Chaires Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chaires Elementary School

4774 CHAIRES CROSSROADS, Tallahassee, FL 32317

http://www.leonschools.net/chaires

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Prescott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2010

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: B 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.](http://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

At Chaires Elementary it is our mission to focus instruction on developing the whole child. We are committed to providing opportunities designed to meet individual needs and to ensure that every child experience success, academically, emotionally and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement

Chaires Elementary school will build academic achievement by discovering the individual talents of each child, and by providing an environment where students want to learn and naturally discover their true passions.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Prescott, Michele	Principal
Principal	
Ricciardi, Champayne	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Williams, Chelsea	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	89	89	93	112	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	14	16	7	15	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	15	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	37	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students 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	1	1	0	9	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
35

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 6/18/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	6	9	6	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	15	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	6	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Prior Year - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	6	9	6	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	15	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	6	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	57%	57%	57%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	58%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	47%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	56%	64%	63%	63%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	65%	63%	62%	67%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	45%	51%	42%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	53%	52%	53%	76%	52%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	89 (0)	89 (0)	93 (0)	112 (0)	86 (0)	0 (0)	469 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (13)	16 (6)	7 (9)	15 (6)	17 (10)	15 (8)	84 (52)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (2)	6 (0)	12 (0)	10 (3)	34 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	15 (15)	18 (18)	18 (18)	53 (53)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (5)	37 (14)	19 (25)	79 (44)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	48%	56%	-8%	56%	-8%
	2018	62%	57%	5%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
	2018	57%	64%	-7%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	66%	-12%	64%	-10%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	63%	61%	2%	60%	3%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	23	32	30	25	50	40	27				
BLK	41	44	39	39	55	44	45				
WHT	60	52	38	66	71	38	55				
FRL	45	41	31	46	59	35	46				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	26	40	33	30	37	26	33				
BLK	43	44	35	53	67	45	53				
WHT	62	55	39	68	69	39	82				
FRL	47	48	50	58	58	44	64				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Black/African American Students	
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	54
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA Lowest 25%. 4th Grade ELA has dropped significantly in the past two years showing a clear trend.

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

3rd Grade Math. One of the four classes had a teacher change in December.

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

ELA Lowest 25%. 4th Grade ELA has dropped significantly in the past two years showing a clear trend.

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

Math Adequate Progress. Mathematics teachers in 4th and 5th grade adequate growth scores have been significant and consistent for the prior 3 years.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

4th Grade had a high number of students with EWS.

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

1. ELA Bottom 25%
2. 3rd Grade Math
3. 4th Grade ELA Adequate Progress
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25%
Rationale	Students in the bottom 25 percent in 4th and 5th Grade showed the lowest gains in ELA. We are looking to increase learning gains to 60% in the bottom 25 percent.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	60% of our ELA Lowest 25th% student in 4th and 5th will show adequate progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chelsea Williams (williamsc9@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students in 4th and 5th grade will be ability grouped allowing us to focus our resources on specific needs. 4th and 5th Grade Language Arts teachers will receive coaching in rigor and specific writing strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be placed in a remediation group according to their needs as determined by the Progress Monitoring Team. Strategies are all evidenced based and Cloud Nine is multi-sensory.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify T!, T2 and T3 Students using prior year data, Iready, STAR and Wonders Assessments 2. Serve students in remediation groups 3. Monitor Progress through RTI team using GO Math and IReady 4. Change/continue with remediation instructions 5. Continue to Monitor Progress
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	Students in 4th and 5th Grade showed the lowest gains in ELA. We are looking to increase learning gains to 60% in the bottom 25 percent. Students prior year data was at 60% proficient. Moving from 3rd to 4th the dropped to 38%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	60% of our students will be proficient in ELA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chelsea Williams (williamsc9@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students in 4th and 5th grade will be ability grouped allowing us to focus our resources on specific needs. 4th and 5th Grade Language Arts teachers will receive coaching in rigor and specific writing strategies. TIER 1 - Wonders and Progress Monitored through IREADY TIER 2 - IREADY Lessons based on Diagnostic, TIER 3 - Visualizing and Verbalizing, Reading Mastery, Wonder Works,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be placed in a remediation group according to their needs as determined by the Progress Monitoring Team. Strategies are all evidenced based and V and V are multi-sensory.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify T!, T2 and T3 Students using prior year data, Iready, STAR and Wonders Assessments 2. Serve students in remediation groups 3. Monitor Progress through RTI team using GO Math and IReady 4. Change/continue with remediation instructions 5. Continue to Monitor Progress
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	3rd Grade Math
Rationale	3rd Grade Math droped significantly from 60% to 48%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	60% of our 3rd Grade students will be proficient on the Mathematics FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michele Prescott (prescottm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Tier 1 Students will receive Go Math Tier 2 students will receive Reteach Tier 3 Students will receive Cloud 9 Teachers were trained in Math Strategies over the Summer.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be placed in a remediation group according to their needs as determined by the Progress Monitoring Team. Strategies are all evidenced based and Cloud Nine is multi-sensory.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify T!, T2 and T3 Students using prior year data, Iready, and Go Math 2. Serve students in remediation groups 3. Monitor Progress through RTI team using GO Math and IReady 4. Change/continue with remediation instructions 5. Continue to Monitor Progress
Person Responsible	Michele Prescott (prescottm@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Communicate classroom and school news to parents through monthly newsletters; listserv, invitations to
fun, interactive activities at the school, and community share nights.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Operational school based team that meets weekly to discuss students with barriers to academic and
social success. Mentors are assigned to students identified with concerns. Counseling sessions are
provided for students through our guidance counselor.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

The Kindergarten team holds a Kindergarten parent orientation in the Spring prior to enrollment.
Students and parents are taken on a tour of the school and are able to ask questions about the school,
curriculum, and activities pertaining to Kindergarten. Open House was held on September 6th, and all
parents and students were invited to attend.
Representatives from middle schools come to Chaires and hold an informational meeting with students
to orient them to the expectations and scheduling options for the next year.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Students school-wide are monitored using a variety of data sources.
In grades PreK and K, students are monitored through the Renaissance program. In addition, students in
K-2 are monitored with AIMS Web+ Reading and math data, STAR reading data, and IReady data.
Students in grades 3-5 are monitored using AIMS Web+ Reading and math data, STAR reading data, IReady
data and the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Title II funds will be spent on Professional Development to enhance teacher development and increase
student progress towards school goals. SAI funds are allocated by District and go 100% for staffing.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Grade levels advance college and Career awareness by providing age appropriate lessons, speakers, field trips and activities.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25%					$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6400	730-Dues and Fees	0491 - Chaires Elementary School	Title II	517.0	$3,000.00	
			Notes: Get Your Teach On				
	6400	330-Travel	0491 - Chaires Elementary School	Title II	517.0	$4,000.00	
			Notes: Get Your Teach On				
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency**					**$0.00**
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: 3rd Grade Math**					**$6,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6400	330-Travel	0491 - Chaires Elementary School	Title II	517.0	$3,000.00	
			Notes: FETC Training				
	6400	730-Dues and Fees	0491 - Chaires Elementary School	Title II	517.0	$3,000.00	
			Notes: FETC				
						Total:	$13,000.00