Assisting Students with Transition from Preschool to Elementary School:

Sealey assists students with the transition from preschool to elementary school by collaborating with local preschools to share information about incoming students and conducting transition meetings with parents to discuss school expectations. There is an annual "Meet the Teacher" event before the school year begins where families can meet with their classroom teacher to discuss classroom and teacher specific expectations.

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

Once funding allocations are received, the school improvement committee reviews the School Improvement Plan to determine the greatest need of students as determined by the previous year's data collection and analysis. Improvement plans are developed looking at site-based, District, and out-of-county professional development and training opportunities. These opportunities are presented to the School Advisory Council for discussion, approval, and, ultimately, effectiveness.

Moreover, Sealey is in the State's Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) category due to our Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Multiracial sub-populations not meeting the 41% threshold on the Federal index. These students are often represented within our planning for improvement goals, but special attention is paid to opportunities that could specifically impact this sub-population and follow a similar path when reviewing funding allocations as stated previously.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Often, Students with Disabilities (SWD) require additional support to ensure that they meet grade level expectations for success. To meet the needs of these students we will provide instruction in a small group setting.

Resources that will be used to support SWD and Multiracial students will include: UFLI, Wordly Wise, Ready Math, Magnetic Reading, and Measuring Up. UFLI lessons will be provided to students in grades K-5, should the students require additional support in foundational reading skills. Wordly Wise is an academic language program that develops the link between vocabulary and reading comprehension. Ready Math and Measuring Up Math will be utilized to support students in filling in gaps of knowledge and to move students towards grade level expectations. Magnet Reading and Measuring Up Reading will be utilized to provide targeted instruction for benchmarks students are struggling to master.

Students will take a diagnostic assessment during the month of August to determine their needs. Diagnostic data will be reviewed by the administrative team to determine the target areas for each student and to create groups. These groups will meet daily, beginning no later than 9/3/2024, using the aforementioned materials to support students. Student success will be monitored monthly using STAR Reading and iReady Math Growth assessments.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00