Woodville School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Woodville School

9373 WOODVILLE HWY, Tallahassee, FL 32305

https://www.leonschools.net/woodville

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Mehr

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2020-21: (40%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To promote outstanding achievement in a dedicated learning environment for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Improving tomorrow...Learning today, Honoring our past!

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mehr, Lisa	Principal	Provides vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing procedures that improve the school in all aspects academically and in regards to student safety and school culture, ensures implementation of standards based core instruction and intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support faculty and staff and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based programs such as Title 1, MTSS and PBIS.
Andrews, Jessica	Reading Coach	Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading strategies. She also serves as the Literacy Leadership Committee Chair.
Bramblett, Amy	Assistant Principal	With the principal, provides vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing procedures that improve the school in all aspects academically and in regards to student safety and school culture, ensures implementation of standards based core instruction and intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support faculty and staff and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based programs such as Title 1, MTSS and PBIS. She is the testing coordinator and responsible for evaluation of members of the staff.
Rudd, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	With the principal, provides vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing procedures that improve the school in all aspects academically and in regards to student safety and school culture, ensures implementation of standards based core instruction and intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support faculty and staff and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based programs such as Title 1, MTSS and PBIS. She is the ELL coordinator and responsible for evaluating members of the staff.
Coley, Demetrius	Dean	Duties and Responsibilities: *Assists in the development, implementation, and evaluation of intervention programs. *Performs a variety of administrative duties to assist the Principal in managing the school. *Assists the Principal in providing instructional leadership to the school. *Develops and administers disciplinary procedures in accordance with district policies and state laws; receives

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
			referrals and confers with students and parents to resolve concerns. *Supervises students on campus before and after school; monitors students during lunch, transitional times, other activities. *Instructs students in appropriate behavior, guides students within the PBIS program. *Participates as needed in Individual Educational Plan meetings and Student Study Teams. *Works with the Principal to establish a safe learning environment for students. *Prepares and maintains a variety of reports. *Participates in administrative meetings and training to improve administrative skills. *Performs duties as assigned.
Miller, Brandyce	Other	Referral Coordinator	Referral Coordinator: Will serve as Referral Coordinator and conduct pre-screenings for referred students. ESE teacher: (Varying exceptionalities, speech, language, gifted, etc.) Provides information about intervention instruction, participates in student data collection, collaborates with general education teachers.
Beard, Roshanna	Other	Math Interventionist	• Provides high quality mathematics instruction to individual students and small groups • Uses data to provide instruction to students and to bring their skills to grade-level • Collaborates with teachers, administration, and families to help identify best practices for individual and small groups of students • Uses identified research-based interventions focuses specifically on individual student needs • Maintains data-based documentation of continuous monitoring of student performance and progress • Provides data to school teams and participates in decisions about student progress • Communicates with teachers, administration, and families regarding student progress • Assists with identifying students for placement in intervention groups • Participates in meetings with teachers, administration, and families to discuss student placement and progress • Provides diagnostic assessments for students as needed • Provides input for program development • Supports implementation of assessment tools and data management systems

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harrison, Natalee	Other	Reading Interventionist	*Designing the intervention program so that it is consistent with the Primary *Reading Intervention program and with the educational philosophy of the district. *Continuing professional growth through participating in educational meetings and defined professional growth opportunities, reading professional literature, and exchanging ideas with others on staff. *Participating in a network/support system in planning and developing the program. *Attending weekly seminars. *Administrating and interpreting specific diagnostic surveys of reading behavior *Using appropriate formal in informal assessment tools to plan instruction. *Preparing daily one-to-one reading lessons. *Providing specialized instructional strategies to ensure reading progress as well as to meet the social and emotional needs of the pupils. *Selecting and using materials appropriate for each child. *Participating in conferences concerning pupils served.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Lisa Mehr

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Total number of students enrolled at the school
473

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	53	68	55	55	61	44	49	45	33	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	15	21	15	20	18	13	17	15	12	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	31	15	26	14	7	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	35	13	22	14	8	0	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	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 who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	1	13	8	15	8	3	0	0	0	0	50

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/5/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	63	57	51	66	40	51	48	31	45	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	15	16	19	17	9	15	13	9	21	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	13	24	21	6	15	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	12	26	23	11	22	0	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	8	15	21	16	24	21	6	14	0	0	0	0	126

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	4	11	9	4	12	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	4	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	63	57	51	66	40	51	48	31	45	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	15	16	19	17	9	15	13	9	21	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	13	24	21	6	15	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	12	26	23	11	22	0	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	8	15	21	16	24	21	6	14	0	0	0	0	126

