



---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>17</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>19</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>21</b> |

## Gilchrist Elementary School

1301 TIMBERLANE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/gilchrist>

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

"The Gilchrist Family of Life Long Learners" - students, teachers, staff, parents, and community members – is committed to an on-going planning process that will ensure a quality learning environment, state-of-the-art facility, and a curriculum that will be the foundation for this life long learning.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Gilchrist Elementary will be the foundation for life-long learning by teaching individual skills in communicating ideas, making decisions, acting with integrity and celebrating diversity. We will seek to inspire a love of learning, a healthy self-esteem, community participation, and individual responsibility in each of our students and the entire Gilchrist family.

<https://www.leonschools.net/gilchrist>

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### **School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Crowe, Scotty    | Principal           | <p>The Principal leads the school community in developing, communicating, and implementing the school's vision.</p>  |
|                  |                     | <p>The Principal assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff and oversee facilities.</p>  |
|                  |                     | <p>The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission.</p> <p>Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.</p> |
| Wilder, Dawn     | Assistant Principal | <p>The Assistant Principal supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school.</p>  |
|                  |                     | <p>The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission.</p>   |
|                  |                     | <p>Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.</p>  |
| Mitchell, Cheryl | Assistant Principal | <p>The Assistant Principal supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school.</p>  |
|                  |                     | <p>The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission.</p>   |
|                  |                     | <p>Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.</p>  |

| Name            | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------|----------------|---|
| Wyatt, Rosemary | Other          | <p>The Guidance Counselor supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school.</p> <p>The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission.</p> <p>Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.</p> |

|            |                     |  |
|------------|---------------------|--|
| Ross, Anna | Instructional Coach | <p>The Instructional (Reading) Coach supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school.</p> <p>The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission.</p> <p>Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.</p> |
|------------|---------------------|--|

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

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

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

Gilchrist's school leadership team meets regularly to review and inspect progress towards goals in the School Improvement Plan. Teachers are given opportunities for input through monthly meetings, SIP committees, and SITE. Parents, families, and business partners express input through the Gilchrist SAC.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

Leadership teams and administration meet with teachers monthly for data chats and monthly committee meetings. SAC will meet quarterly throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

| Demographic Data   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Other School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 39%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 33%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | <i>Data will be uploaded when available</i>                        |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Identification</b>   | ATSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A<br>2020-21: A<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>2017-18: A |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

### Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 10          | 4 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| 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   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 1  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4     |

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

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |    |   |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 5 | 10 | 8 | 7  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 6 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 5 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 10          | 2 | 10 | 4 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26    |

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           | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |

The number of students identified retained:

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |    |   |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 5 | 10 | 8 | 7  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 6 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 5 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 10          | 2 | 10 | 4 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26    |

**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           | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**District and State data will be uploaded when available.**

| Accountability Component    | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*            | 84     |          |       | 84     |          |       | 83     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66     |          |       | 73     |          |       | 64     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 52     |          |       | 63     |          |       | 44     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*           | 82     |          |       | 80     |          |       | 87     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains         | 73     |          |       | 57     |          |       | 69     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53     |          |       | 60     |          |       | 61     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*        | 75     |          |       | 78     |          |       | 82     |          |       |

| Accountability Component        | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 71     |          |       | 67     |          |       | 71     |          |       |

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 70   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 556  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 58                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                | 61                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 78                              |                    |   |   |

| 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% |
| BLK                                | 40                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| HSP                                | 69                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 80                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 77                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 55                              |                    |   |   |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**  
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 84       | 66     | 52          | 82        | 73      | 53           | 75       |         |           |                   |                     | 71           |
| SWD  | 61       | 62     | 50          | 61        | 70      | 54           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 65       | 40     |             | 67        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 71           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 77       | 67     |             | 85        | 83      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 48       | 36     | 26          | 46        | 53      | 39           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 80       | 52     |             | 69        | 71      |              | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 96       | 64     |             | 82        | 86      |              | 73       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 91       | 74     | 64          | 90        | 75      | 62           | 83       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 66       | 53     | 43          | 57        | 61      | 46           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 84       | 73     | 63          | 80        | 57      | 60           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     | 67           |
| SWD  | 60       | 50     |             | 54        | 40      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 84       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 67           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 93       | 73     |             | 93        | 91      |              | 91       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 54       | 60     | 40          | 37        | 33      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 92       | 79     |             | 81        | 50      |              | 93       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 94       |        |             | 88        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 87       | 75     | 69          | 86        | 59      | 73           | 82       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 63       | 80     |             | 56        | 64      |              | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 83       | 64     | 44          | 87        | 69      | 61           | 82       |         |           |                   |                     | 71           |
| SWD  | 40       | 32     | 25          | 48        | 49      | 42           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 63       | 62     |             | 73        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 71           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 93       | 90     |             | 97        | 85      |              | 85       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 60       | 49     | 39          | 63        | 55      | 48           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 90       | 45     |             | 85        | 45      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 75       | 56     |             | 85        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 87       | 67     | 43          | 92        | 73      | 70           | 86       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 75       | 65     | 55          | 78        | 63      | 57           | 77       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

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

**III. Planning for Improvement**

### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data components that showed the lowest performance were Math and ELA. These components both scored in the 80th percentile for proficiency. Contributing factors may be the new assessment (FAST) , implementation of new standards and new curriculum. We will continue to monitor progress in both areas of Math and ELA.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was ELA. Factors that contributed to this decline may have been the implementation of new standards, new curriculum, and a new platform for assessing students.

**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.**

All data components scored above the state average.

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

5th grade Science showed the most improvement. Scores went from 75 percent proficient to 82 percent proficient. Actions implemented in this area were lateral review of standards and support with reading skills.

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

One area of concern is 4th grade level 1 ELA scores.

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

1. Improving reading scores from 80 percent proficient to 81 percent proficient.
2. Improving math scores from 80 percent proficient to 81 percent proficient.

### Area of Focus

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Other****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The ESSA subgroup from area from 2021-2022 of Black/African American students scored below the 41st percentile.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The ESSA subgroup area from 2021-2022 of Black/African American students scores will improve and score above 41st percentile.

**Monitoring:**

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

Ongoing training on intervention materials will benefit all subgroups. Continued monthly monitoring of all subgroups and meetings to discuss EWS indicators will continue to be implemented.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

UFLI Foundations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

UFLI Foundations will help support the foundational reading skills for all students. Therefore improving reading score across all subgroups.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Teacher Retention and Recruitment is important for consistency and school morale.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Gilchrist will continue to maintain a full staff.

**Monitoring:**

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

Climate surveys and teacher intention forms will be monitored throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

NA

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

NA

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

NA

**Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

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

### **Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

#### **Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**

#### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

### **Monitoring**

#### **Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

#### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step**

**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

**Title I Requirements**

**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school’s webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

NA

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

NA

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

NA

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

NA

#### **Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

NA

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

NA

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

NA

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

NA

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

NA

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Other  | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |

### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes