

Leon County Schools

Buck Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Buck Lake Elementary School

1600 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

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

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), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. 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 mission of the Buck Lake School community is to nurture each child regardless of gender, race, creed or ability by providing all students with a safe environment where they can take risks, practice problem solving, and learn to be responsible citizens. Our school community thrives on respect among all of our members. We will work diligently to provide for each student’s academic, physical, social, and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Programs in our school community will be designed to meet the needs of all students. Our classrooms will be infused with traditional resources and technology that will help students access curricula and learn about areas of interest. Teachers will use research-based practices, coupled with innovative techniques to prepare students to be productive, respectful members of a larger community. Our students will experience a campus filled with adults who care, are knowledgeable, and will support them to grow into life-long learners and leaders.

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
Wetherington, Ron	Principal	Ensures that the vision, mission of the school is communicated to all stakeholders. Provides support to teachers by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations/feedback. Works with grade levels to analyze student data as it relates to proficiency with curricular standards.
Quiggins, Angela	Assistant Principal	Identifies needs of grade levels, individual teachers. Provides support to teachers by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations/feedback. Ensures that the standards are being taught with fidelity.

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.

The school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents and families, as well as business or community leaders were given the opportunity to give input for the School Improvement Plan.

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))

The SIP will be monitored monthly as the progress of students is monitored.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	3	15	13	12	14	7	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	9	12	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	17
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	

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	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	14	10	6	5	10	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	5
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	2	6	5	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	13	0	0	0	27
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	

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	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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	3	14	10	6	5	10	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in 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	2	6	5	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	13	0	0	0	27
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

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	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	80	58	56	79	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	71	60	61	64	54	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53	49	52	49	47	53
Math Achievement*	80	58	60	80	64	63
Math Learning Gains	82	60	64	75	63	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62	48	55	55	45	51
Science Achievement*	73	50	51	77	52	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	53			
HSP	80			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	54			

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	80	71	53	80	82	62	73					
SWD	57	58	36	54	68	50	43					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	91	90		93	93		92					
BLK	59	63	53	50	64	56	23					
HSP	78	75		85	80							
MUL	83	53		83	73		73					
PAC												
WHT	82	71	59	82	84	68	78					
FRL	53	60	46	46	71	64	36					

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	76	60	36	72	53	18	68					
SWD	45	27		40	27		33					
ELL	80			60								
AMI												
ASN	94			89								
BLK	44	47		38	12		47					
HSP	77			77			80					
MUL	79			79								
PAC												
WHT	80	59	54	75	59	18	69					
FRL	64	69		45	38		71					

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	79	64	49	80	75	55	77					
SWD	50	52	58	42	48	44	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	93	74		95	97		93					
BLK	67	63	58	65	50	38	60					
HSP	72	74		62	53							
MUL	92			92								
PAC												
WHT	79	62	44	82	78	67	78					
FRL	73	61	63	73	71	50	67					

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	55%	16%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	52%	26%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	77%	57%	20%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	58%	18%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	52%	22%	55%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	50%	16%	51%	15%

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.

Our Science proficiency showed the lowest performance, with only 66% proficient.

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

Science showed decline, with proficiency dropping from 73% to 66% proficient.
 4th grade math declined from 83% proficiency to 76% proficiency in math.
 5th grade math declined from 82% proficiency to 74% proficiency in math.
 5th grade reading declined from 78% proficiency to 71% proficiency in ELA.
 New ELA curriculum, motivating students (e.g. participating in Accelerated Reading).

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.

Buck Lake had a greater proficiency than the state average in ELA, Math, and Science. The largest gap was 3rd grade reading proficiency, where we were at 78% proficiency compared to the state average of 50% proficiency. Factors that contributed to this were focus on standards, using Tier two interventions, Tier 3 interventions with interventionists, new Savvas curriculum, and Lexia to support various abilities.

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

3rd grade math increased from 76% proficient to 77% proficient.

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

Attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase science proficiency.
2. Maintain or increase math and reading proficiency from previous year.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment 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.

Increase faculty/staff knowledge of working with Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of faculty/staff will increase knowledge of how to work with DHH students.

Monitoring:

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

Monitor knowledge of working with DHH students through Professional Development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@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.)

Professional Development

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Faculty/Staff will participate in professional development activities to learn simple sign language and best practices for interacting with DHH students.

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.

1. Ongoing professional development

Person Responsible: Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@leonschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Science proficiency dropped from 73% to 66% from 21-22 to 22-23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

70% of matched and qualified students will score at or above Level 3 on the Statewide Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Beginning of the year, mid-year, and end of year progress monitoring. Standards mastery checks, unit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@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.)

Multisensory instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multisensory instruction brings together what students see, hear, do, and feel. Linking these senses during education can help students recall information.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

78% or more of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in Math.

Monitoring:

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

FAST data, benchmark assessments, iReady data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ron Wetherington (wetheringtonr@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.)

B.E.S.T Instructional Guide for Mathematics

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The B.E.S.T. Instructional Guide for Mathematics (B1G-M) is intended to assist educators with planning for student learning and instruction aligned to Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards. This guide is designed to aid high-quality instruction through the identification of components that support the learning and teaching of the B.E.S.T. Mathematics standards and benchmarks. The B1G-M includes an analysis of information related to the B.E.S.T. Standards within this specific mathematics course, the instructional emphasis and aligned resources. This document is posted on the B.E.S.T. Mathematics webpage of the Florida

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.

1. Teacher training with new math standards, curriculum, and B.E.S.T Instructional Guide for Mathematics.
2. On-going professional development and collaboration
3. Short and long term planning
4. Differentiated instruction in math

Person Responsible: Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

78% or more of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FAST data, benchmark assessments, Lexia data

Monitoring:

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

Monthly data meetings, on-going review of student data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@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.)

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the Decision Tree, students will receive interventions based on progress monitoring data.

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.

1. Support from Reading Coach
2. On-going collaboration
3. Short and long term planning
4. Differentiated instruction in reading

Person Responsible: Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

By When: May 2024