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	4	11	9	4	12	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	4	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%			33%			41%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	44%			41%			53%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%			37%			58%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	38%			32%			43%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	57%			31%			48%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%			33%			36%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	29%			32%			39%	59%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	71%			50%			63%	64%	78%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	40%	61%	-21%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	56%	-21%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
06	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	54%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
07	2022					
	2019	43%	56%	-13%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	30%	63%	-33%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	66%	-27%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	61%	-2%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
06	2022					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	55%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2022					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2022					
	2019	21%	45%	-24%	46%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	50%	44%	6%	48%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

		BIOLOGY EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
		CIVICS EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	75%	-6%	71%	-2%
		HISTORY EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
		ALGEBRA EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	69%	-5%	61%	3%
		GEOMETRY EOC			
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	12	36	36	18	49	50	19				
ELL	9			36							
BLK	27	47	50	34	59	52	33	73			
HSP	21	55			33	64		9			
MUL	41	46		33	46						
WHT	34	36	13	45	56	50	31	67			
FRL	24	39	42	32	52	46	24	70	87		

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	30	31	13	26	37	25	38			
ELL											
BLK	26	34	26	18	24	39	21	38			
HSP	39	25		39	25						
MUL	33	45		54	40						
WHT	40	52	62	42	39	33	41	64	70		
FRL	30	38	40	26	28	30	31	50	64		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	51	50	23	34	27	30				
ELL	20			40							
BLK	33	45	59	32	42	29	18	53			
HSP	56	64		56	57						
MUL	53	73		50	50						
WHT	44	55	52	50	52	38	53	72			
FRL	40	54	58	39	45	40	36	64			

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	42
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Over the past three years our ELA proficiency levels have continued to decline school wide with the total for 21-22 being 30%. This year we will be an intensive RAISE school with FLDOE because of our ELA scores in grades 3-5.

Another, trend is that our Science scores have declined from 39% proficient in 2019 to 29% proficient in 2022. Science scores across the district have also declined so this is a definite area we will focus on.

We have also shown growth in multiple areas since the 2020-2021 school year. In Civics our scores increased from 50% proficient to 71% proficient. We also raised our Math Learning Gains in students from 31% to 57% of students making at least a years worth of gains.

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

Based on both the state assessments and our school progress monitoring, the areas where we have the greatest need for improvement are ELA proficiency for all students and specifically with our ELL subgroup and the SWD subgroup, also science proficiency in 5th and 8th grade. Additionally, although we increased our Math proficiency in 21-22, we still will focus on this area with the addition of our Math Interventionist.

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

Certainly a major contributing factor to the areas for improvement listed above are the years of lost instruction some students experienced during the COVID 19 epidemic. While this is a factor outside of our control we are continuing to give our students intense interventions in all grade levels to close the

gaps created by this loss of instruction.

Our school also faces barriers such as poor attendance and a transient population. For example this year we have had over 100 new students enroll while our total population is still only 500 students. It is extremely difficult to make long term growth with students that we do not keep year after year. With the addition of a full time social worker we hope to increase our communication with our fragile families and work to increase attendance with students.

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

As stated above, Woodville was able to show improvement in Civics Proficiency, Math Proficiency and Learning Gains, as well as in the area of Middle School Acceleration where we have increased our score to 88%.

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

One major factor was that there was no more virtual learning in the 21-22 school year. With all students back on campus we were able to more accurately progress monitor and deliver instruction. Also, we were diligent about keeping our school goals at the fore front in all Progress Monitoring and Faculty Meetings.

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

Student Data Tracking- All students will have data folders/binders to track and have ownership of their data. These folders will be reviewed during progress monitor meetings and throughout classroom observations.

Improve Student Behavior- Our PBIS team will work to provide targeted school wide incentives and celebrations that encourage positive student behaviors.

Instructional Practices- All instruction will be based on the FL Standards and will come from evidence based materials. Also, we have added two intervention teachers to our staff to assit in ensuring that we are meeting the needs of all learners.

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.

PLCs- This year teachers will lead and attend monthly PLCs. These groups will focus on best practices and student data. Also, there will be a focus on identifying trends in school data and responsive instruction. During these meetings, facilitators will work to increase teacher knowledge of the new curriculum, standards, and assessments that are being utilized school wide.

