Desoto Trail Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Desoto Trail Elementary School

5200 TREDINGTON PARK DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

https://www.leonschools.net/desototrail

Demographics

Principal: Michele Keltner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2020-21: (66%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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.

To Challenge Each Student to Blaze a Successful Trail To the Future!

Provide the school's vision statement.

DeSoto Trail Elementary will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Keltner, Michele	Principal		School-wide responsibilities
Poole, Cassandra	Assistant Principal		School-wide responsibilities
Schubert, David	Instructional Technology		Oversee the technology component of school wide schedules and systems
Chrisinger, Barbara	Instructional Media		Oversee reading/literacy program
Lambert, Theresa	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and kindergarten team
Hutchins, Amanda	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and third grade team
Morris, Kim	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and fourth grade team
Saud, Hina	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and first grade team
Whitley, Sharon	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and second grade team
Alexander, Kala	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and fifth grade team
Baez, Randy	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and special area team
Marti, Peter	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and ESE team

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2007, Michele Keltner

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 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

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

639

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	97	107	107	133	102	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	14	17	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - 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	
Number of students enrolled	104	112	129	110	97	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	12	17	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	5	3	3	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

2020-21 - 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	
Number of students enrolled	104	112	129	110	97	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	12	17	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	5	3	3	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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	85%			83%	57%	57%	83%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	74%			68%	54%	58%	69%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%			52%	47%	53%	57%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	78%			83%	64%	63%	88%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	65%			73%	63%	62%	81%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%			52%	45%	51%	74%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	77%			74%	52%	53%	85%	52%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	91%	61%	30%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	66%	13%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	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	98
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
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	
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	70
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	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

Across the board, our students generally exhibit high achievement. All of our student groups could improve their growth rate.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning gains in ELA and Math.

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

Data chats, progress monitoring, interventions for Tiers 1, 2, and 3 to target individual skills needed for improvement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Fourth grade ELA and Math showed improvement in percent of students proficient.

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

Team curricular planning and commitment to covering all standards that students are expected to master throughout the school year.

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

Data conferencing with students and setting goals.

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.

Half day planning, common planning, data chats, support from Reading Coach.

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

Continuing common planning, half day planning professional development, review of individual student data, and acquiring resources to meet individual student needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a whole, our students performed well on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA assessment and on progress monitoring assessments during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. We consistently have a much higher percentage of students proficient on the FSA than the state or district averages. Our lowest quartile, however, makes learning gains at near the same rate as the state average. Our goal is to rise above the state average in this category, as we are in overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who make a learning gain in ELA by at least 5%
Monitoring:	Through data chats and student progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide research-based reading intervention programs such as Lexia and Read Naturally for teachers to use with low-performing students. Provide training for teachers in using these programs as well as intervention resources already available at the school, such as Six Minute Solutions and Reading Wonders intervention materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our district has vetted intervention programs to ensure they are research- based and evidence-based to be effective interventions

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers in the use of intervention programs

Person Responsible	Mary Watkins (watkinm@leonschools.net)

Select students based on data from i-Ready Diagnostic and STAR Reading

Person Responsible	Mary Watkins (watkinm@leonschools.net)

Implement interventions with students

Person Responsible	Mary Watkins (watkinm@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a whole, our students perform well on the FSA Math assessment and on progress monitoring assessments during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school year. We consistently have a much higher percentage of students proficient on this FSA than the state or district averages. Our lowest quartile, however, makes learning gains at near the same rate as the state average. Our goal is to rise above the state average in this category, as we are in overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who make a learning gain in Math by at least 5%
Monitoring:	Through data chats and student progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use the i-Ready Diagnostic assessment to provide teachers with data on the areas where students have gaps in understanding of mathematics concepts, and structure instructional time to include small- group instruction during which teachers can differentiate math instruction to fill-in gaps in understanding by individualizing instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our district has provided assessments to identify students and selected curriculum materials that contain robust, evidence-based interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers in the use of intervention programs

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Select students based on data from i-Ready Diagnostic

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Implement interventions with students

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Monitor student progress in response to interventions

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our teachers need professional development related to intervention programs and data analysis in order to target individual student needs and how to meet them so that all students can make a learning gain.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of all students who make a learning gain in ELA and Math by 5%
Monitoring:	Review of FSA assessment data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide professional development and collaborative planning opportunities to teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development meets the need for teacher training.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a Professional Learning Plan for providing training to teachers

Person Responsible	David Schubert (schubertd@leonschools.net)

Teachers participate in training and follow-up activities

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our school-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is working well, and our incidents per 100 students is far below average. We will continue to build our school culture and environment through our focus on social-emotional learning and by involving parents and other trusted adults in our school-wide activities.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school meets the varying social-emotional needs of its individual students through a variety of programs and services. The Mentoring program pairs community volunteers with at- risk students who need encouragement, academic skills practice, or an adult they can trust and talk to. The guidance counselor holds mini-sessions to help small groups of students process emotions such as anger or grief. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) team brings together the school psychologist, social workers, behavioral specialists, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders to identify the social, emotional, and academic needs of students and pair them with appropriate interventions and other pupil services.
We are proud of how we support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.
-All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and feeder schools. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance. -The school asks parents to complete the Pre-K Readiness Checklist as required by the district.
-The school provides tours to families of students entering the elementary program.
-Fifth graders are invited to a Curriculum Night at Montford Middle School in May to ease their transition to sixth grade. The Montford Middle School guidance team also comes to the school each spring to meet with fifth grade students and answer their questions about transitioning to middle school.
-The school sends representatives to the Northeast Articulation Team (NEAT), the feeder pattern articulation committee, to inform students and families about school events and to motivate students to build a commitment to learning at all school levels.

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

We are proud of how we build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of our students.
•Parental involvement opportunities exist throughout the school year, including parent/ teacher conferences, classroom volunteers, PTO meetings, Science Olympiad, field trips, and fundraisers;
•Curriculum nights inform parents about grade-specific course curriculum and provide answers to any questions parents may have. Further, to encourage parental attendance, the school is offering these informational sessions in the evenings;
•Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators

with questions or problems;
•During curriculum nights, ensure non-threatening methods of introducing parents to teachers and administrators;
•Offer fun, interactive tutorials to parents who are unfamiliar with FOCUS, listservs, and other forms of educational technology;
•Communicate classroom and school news to parents;
•Discuss effective strategies for conducting supportive and effective parent phone calls and face-to-face meetings;
•Positive notes, letters, phone calls, emails home;
•Share information about growth mindset, GRIT, and Sanford Harmony social emotional learning curriculum with parents at curriculum nights and PTO meetings.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning**				$2,861.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0511 - Desoto Trail Elementary School	Other		$2,657.88
			Notes: Substitutes to cover half-day training			
	6400	220-Social Security	0511 - Desoto Trail Elementary School	Other		$203.32
			Notes: Substitutes to cover half-day training			
					Total:	$2,861.20