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

We have already been given funding to implement "Beyond the Bell" afterschool tutoring for our K-3 students and hope to expand this across all grade levels. During these times teachers are able to target specific learning needs and give students additional instruction from evidence based programs.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	One focus area for Woodville School is to increase proficiency across multiple subgroups. Specifically, we will focus on Students with Disabilities and ELL students since both subgroups were below the Federal Index. Our subgroup for Students with Disabilities performed below other students as well. In ELA, this subgroup performed at 11.5% proficient. Math proficiency was at 18.3% proficient. This subgroup was below the 41% threshold (31%). Our subgroup for ELL students also performed below their peers. In ELA, this subgroup performed at 9.1% proficient. Math proficiency was at 36.4% proficient. This subgroup was below the 41% threshold (33%).
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The goal is to raise each of the subgroups listed above to at least the 41% proficiency threshold based on end of the year assessments. We would like to have all subgroups meeting the Federal Index target of 41% or higher.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teachers will meet with members of administration for progress monitoring meetings to discuss their student data trends for these targeted subgroups, interventions progress for these subgroups and resources needed to meet the goals set for student growth with these subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Andrews (andrewsj@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Provide additional standards based instruction and interventions for these students based on needs identified through benchmark assessments. Our progress monitoring plan, alongside the district K-12 reading plan will be used to ensure that students are properly identified and receiving the correct instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research shows that standards based instruction helps to ensure that teachers are focused on common learning targets and that students are held to expectations that meet the demands on standardized assessments. This approach focuses on planning and also provides a framework for evaluating resources and assessments.

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.

1. Identify individual students in each of the subgroups listed above.
2. Identify specific areas of weakness for these students using benchmark assessments and the decision trees provided by the district.
3. Provide additional targeted instruction and interventions for students within these subgroups.
4. Use ongoing assessments to monitor progress.

Person Responsible	Jessica Andrews (andrewsj@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our students need to increase their understanding of the scientific method, process, reasoning, and problem solving skills in order to improve their proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The goal is to have at least 50% of our students in 5th and 8th grades attaining proficient scores (Levels 3-5) on the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The 5th and 8th grade science teachers will meet with members of administration for progress monitoring meetings to discuss their student data trends, interventions progress and resources needed to meet the goals set for student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Rudd (rudde@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Provide students with standards based instruction in Science. Teachers will utilize research based curriculum and eLearning programs shown to be successful in order to engage students both at home and in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research shows that standards based instruction helps to ensure that teachers are focused on common learning targets and that students are held to expectations that meet the demands on standardized assessments. This approach focuses planning and also provides a framework for evaluating resources and assessments.

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.

1. Identify specific areas of weakness for these students using benchmark assessments.
2. Provide additional targeted instruction and interventions in these areas.
3. Use ongoing assessments to monitor progress and incorporate mini assessments each week.
4. Collaborative planning with teachers, instructional coaches, and district developers.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Rudd (rudde@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	We will target Math Proficiency school-wide during the 2022-2023 school year. Although we increased our overall proficiency last year, we were still below 40% proficient as a school. Teachers will work to increase student proficiency by developing number sense, the ability to accurately compute and solve complex problems and the skill to identify alternative representations and methods of problem solving.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The goal is to have at least 50% of our students attaining proficient scores in math on the end of year FAST assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teachers will meet with members of administration for progress monitoring meetings to discuss their student data trends, interventions progress and resources needed to meet the goals set for student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roshanna Beard (beardr@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Provide students with evidence-based interventions and standards-based instruction for math as well as monthly PLCs for teachers facilitated by our Math Interventionist.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Our instructional plan places emphasis on how core instruction must be standards-based and be shown to be effective with the majority of students. Also, our intervention plan specifies that interventions are evidenced-based and systematic so students' progress can be monitored and the effectiveness of the intervention can be tracked.

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.

1. Identify specific areas of weakness for these students using benchmark assessments.
2. Provide additional targeted instruction and interventions in these areas.
3. Use ongoing assessments to monitor progress and incorporate mini assessments each week.
4. Collaborative planning with teachers, instructional coaches, and district developers.

Person Responsible   Roshanna Beard (beardr@leonschools.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

All of our primary grade levels, for which we have previous data, fall in the low 40s for percent of students projected to be proficient in ELA. Based on this data and the number of students we typically see in Tier 2 or Tier 3, we have chosen to focus on ensuring that teachers are selecting and correctly delivering targeted, systematic, and evidence based interventions. This will help to ensure that students are entering 3rd grade as fluent readers so they are ready to receive Tier 1 instruction in order to master benchmarks and reach proficiency on the end of year ELA assessment.

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

In grades 3 and 5 we had more than 70% of our students fail to demonstrate proficiency on the ELA FSA in 21-22. In grade 4, 65% scored below a level 3 on the ELA FSA. Based on this data, we are focusing on quality Tier 1 (core) instruction that is anchored in the new BEST benchmarks. Teachers will utilize the BEST Standards and progress monitoring data to inform their planning and delivery of ELA instruction. By focusing on effective Tier 1 instruction, students will be exposed to and monitored for proficiency on standard level materials so that they may demonstrate proficiency on the end of year ELA assessment.

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of all Woodville K-2 students will be proficient on the FAST ELA end of year assessment within the next two years. (STAR EL and STAR Reading)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of all Woodville 3-5 students will be proficient on the FAST ELA end of year assessment within the next two years. (FAST ELA Cambium)

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Admin and Instructional Coaches will hold monthly Progress Monitoring Meetings with all teachers to review and analyze school data. In addition to these meetings, the school will have 2 PLCs; one dedicated to ELA instruction specifically and the school based Literacy Leadership Team. Through all of these meetings and coaching from the literacy coach, teachers will receive professional development on instruction, collaborative planning, and data analysis.

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

Andrews, Jessica, andrewsj@leonschools.net

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence based programs we will use are listed below:

Tier 1 instruction
Savvas

Tier 2 & 3
Lexia
Ready Teacher Toolbox Materials
The Hardman Technique
RAZ Plus
Corrective Reading

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These programs are all either the district adopted curriculum or considered evidence based according to the FCRR Reading Repository. Each of the programs included in the repository have been reviewed by either the What Works Clearinghouse or Evidence for ESSA.

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
We will have both an ELA PLC and a Literacy Leadership Team PLC that meets at least monthly. The groups will use practice guides from the REL site. [Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade & Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9] Professional Development will be delivered through these PLCs to teachers on engaging and evidence based instructional practices. Teachers will also meet with the Literacy Coach to plan and implement the coaching cycle as needed.	Andrews, Jessica, andrewsj@leonschools.net
Admin and Instructional Coaches will hold monthly Progress Monitoring Meetings with all teachers to review and analyze school data. ELA teachers, based on ELA progress monitoring data, will be able to identify where students are based on the ELA decision tree (i.e. Proficient, Tier 2, Tier 3, etc.). Using student data, teachers will implement the appropriate evidence based intervention/instruction(FCRR-Reading Repository/REL). The Reading Interventionist will assist and monitor intervention groups.	Andrews, Jessica, andrewsj@leonschools.net
All grade level teams, along with admin, will ensure that progress monitoring assessments are administered within the testing windows set by the district and that all instruction is based on specific student needs identified in these assessments.	Bramblett, Amy, brambletta@leonschools.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

At Woodville School, we work together to promote a positive and safe environment for everyone. A sense of community is our goal. The power of parent engagement is represented in our school-wide communications which allows everyone to stay involved. We work to ensure a positive climate where everyone feels valued, cared for, and respected.

Student Awards/Recognitions:
1. Positive Referrals
2. PBIS Student of the Month
3. Quarterly PBIS Celebrations

Teacher Support:
1. Workday Wednesday - teachers can attend to get assistance in any area
2. Treat Trolley - each month the teachers are given a special treat from a cart
3. Faculty Meeting Drawings - each faculty meeting teachers are given a ticket to earn a prize donated from local companies
4. Sunshine Committee- Teachers and Admin work together to celebrate achievements, support each other during hard times, and build school spirit together.

Professional Learning Communities:
Each teacher will participate in a PLC that is guided by administration but facilitated by their peers. These PLCs are a support system for teachers in the areas of instruction, discipline, data, or any additional area they request for support.

Stakeholder Resources/Communications:
1.) Communication documents (e.g., flyers or newsletters)
2.) Special Events/Celebrations
3.) Meetings/Conferences
4.) School Website
5.) Social Media posts
6.) Remind App
7.) LISTSERV
8.) Parent Portal

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

Student Awards and Recognitions are provided by classroom teachers at each grade level, as well as members of the administrative team and other school staff.

Teacher Support is provided by all members of the administration team:
Dr. Lisa Mehr
Elizabeth Rudd
Amy Bramblett
Jessica Andrews
Dr. Demetrius Coley
Natalee Harrison
Roshanna Beard

PLCs:
Literacy Leadership Committee - Jessica Andrews- facilitator
Math Committee - Melissa Auter & Roshanna Beard - facilitators
PBIS Committee - Dr. Coley & Elizabeth Rudd - facilitators
Science Committee - Jeanette Villa - facilitator
ELA/Social Studies Committee - Daisy Bush & Natalee Harrison - facilitators